

Alfred M. Jones to be postmaster at Summit, in the county of Union and State of New Jersey.

William H. Mackay to be postmaster at Rutherford, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey.

Frank D. Pedrick to be postmaster at Woodbury, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK.

Charles B. Ball to be postmaster at Montour Falls, in the county of Schuyler and State of New York.

George R. Cornwell to be postmaster at Penn Yan, in the county of Yates and State of New York.

George N. Deyoe to be postmaster at Johnstown, in the county of Fulton and State of New York.

John L. Kyne to be postmaster at East Syracuse, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York.

Adolph Lienhardt to be postmaster at Stapleton, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

OKLAHOMA.

C. C. Curtis to be postmaster at Cordell, in the county of Washita and Territory of Oklahoma.

Arthur E. Gunn to be postmaster at Okeene, in the county of Blaine and Territory of Oklahoma.

Perry C. Hughes to be postmaster at Busch, in the county of Roger Mills and Territory of Oklahoma.

OREGON.

John R. Casey to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Joseph H. Denning to be postmaster at St. Clair, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

William W. Kemble to be postmaster at Tidioute, in the county of Warren and State of Pennsylvania.

Joseph I. Latimer to be postmaster at New Bethlehem, in the county of Clarion and State of Pennsylvania.

William D. McHenry to be postmaster at Big Run, in the county of Jefferson and State of Pennsylvania.

William W. Reber to be postmaster at Lehigh, in the county of Carbon and State of Pennsylvania.

John S. Weaver to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

William W. Wren to be postmaster at Boyertown, in the county of Berks and State of Pennsylvania.

RHODE ISLAND.

James E. Bowen to be postmaster at Central Falls, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

James T. Caswell to be postmaster at Narragansett Pier, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Dalton A. Brosius to be postmaster at Vermillion, in the county of Clay and State of South Dakota.

William T. Dale to be postmaster at Mellette, in the county of Spink and State of South Dakota.

J. N. Fulford to be postmaster at Oacoma, in the county of Lyman and State of South Dakota.

George Reed to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Kingsbury and State of South Dakota.

VERMONT.

Stanley R. Bryant to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont.

B. J. Derby to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Chittenden and State of Vermont.

L. D. Hazen to be postmaster at St. Johnsbury, in the county of Caledonia and State of Vermont.

WASHINGTON.

Dan W. Bush to be postmaster at Chehalis, in the county of Lewis and State of Washington.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William F. Squires to be postmaster at Parsons, in the county of Tucker and State of West Virginia.

WISCONSIN.

James T. Brownlee to be postmaster at Mondovi, in the county of Buffalo and State of Wisconsin.

Robert Downend to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of Polk and State of Wisconsin.

Joseph W. Fritz to be postmaster at Ladysmith, in the county of Rusk and State of Wisconsin.

Cyrus C. Glass to be postmaster at River Falls, in the county of Pierce and State of Wisconsin.

Thomas Hughes to be postmaster at Beaver Dam, in the county of Dodge and State of Wisconsin.

Christ Legreid to be postmaster at Cambridge, in the county of Dane and State of Wisconsin.

Nicholas T. Martin to be postmaster at Mineral Point, in the county of Iowa and State of Wisconsin.

Andrew Moberg to be postmaster at Amherst, in the county of Portage and State of Wisconsin.

John Vilberg to be postmaster at Mount Horeb, in the county of Dane and State of Wisconsin.

Eldon D. Woodworth to be postmaster at Ellsworth, in the county of Pierce and State of Wisconsin.

BANCOS IN THE RIO GRANDE.

The injunction of secrecy was removed February 28, 1907, from the ratification of a convention between the United States and Mexico, signed on March 20, 1905, for the elimination of the bancos in the Rio Grande from the effects of Article II of the treaty of November 12, 1884.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 28, 1907.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

WILLIAM J. CRANE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, from the Speaker's table, the bill (H. R. 9767) entitled "An act granting a pension to William J. Crane," with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

DAM ACROSS COOSA RIVER, ALABAMA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill S. 8526, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

The title was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 8526) permitting the erection of a dam across Coosa River, Alabama, at the place selected for Lock No. 12 on said river.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the consideration of the bill and against the House bill being on the House Calendar. Section 5 of the bill provides:

That Congress reserves the right to revoke the rights and privileges conferred by this act, but in the event of such revocation the United States shall pay to the contracting party as full compensation the reasonable value, exclusive of any franchise that may be acquired under this act, of any dam and of all properties erected and land purchased by them necessary for the use and enjoyment of the benefits hereby conferred, etc.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to hear from the gentleman further, and will call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] that this bill affects property of the United States, and should be upon the Union Calendar; and the Chair will direct it to be placed upon the Union Calendar. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill at this time?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; I do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I stated to the gentleman the other day that if he would amend this bill in conformity with the practice of the House, that this dam should be erected under the provisions of the general dam act, as required in all other cases which had passed through the House at this session, I would not object, but under the bill as it is presented I shall object.

Mr. BURNETT. I hope the gentleman will reserve the objection until—

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to reserve it until the gentleman makes a statement. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] desire to accept the amendment?

Mr. BURNETT. No.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 3518. An act for the relief of Copiah County, Miss.;

H. R. 25769. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fayette Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County," approved April 23, 1906;

H. R. 25758. An act amending an act entitled "An act to in-

crease the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes;"

H. R. 8. An act for the relief of the Harbison-Walker Company, of Pittsburg, Pa.;

H. R. 3462. An act for the relief of Franklin Patterson;

H. R. 12188. An act for the relief of George T. Larkin;

H. R. 9326. An act for the opening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of William H. Gowdy;

H. R. 24118. An act granting to the Central Colorado Power Company a right of way over certain public lands for irrigation and electric power plants in the State of Colorado;

H. R. 24374. An act to fix the boundaries of lands of certain landowners and entrymen adjoining the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation;

H. R. 16581. An act for the relief of George W. Schroyer;

H. R. 5. An act to provide for the refunding of certain money, etc.;

H. R. 23940. An act for the extension of Albemarle street NW., District of Columbia;

H. R. 25691. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Liberty Bridge Company;

H. R. 25041. An act to provide for the creation of additional land districts in the district of Alaska;

H. R. 12857. An act to validate certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico with reference to the issuance of certain bonds;

H. R. 25184. An act to relieve the Tanana Mines Railroad in Alaska from taxation;

H. R. 21944. An act to amend section No. 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend the homestead laws as to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands in Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904; to restore to and confer upon certain persons the right to make entry under said act, and to amend existing law as to the sale of isolated tracts subject to entry under said act;

H. R. 25611. An act to authorize the Burnwell Coal and Coke Company to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River;

H. R. 16085. An act for the relief of Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company (Limited);

H. R. 25627. An act to authorize the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River in Armstrong County, Pa.;

H. R. 23720. An act to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company;

H. R. 24046. An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America;

H. R. 9109. An act for the relief of J. H. Henry;

H. R. 12840. An act for the relief of L. Biertempfel;

H. R. 24022. An act to correct the military record of Morris H. Walker;

H. R. 11044. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury, in certain contingencies, to refund to receivers of public moneys acting as special disbursing agents amounts paid by them out of their private funds;

H. R. 15320. An act to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Parsch;

H. R. 19524. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906;

H. R. 24605. An act granting to the Norfolk and Portsmouth Traction Company the right to operate trains through the military reservation on Willoughby Spit, Norfolk County, Va.;

H. R. 25401. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to make certain disposition of condemned guns and cannon balls;

H. R. 25716. An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River above the village of Monticello, Wright County, Minn.," approved June 14, 1906;

H. R. 25717. An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Wright County, Minn.," approved June 14, 1906;

H. R. 25773. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at McDaniel shoals;

H. R. 25774. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Turner shoals;

H. R. 25776. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Middleton shoals;

H. R. 25795. An act to authorize the Pensacola and North-eastern Railroad Company, a corporation existing under the

laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over the Escambia River between the counties of Santa Rosa and Escambia, in the State of Florida; and

H. R. 21857. An act to correct the military record of Jacob Rockwell.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 8409. An act to amend an act approved June 30, 1906, entitled "An act creating a United States court for China and prescribing the jurisdiction thereof;"

S. 3425. An act for the relief of Capt. George Van Orden, United States Marine Corps;

S. 7921. An act for the relief of George A. Armstrong;

S. 6649. An act authorizing the purchase of grounds for the accommodation of public buildings for the use of the Government of the United States in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 6190. An act authorizing the Omaha tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

S. 6754. An act granting to the Siletz Power and Manufacturing Company a right of way for a water ditch or canal through the Siletz Indian Reservation in Oregon;

S. 7929. An act to provide a temporary home for ex-Union soldiers and sailors in the District of Columbia;

S. 8303. An act to establish the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace;

S. 8542. An act to authorize W. D. Clay and others to select lands in lieu of lands purchased by the father of said parties from the United States Government and lost by said heirs;

S. 8498. An act to amend sections 16, 17, and 20 of an act entitled "An act to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," approved June 16, 1906, and for other purposes;

S. 32. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire;

S. 8431. An act to authorize the cutting and sale of timber on land reserved for the use of the Menominee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin;

S. 8117. An act to create the Calaveras Bigtree National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 8292. An act providing for the completion by the Secretary of War of a monument to the memory of the American soldiers who fell in the battle of New Orleans, at Chalmette, La., and making the necessary appropriation therefor;

S. 7851. An act for the relief of J. M. Bloom;

S. 8420. An act for the relief of the Mille Lac band of Chipewya Indians, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; and

S. 1181. An act to provide for the payment of overtime claims of letter carriers excluded from judgment as barred by limitation.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 7684) to provide and maintain for the port of Galveston, Tex., a customs boarding boat.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6229) to authorize the sale of public lands for cemetery purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 24122. An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad;

H. R. 13122. An act to correct the military record of John Allen;

H. R. 8984. An act to amend the laws governing labor or improvements upon mining claims in Alaska;

H. R. 10703. An act authorizing the extension of Monroe street NE.;

H. R. 23650. An act to quiet title to lands on Jicarilla Reservation, and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause allotments to be made, and to dispose of the merchantable timber, and for other purposes;

H. R. 22210. An act to correct the military record of Homer Quick;

H. R. 10305. An act to provide for the repayment of certain customs dues;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Henry O. Bassett, heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased;

H. R. 15909. An act to reward the widow and minor son of

Capt. Charles W. Dakin and the widow and minor children of Thomas J. Hennessy, late of San Francisco fire department, who lost their lives while fighting a fire on board of the U. S. Army transport *Meade*;

H. R. 7676. An act authorizing the appointment of Allen V. Reed, now a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a commodore on the retired list of the Navy;

H. R. 13605. An act to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department; and

H. R. 19500. An act for the relief of Indian traders Marion Wescott, F. F. Green, and J. A. Leige, assignee of Joseph F. Gauthier a Menominee Indian trader, with the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24537) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolutions:

House concurrent resolution 60.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the invitation extended to the Congress of the United States by the Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition to attend the opening ceremonies of said exposition to be held April 26, 1907, is hereby accepted.

That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and are hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a committee, to consist of ten Senators and fifteen Representatives, of the Fifty-ninth Congress to attend the formal opening of the ceremonies referred to and to represent the Congress of the United States on that occasion.

Also:

House concurrent resolution 59.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return the bill (H. R. 21606) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Felix G. Morrison."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 8377. An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River in the county of Morrison, State of Minnesota," approved June 4, 1906;

S. 2787. An act to amend the act of Congress approved February 11, 1901, entitled "An act providing for allotments of lands in severalty to the Indians of the La Pointe or Bad River Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin;" and

S. 8535. An act for the relief of certain white persons who intermarried with Cherokee citizens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 8556) to authorize the Pensacola and Northeastern Railroad Company, a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over the Escambia River between the counties of Santa Rosa and Escambia, in the State of Florida.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 25630. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1901," approved June 8, 1906.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8409. An act to amend the act approved June 30, 1906, entitled "An act creating a United States court for China, and prescribing the jurisdiction thereof"—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 32. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 8431. An act to authorize the cutting and sale of timber on land reserved for the use of the Menominee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1181. An act to provide for the payment of overtime claims of letter carriers excluded from judgment as barred by limitation—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3425. An act for the relief of Capt. George Van Arden, United States Marine Corps—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6649. An act authorizing the purchase of grounds for the accommodation of public buildings for the use of the Government of the United States in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 7851. An act for the relief of J. M. Bloom—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6754. An act granting to Siletz Power and Manufacturing Company a right of way for a water ditch or canal through the Siletz Indian Reservation, in Oregon—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 7921. An act for the relief of George A. Armstrong—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 8117. An act to create the Calaveras Bigtree National Forest, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 8292. An act providing for the completion by the Secretary of War of a monument to the memory of the American soldiers who fell in the battle of New Orleans, at Chalmette, La., and making the necessary appropriation therefor—to the Committee on the Library.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 24103. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9326. An act for the opening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street;

H. R. 8080. An act for the relief of S. Kate Fisher;

H. R. 15434. An act to regulate appeals in criminal prosecutions;

H. R. 9767. An act granting a pension to William J. Crane;

H. R. 7153. An act for the relief of David McClelland for loss sustained at Chickamauga Park, Ga., January 29, 1904;

H. R. 25758. An act amending an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," and for other purposes;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of William H. Gowdy;

H. R. 25691. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Liberty Bridge Company;

H. R. 25190. An act to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act entitled "An act to prohibit shanghaiing in the United States," approved June 28, 1906;

H. R. 25769. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fayette Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County," approved April 23, 1906; and

H. R. 24022. An act to correct the military record of Morris H. Walker.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 5588. An act authorizing the President to appoint James Carroll a surgeon, with the rank of major, in the United States Army;

S. 6229. An act to authorize the sale of public lands for cemetery purposes;

S. 7017. An act extending the time for making settlement, final proof, and payment on public lands in certain cases;

S. 7684. An act to provide and maintain for the port of Galveston, Tex., a customs boarding boat;

S. 8400. An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904;

S. 8435. An act granting to the city of Durango, in the State of Colorado, certain lands therein described for water reservoirs;

S. 8446. An act to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak., by the Yankton, Norfolk and Southern Railway Company; and

S. 8534. An act providing that the State of Wyoming be permitted to relinquish to the United States certain lands heretofore selected and to select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 17814. An act granting an increase of pension to Simon E. Chamberlin;

H. R. 21413. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Platt;

- H. R. 21788. An act granting an increase of pension to Satina A. Waymer;
- H. R. 21818. An act granting an increase of pension to William Hardesty;
- H. R. 21827. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Murray;
- H. R. 21899. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine Koch;
- H. R. 21911. An act granting an increase of pension to George Newton;
- H. R. 21914. An act granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Pahl;
- H. R. 21974. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Lowell;
- H. R. 21983. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Pusey;
- H. R. 22055. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria Lorch;
- H. R. 22063. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace F. Packard;
- H. R. 22093. An act granting an increase of pension to Lars Isaacson;
- H. R. 22165. An act granting an increase of pension to John Hand;
- H. R. 22169. An act granting an increase of pension to Cynthia M. Bryson;
- H. R. 22170. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin James;
- H. R. 22175. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Prendeville;
- H. R. 22199. An act granting an increase of pension to William Templin;
- H. R. 22216. An act granting an increase of pension to Griffin A. Coffin;
- H. R. 22251. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Manly;
- H. R. 22260. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Bissell;
- H. R. 22283. An act granting an increase of pension to Stoddard Caswell;
- H. R. 22294. An act granting an increase of pension to Perry Lamphere;
- H. R. 22302. An act granting an increase of pension to Burrell H. Gillam;
- H. R. 22326. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Levina Williams;
- H. R. 22327. An act granting an increase of pension to Isabel Manney;
- H. R. 22328. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan Baker;
- H. R. 22329. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. James;
- H. R. 22330. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Jones;
- H. R. 22426. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Robertson;
- H. R. 22441. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mose;
- H. R. 22468. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kelso;
- H. R. 22503. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Clarke;
- H. R. 22529. An act granting an increase of pension to William Truett;
- H. R. 22540. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard Turnbull;
- H. R. 22547. An act granting an increase of pension to John Hieckox, jr.;
- H. R. 22548. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin H. Davis;
- H. R. 22562. An act granting an increase of pension to George J. Abbey;
- H. R. 22592. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Frayer;
- H. R. 22613. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac G. McKibban;
- H. R. 22617. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret O'Reilly;
- H. R. 22629. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah N. Pratt;
- H. R. 22630. An act granting an increase of pension to George Wiley;
- H. R. 22650. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Baldwin;
- H. R. 22701. An act granting an increase of pension to James R. Fairbrother;
- H. R. 22703. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Richards;
- H. R. 22707. An act granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Gerhardt;
- H. R. 22727. An act granting an increase of pension to John Miller;
- H. R. 22763. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Slocum;
- H. R. 22785. An act granting an increase of pension to Morton A. Pratt;
- H. R. 22788. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Gilmore;
- H. R. 22798. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Robinson;
- H. R. 22801. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert McMillen;
- H. R. 22823. An act granting an increase of pension to John Tipton;
- H. R. 22859. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Boyd;
- H. R. 22863. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar A. Fuller;
- H. R. 22894. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa Berry;
- H. R. 22947. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Sibert;
- H. R. 22949. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Wells;
- H. R. 22950. An act granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Poffenberger;
- H. R. 22964. An act granting an increase of pension to Eudocia Arnett;
- H. R. 22986. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Beeny;
- H. R. 22987. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Lane;
- H. R. 22988. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Horton;
- H. R. 23031. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Terry;
- H. R. 23034. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Snoddy;
- H. R. 23148. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Liddell;
- H. R. 23150. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. W. Riter;
- H. R. 23175. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Fuller;
- H. R. 23198. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucie A. Allyn;
- H. R. 23280. An act granting an increase of pension to Bartholomew Burke;
- H. R. 23282. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Tumey;
- H. R. 23311. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Burke;
- H. R. 23312. An act granting an increase of pension to William Lewis;
- H. R. 23313. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin D. Reed;
- H. R. 23323. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Foote;
- H. R. 23360. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Hastie;
- H. R. 23407. An act granting an increase of pension to Hurd L. Miller;
- H. R. 23411. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Martin;
- H. R. 23414. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Riddle;
- H. R. 23426. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Bergen;
- H. R. 23442. An act granting an increase of pension to James J. Lawley;
- H. R. 23443. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa R. Matthews;
- H. R. 23467. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Flanagan;
- H. R. 23609. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Wallis;
- H. R. 23626. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Taylor;

- H. R. 23627. An act granting an increase of pension to William B. Walton;
- H. R. 23628. An act granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Daniels;
- H. R. 23660. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet U. Burgess;
- H. R. 23673. An act granting an increase of pension to John T. Grayson;
- H. R. 23675. An act granting an increase of pension to Watson F. Bisbee;
- H. R. 23677. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Dryden;
- H. R. 23682. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Bartlett;
- H. R. 23685. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Brake;
- H. R. 23698. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Wyman;
- H. R. 23709. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Dick;
- H. R. 23729. An act granting an increase of pension to John Vandegrift;
- H. R. 23732. An act granting an increase of pension to Rossanna Kaogan;
- H. R. 23733. An act granting an increase of pension to Gifford M. Bridge;
- H. R. 23744. An act granting an increase of pension to John O. Cravens;
- H. R. 23748. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Vanbeher;
- H. R. 23751. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Moody;
- H. R. 23763. An act granting an increase of pension to James Riley;
- H. R. 23791. An act granting an increase of pension to Calvin B. Fowlkes;
- H. R. 23797. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Tomson;
- H. R. 23802. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brown;
- H. R. 23806. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Barker;
- H. R. 23834. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Langmaid;
- H. R. 23849. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Mathews;
- H. R. 23850. An act granting an increase of pension to William Freeman;
- H. R. 23852. An act granting an increase of pension to James G. Crozer;
- H. R. 23857. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Smith;
- H. R. 23864. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Miller;
- H. R. 23890. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Haslam;
- H. R. 23912. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Fitzgerald;
- H. R. 23961. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar N. Cowell;
- H. R. 23966. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh Stevenson;
- H. R. 23967. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Hill;
- H. R. 23968. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander McWhorter;
- H. R. 23971. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. C. Butler;
- H. R. 23982. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Seed;
- H. R. 23997. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael M. Field;
- H. R. 23999. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Gough;
- H. R. 24000. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Holle;
- H. R. 24002. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael F. Gilrain;
- H. R. 24015. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron C. Sanford;
- H. R. 24028. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Boney;
- H. R. 24030. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Foor;
- H. R. 24031. An act granting an increase of pension to John Downey;
- H. R. 24034. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Banta;
- H. R. 24037. An act granting an increase of pension to Theodore Teeple.
- H. R. 24061. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Nelson;
- H. R. 24068. An act granting an increase of pension to John Maginnis;
- H. R. 24079. An act granting an increase of pension to David Jones;
- H. R. 24100. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Wilson;
- H. R. 24101. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Ashton;
- H. R. 24161. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh O'Neal;
- H. R. 24171. An act granting an increase of pension to Finus M. Wyatt;
- H. R. 24183. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Joyce;
- H. R. 24189. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hoffner;
- H. R. 24194. An act granting an increase of pension to William Davis;
- H. R. 24197. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Foard;
- H. R. 24210. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Maddox;
- H. R. 24215. An act granting an increase of pension to George Hoell;
- H. R. 24220. An act granting an increase of pension to William P. Robbe;
- H. R. 24225. An act granting an increase of pension to William Ivans;
- H. R. 24226. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis J. Eachus;
- H. R. 24269. An act granting an increase of pension to William L. Stewart;
- H. R. 24288. An act granting an increase of pension to John Gooding;
- H. R. 24294. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Lamoreau;
- H. R. 24299. An act granting an increase of pension to William B. Doyle;
- H. R. 24308. An act granting an increase of pension to Lyman Thompson;
- H. R. 24334. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Case;
- H. R. 24338. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Gardner;
- H. R. 24343. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Haney;
- H. R. 24344. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. James;
- H. R. 22392. An act granting an increase of pension to Eugene W. Rolfe;
- H. R. 24397. An act granting an increase of pension to David Prunkard;
- H. R. 24405. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Bishop;
- H. R. 24406. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmund Johnson;
- H. R. 24413. An act granting an increase of pension to William Thomas;
- H. R. 24493. An act granting an increase of pension to Theodore Gage;
- H. R. 24502. An act granting an increase of pension to A. Judson Conant;
- H. R. 24504. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Leiter;
- H. R. 24518. An act granting an increase of pension to Reuben Nye;
- H. R. 24530. An act granting an increase of pension to David Miller;
- H. R. 24531. An act granting an increase of pension to David E. Jefferson;
- H. R. 24532. An act granting an increase of pension to Absalom R. Shacklett;
- H. R. 24553. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Reed;
- H. R. 24560. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Lesley;

- H. R. 24577. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Flanery;
- H. R. 24586. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan A. Vincent;
- H. R. 24599. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Richardson;
- H. R. 24638. An act granting an increase of pension to Bernard Shallow;
- H. R. 24681. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Jarvis;
- H. R. 24691. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Burtch;
- H. R. 24698. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia Hunt;
- H. R. 24700. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Brooks;
- H. R. 24707. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Campbell;
- H. R. 24710. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Riner;
- H. R. 24726. An act granting an increase of pension to Seldon R. Sanders;
- H. R. 24733. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Morrison;
- H. R. 24740. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Chase;
- H. R. 24769. An act granting an increase of pension to John George;
- H. R. 24776. An act granting an increase of pension to David T. Taylor;
- H. R. 24792. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Penfield;
- H. R. 24801. An act granting an increase of pension to George G. Martin;
- H. R. 24807. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Heath;
- H. R. 24829. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Robbins;
- H. R. 24838. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. A. Walker;
- H. R. 24845. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Price;
- H. R. 24846. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Wolf;
- H. R. 24851. An act granting an increase of pension to Oren S. Rouse;
- H. R. 24861. An act granting an increase of pension to Otho E. D. Culbertson;
- H. R. 24868. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Stevens;
- H. R. 24890. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Lusk;
- H. R. 24902. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Rawlings;
- H. R. 24905. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Davis;
- H. R. 24907. An act granting an increase of pension to Lloyd Roberts;
- H. R. 24910. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Churchill;
- H. R. 24911. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Cosgro;
- H. R. 24921. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick F. Shevlin, alias Patrick Burns;
- H. R. 24924. An act granting an increase of pension to William V. Monroe;
- H. R. 24940. An act granting an increase of pension to Timothy H. Gibson;
- H. R. 24947. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Mailey;
- H. R. 24957. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Ferry;
- H. R. 24958. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Kanline;
- H. R. 24965. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Gilbrech;
- H. R. 24968. An act granting an increase of pension to John Burke;
- H. R. 24969. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Stafford;
- H. R. 24971. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah Devore;
- H. R. 24984. An act granting an increase of pension to Lauranah J. Hedgepeth;
- H. R. 25016. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick G. Ackerman;
- H. R. 25020. An act granting an increase of pension to Cinderella B. McClure;
- H. R. 25023. An act granting an increase of pension to Virginia C. Galloway;
- H. R. 25025. An act granting an increase of pension to John Ham;
- H. R. 25069. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Decker;
- H. R. 25097. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmund P. Weatherby;
- H. R. 25101. An act granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Meredith;
- H. R. 25106. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Biffar;
- H. R. 25108. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown;
- H. R. 25112. An act granting an increase of pension to William Turner;
- H. R. 25113. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Hayes;
- H. R. 25120. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Spring;
- H. R. 25143. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wolfe;
- H. R. 25145. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Henry Weatherwax;
- H. R. 25149. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua L. Hayes;
- H. R. 25172. An act granting an increase of pension to Burgess N. Isaacs;
- H. R. 25174. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Casey;
- H. R. 25176. An act granting an increase of pension to Gottfried Haferstein;
- H. R. 25211. An act granting an increase of pension to Alphonso Brown;
- H. R. 25214. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Douglas;
- H. R. 25224. An act granting an increase of pension to David C. Smith;
- H. R. 25229. An act granting an increase of pension to James T. Blair;
- H. R. 25247. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren Onan;
- H. R. 25248. An act granting an increase of pension to Knute Thompson;
- H. R. 25254. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Warfel;
- H. R. 25255. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Loy;
- H. R. 25256. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus W. Scott;
- H. R. 25257. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Phillips;
- H. R. 25260. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Richie;
- H. R. 25261. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Helvy;
- H. R. 25263. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDermott;
- H. R. 25288. An act granting an increase of pension to Minna Y. Field;
- H. R. 25303. An act granting an increase of pension to Adeline Brown;
- H. R. 25305. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar A. Stevens;
- H. R. 25309. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Casavaw;
- H. R. 25325. An act granting an increase of pension to Polly Ann Bowman;
- H. R. 25328. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Barr;
- H. R. 25391. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard Gogin;
- H. R. 25445. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Webster;
- H. R. 25451. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Maxwell;
- H. R. 25455. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Hempler;
- H. R. 25511. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Filkins;

H. R. 23974. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Bennett;

H. R. 23612. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Adams;

H. R. 8894. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Strong;

H. R. 12021. An act granting a pension to James M. Wood;

H. R. 14322. An act granting a pension to Abbie L. Hanford;

H. R. 15779. An act granting a pension to Margaret A. Jordan;

H. R. 19239. An act granting a pension to Salome Jane Marland;

H. R. 21910. An act granting a pension to Emil S. Weisse;

H. R. 22041. An act granting a pension to John P. Walker;

H. R. 22086. An act granting a pension to Amelia Schmidtke;

H. R. 22395. An act granting a pension to Edward Miller;

H. R. 22709. An act granting a pension to Martha E. Mühlenfeld;

H. R. 22696. An act granting a pension to Charles F. Ellingwood;

H. R. 23440. An act granting a pension to Carrie May Allen;

H. R. 23855. An act granting a pension to Sarah E. Selders;

H. R. 24223. An act granting a pension to Martha A. L. Stephens;

H. R. 24300. An act granting a pension to Sadie E. Hawthorn;

H. R. 24355. An act granting a pension to Mary O. Learned;

H. R. 24404. An act granting a pension to Lauraette La Fleur;

H. R. 24414. An act granting a pension to Van C. Wilson;

H. R. 24419. An act granting a pension to Belle M. Ocker;

H. R. 24483. An act granting a pension to Clarence W. Thomas;

H. R. 24635. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth Stuessi;

H. R. 24855. An act granting a pension to George W. Robins;

H. R. 24946. An act granting a pension to Phebe Wright;

H. R. 25354. An act granting a pension to Alice House;

H. R. 25355. An act granting a pension to William McCraney;

H. R. 19589. An act granting a pension to Aaron Davis;

H. R. 10574. An act granting a pension to Edward W. Hoban;

H. R. 24134. An act providing for the granting and patenting to the State of Colorado desert lands formerly in the Southern Ute Indian Reservation, in Colorado;

H. R. 19932. An act for the relief of John Lavine;

H. R. 25513. An act extending the time for making final proof in certain desert-land entries;

H. R. 15027. An act to remove the charge of desertion against Cornelius O'Callaghan;

H. R. 1561. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to grant a discharge to Peter O'Neil;

H. R. 3498. An act for the relief of Stephen M. Honeycutt;

H. R. 23821. An act 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

H. R. 22580. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution No. 240.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 240) to create a joint committee to consider the revision and codification of the laws of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a joint special committee be appointed, consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice-President from members of the Sixtieth Congress, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker from the Members of the Sixtieth Congress, to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the revision and codification of laws reported by the statutory revision commission heretofore authorized to revise and codify the laws of the United States, including the laws of the last session of the Fifty-ninth Congress; and that the said joint committee be authorized to sit during the recess of Congress and to employ necessary assistants, to order such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business, and to incur such expense as may be deemed necessary, all such expense to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to discharge the committee from further consideration of the joint resolution which has just been read. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. Moon of Pennsylvania, a motion to recon-

sider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

RATES OF INTEREST CHARGED BY BANKS IN NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. SULZER. I rise for the purpose of making a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. There are so many privileged matters.

Mr. SULZER. This is a motion to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from the consideration of a privileged resolution of the House, No. 869, introduced by myself on February 20, which has been before the committee for more than a week, and the committee has not reported on it; and the matter is now privileged. I send it to the Clerk's desk, and ask that it be read.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair can not recognize the gentleman at this time, because there is a special order that is operating on the merchant-marine bill which excepts motions to suspend the rules, general appropriation bills, conference reports, and other privileged matters.

Mr. SULZER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent, then.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair is not at this time recognizing the gentleman for unanimous consent, but will ask the gentleman if it will lead to debate?

Mr. SULZER. It will not lead to debate.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the House the Clerk will read.

Mr. SULZER. The resolution calls on the Secretary of the Treasury for some information.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 869.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public service, to send to the House of Representatives a statement of the rates of interest charged by twenty-five or more of the largest national banks in the city of New York, doing business under and by virtue of the national banking law, at 11 o'clock in the morning and at 2 o'clock in the afternoon on call loans on each banking day from September 1, 1905, to and including the 1st day of September, 1907, and whether said rates of interest on call loans during said period of time were made and charged by said national banks, or any of them, by agreement, expressed or implied, and such other data or information in connection with the subject-matter as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem proper and expedient.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that requires investigation by the Secretary of the Treasury, not merely a report of facts in his office.

The SPEAKER. This is a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, then, I object.

Mr. SULZER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I now move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. It does not present a question of privilege at this time.

Mr. SULZER. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Well, objection is made to its consideration by the gentleman from New York.

ARMY AND NAVY UNION DISTINCTIVE BADGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following House joint resolution, with Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) recognizing the change of name of the Regular Army and Navy Union of the United States to the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of May 11, 1894, 28 Statutes at Large, page 583, be, and the same is hereby, amended by changing the name and title therein described from "Regular Army and Navy Union of the United States" to "Army and Navy Union of the United States of America," and that the organization so last entitled shall have all the rights and privileges conferred by and described in said joint resolution of May 11, 1894.

With a Senate amendment, which was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the distinctive badge adopted by the Army and Navy Union of the United States may be worn, in their own right, upon all public occasions of ceremony by officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy of the United States who are members of said organization."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, is this a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. HULL. I move that the House concur.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, while it is on the Speaker's table, it seems to the Chair that it would require unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, then, reserving the right to object, I

want to find out what this is. Why can not any American citizen wear any special badge he wants to anyhow?

Mr. HULL. Because we have passed a resolution through here making the Regular Army and Navy Union badge so that no one else can wear that badge or anything similar. There are two organizations now. One was called the "Regular Army and Navy Union," which is limited to the Regular Army only, and which is protected by law. The new organization, which is now a much larger one, takes into the union both regulars and volunteers. They have adopted the badge similar to the Regular Army and Navy Union as their own. I will say to the gentleman that nearly all the retired officers and enlisted men are members, and they are not permitted to wear the badge of their order now on occasions of ceremony. I can see no objection to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why are they not permitted? What prevents them?

Mr. HULL. Because we have not passed a resolution authorizing them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand that a man who is in the Army or the Navy, or has been, can not wear it because Congress has not authorized it?

Mr. HULL. He can not wear it on occasions of ceremony. I suppose anybody could wear it. For instance, I wear the Loyal Legion button. Congress authorized it and confined it to members. I suppose anybody could wear it. But this legislation protects it.

Mr. MANN. What you want to do is to limit its use?

Mr. HULL. We want to fix it so that they have the same rights as the other body in the Regular Army.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would prevent any member of any organization, being a free American citizen, from wearing the badge of that organization?

Mr. HULL. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, then, if Congress has not done it, what is the necessity for it?

Mr. HULL. Let me illustrate. Congress passed a resolution allowing all members of the Loyal Legion to wear this badge, but the gentleman from Mississippi could put it on and wear it, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; except if I was doing it with fraudulent intent, and had received some honor or emolument thereby.

Mr. HULL. We have done this for all the military orders. It simply gives them the exclusive right to wear this badge. Now, there is no question but that they can wear their badge anyhow, but it does not prevent any other man who has been in the Army wearing it, if he wants to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is nothing to prevent any man from wearing a Masonic button except the fact that he does not belong to the Masons. There is nothing to prevent a man from wearing a Knight of Pythias badge; there is nothing to prevent him from wearing the cross of the Confederacy. I do not want to object to this legislation, because it will place me, I am afraid, in a false attitude, but it does seem to me that we ought not to be legislating and establishing military orders in a sort of a way.

Mr. HULL. This only gives them the exclusive right to wear this badge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are getting where we are guarding the citizen from everything in the world, even from a lie; for that is all it is, a lie.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Am I mistaken in understanding that the intent of this resolution is to authorize men in the service to wear this badge of their order while in uniform?

Mr. HULL. No; the regulations of the War Department would regulate that. They let them wear certain decorations; they can wear the Loyal Legion, and the Grand Army, and if this is passed they could wear this on all occasions of ceremony—if passed, the regulation of the War Department would not be against it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not that the intent of this resolution?

Mr. HULL. That is one reason for it; it is also to protect their badge from being worn by outsiders.

Mr. MANN. How many of these orders are there?

Mr. HULL. The Loyal Legion, the Grand Army—

Mr. MANN. And if we pass this there will be three now. How long will it be before there will be thirty?

Mr. HULL. It is hardly possible that they would subdivide it to that extent. This is the largest one affecting the Regular Army.

Mr. MANN. These men are not all in the Regular Army, are they?

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; they are not all in the Regular Army. This organization takes in all in the Volunteer Army as well as in the Regular Army. It is to break down the dividing line between the two services and put them on a common level.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The bill operates outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. HULL. It operates all over the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. What jurisdiction has the Congress over such a matter as this?

Mr. HULL. That would be a legal question.

Mr. MANN. What penalty does it put upon somebody else who wears the badge?

Mr. HULL. None at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the amendment was concurred in.

FISH-CULTURAL STATIONS ON PUGET SOUND.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules, discharge the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from the further consideration of the following Senate bill, and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington moves to discharge the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from further consideration of the bill S. 1462, suspend the rules, and pass the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for the establishment of one or more fish-cultural stations on Puget Sound, State of Washington, for the propagation of salmon and other food fishes, including purchase of sites, construction of buildings and ponds, purchase and hire of boats and equipment, and such temporary help as may be required for the construction and operation of the fish-cultural stations, at a suitable point or points to be selected by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and the number of said fish-cultural stations to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. This is a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. SULZER. So was mine.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that under the special order covering the merchant-marine bill it has the right of way except for appropriation bills, conference reports, and motions to suspend the rules. This is a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a second.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Washington to the fact that the bill is not at the desk. The Chair presumes the bill is on the files of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The gentleman can send for the bill while debate is going on. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that a second be considered as ordered?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to know if this bill has been reported from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries?

The SPEAKER. No; this is a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. SULZER. That was my motion a while ago. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is quite mistaken. The gentleman's request was for unanimous consent; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] objected. That is an entirely different proposition. This is a motion to suspend the rules, which is excepted under the rule with respect to the merchant-marine bill, which the House is discussing in Committee of the Whole. With the keen intellect and quick perception of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], the Chair is quite sure that the gentleman will recognize the difference. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I shall make my motion at some subsequent time and in the Speaker's own way. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington is entitled to twenty minutes, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is entitled to twenty minutes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman starts I wish he would tell the House why it is that the committee has not reported this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is what I expect to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But first tell us whether this makes a charge upon the Treasury.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It does provide for an ap-

proportion of \$50,000, or as much as may be necessary, for the construction of two fish hatcheries on Puget Sound. Now I will answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] if he will give me attention. The reason why this was not reported from our committee was this, that it was hoped that what was known as the "omnibus fishery bill" might come up and be passed at this session of Congress; but having failed so far to accomplish that purpose, the members of that committee agreed that I might call this up in this manner, as the fishing industry on Puget Sound is so large, and this being an exceptional case.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If the fishing business is so large on Puget Sound, that means that there are many fishes there and many kinds. So what do you want with a hatchery there? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is the gentleman through? I want the gentleman to finish his question.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why do you want to take \$50,000 away from some other place where there are no fish, like Tennessee, and take it to where there are so many fishes that you can not get half of them out of the sea?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman is through, I will answer his question. In answering the gentleman's question I wish to read from a Government publication. The publication is not yet in book form, but I read from the proof. One paragraph here shows the necessity for it:

In 1904 the fisheries of Washington supported 50 fishing vessels, with a tonnage of 1,540 tons, of the value of \$134,600; 80 transport vessels, with a tonnage of 1,247, and a value of \$261,300; 63 gasoline boats, valued at \$44,300, and 3,444 sail and row boats, valued at \$309,610. The principal apparatus were 250 seines, 1,538 gill nets, and 602 pound nets. The total value of vessels, boats, fishing apparatus, shore properties, and cash capital invested was \$5,319,201, as against \$6,601,243 in 1889, the year shown previous to the last census on the Pacific coast. The number of persons engaged in 1904 was 8,000, an increase of 1,882 since 1889. The product amounted to \$8,945,790 pounds, to the value of \$2,962,633 for the fishermen, a decrease of 31,632,936 pounds.

Now, why we want fish hatcheries there is because that great fishing industry is constantly decreasing, and many of the most valuable fishes have already disappeared.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean to say that the fish are diminishing in number?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; very greatly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How many kinds of fish are there there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The main fish is the salmon, although there are a great many others.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, if the gentleman will go down to Florida he will get all the fish that he wants, including porpoise and shark. I did not catch them all the other day, but I caught a good many.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that the committee has reported this bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; it has not.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman to say that the committee had agreed to allow him to call it up. Under the rules of the House there is one way in which a committee indicates its desire or willingness that the matter be brought before the House, and that is by a report. How does it happen in this particular case that the committee, as the gentleman says, instead of having reported the bill in the regular way, has indicated in some way to the gentleman its willingness that this bill be brought up?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wish the gentleman would finish his question so that I can answer it, and not take up all of the time.

Mr. MONDELL. I have finished.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I should not have said, if I did, that as a committee, but individuals of that committee have all personally expressed a willingness that this should be called up, and all expressed an opinion that it ought to be passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the question the gentleman did not answer is, Why didn't they make a report?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I explained that a moment ago. We have not had any opportunity since that time; we hoped to be able to pass this omnibus bill.

Mr. MONDELL. I suppose the gentleman is aware of the fact that this committee has reported a bill for twenty-seven fish hatcheries.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not understand what the gentleman said.

Mr. MONDELL. I presume the gentleman is aware of the fact that the committee has unanimously reported a bill for twenty-seven fish hatcheries in different States of the Union,

and that bill has been on the Calendar for a year and there has been no opportunity to have it presented here.

Mr. MANN. It was recalled.

Mr. MONDELL. It went back, but was reported again.

Mr. MANN. It went on the Calendar last year, but went back to the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, this request comes in without a report of the committee in its behalf. I know not much if anything about the merits of the particular bill. I do, however, know that very many bills have been introduced for fish hatcheries, and the committee in a regular way has made a report in an omnibus fish-hatchery bill containing twenty-seven hatcheries. I do not think it is fair and right to single out one of them and give the House an opportunity to pass upon it while the House is deprived of all opportunity to pass upon the other twenty-six. [Applause.] I think I have no objection to the bill upon its own merits and think I would be glad to vote for the omnibus bill. That bill was regularly reported by the committee and has been upon the Calendar and is ready to be taken up in an orderly course of things for the consideration of the House. Now there comes one project, presented without a report of the committee, outside of the ordinary procedure of the House, and it would look to me as if favoritism were being extended to one of our Members at the expense of very many others. That is the gravamen of my objection to the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. SOUTHARD. Is this one of the twenty-seven?

Mr. WILLIAMS. One of the twenty-seven. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield two minutes to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has reported an omnibus bill providing for twenty-seven fish hatcheries. Now, this may be the most meritorious of all the twenty-seven, and had the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in a regular way reported this bill and by expressing its views and desires to the House indicated that this of all the twenty-seven was the most meritorious, then I should have had no objection to the passage of the bill. I should have been glad indeed to have followed the view of the committee, that this of all the fish hatcheries proposed in the omnibus bill was the most important and the most meritorious.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman permit a question? Is the gentleman aware in all the period of the Government up to this time, only twenty-eight fish hatcheries have been authorized in the United States?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not know that to be a fact until the gentleman stated it.

Mr. PAYNE. In all the United States, and this omnibus bill calls for twenty-seven, and it is utterly impossible to give twenty-seven fish hatcheries at this session of Congress, and why not take up one of the most meritorious of the fish hatcheries, that of a salmon fish hatchery, and put this through?

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to my friend from New York that had the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries declared to the House in report of the committee in the regular way that this was the most important and meritorious of the twenty-seven hatcheries proposed, I for one would have been glad indeed to have voted for the bill, but this bill comes here with a proposition to suspend the rules and discharge the committee without any official knowledge on the part of the House as to the attitude of the committee on the question, and we are asked to vote for this one fish hatchery, which the committee has favorably reported upon as a separate proposition, and I for one do not believe it ought to pass.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. Why is this one given recognition and no other can get recognition?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has not propounded his inquiry to the proper party. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. This bill may be very meritorious, but it ought not to come up here in a partial and unfair way; and I submit, in all candor, that while I should like to help the gentleman in a purely local project, here is an omnibus bill and there are twenty-seven hatcheries to be covered in that bill. But it is not reported. Here is one bill out of the twenty-seven bills picked out, and it is to be heard and passed. Are the other twenty-six without merit? No one says they are. Every section of the country, Mr. Speaker, wants a fish hatchery. Moreover, it is suggested by the gentleman from Missis-

issippi that the gentleman who asks this favor—a favor, I will say, granted first by the Speaker by giving him recognition—is a member of this committee. He does not say that the other twenty-six bills are without merit. On the contrary, the presumption is that they are bills of merit. But it involves the question of dollars and cents. Now, then, he comes and gets a special favor to build a fishery in a country where there are many, many fishes, Mr. Speaker, and many kinds, while other territories in the United States have not fisheries, have not any hatcheries, and have not any fishes of any account. The entire South, practically, is devoid of any fish hatcheries, Mr. Speaker. Other sections are in the same fix. It seems to me that this is granting a very valuable and unfair distinction to the gentleman. He comes here and asks to discharge his own committee and leave twenty-six bills unattended to and to have a pet measure of his passed, and all the others are to go over to the Sixtieth Congress, and possibly indefinitely, and perhaps entirely defeated. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a \$50,000 expenditure appropriated under these circumstances, making this invidious distinction in a matter that is national, is unjust to the balance of the country and is unjust to the balance of the Members of this House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] to consume some of his time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I believe that I have but a little left.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I will yield to anyone else. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention this, too, for the consideration of the House. This bill involves a charge upon the Treasury of \$50,000. It is not only extending a special favor to this particular bill in that it takes it out of the rule which has been made to apply to other hatchery bills, but it takes it out of the rule of the Speaker, which I understand to apply to recognition for the consideration of bills involving a charge upon the Treasury. We understand it to be the case that gentlemen with bills involving a charge upon the Treasury will not be recognized for unanimous consent or to move a suspension of the rules. If that be the case, then the rule ought to work evenly and uniformly with all Members of the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has fourteen minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is just a bit of misunderstanding in regard to the motion made by the gentleman from Washington and the reason for it. There was reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries an omnibus fish-hatchery bill carrying appropriations for the creation of fish hatcheries in many of the States. I for one believe that that bill ought to have been considered. I believe the appropriations called for by that bill would be wise appropriations, but I never yet have been willing to take the position of refusing support to a project that was entitled to it simply because I could not get something else that I also thought ought to be allowed. Now, it is giving a special advantage to the gentleman from Washington to have this bill considered, but there is a reason, in my judgment, for that special advantage, and that reason is that the salmon industry in the State of Washington is a very great one. That industry is being imperiled, and it is probable that without something being done to restock those streams with salmon many millions will be lost to the people in the reduction of this great food supply. I believe the bill is of more importance than any other fish-hatchery bill before this House.

And believing that it is of more importance than any other one bill, and I might say in passing that I have introduced a bill providing for a fish hatchery for the State of Kentucky, which was carried in the omnibus bill and which I would like exceedingly well to see passed, I am not willing, simply because that is not going to happen, to prevent the establishment of this hatchery in the State of Washington, for I believe that economically it is a wise expenditure of the money. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are but twenty-eight fish hatcheries in the United States. In all the fifty years we have been locating fish hatcheries, there has not been sufficient pressure to produce more than twenty-eight of these concessions. We have a State fish hatchery in our State, supported by the State. Of course I am not informed, and I do not know whether there is in this omnibus bill one for the State of New York or not, and I do not care. It is not practicable to pass an omnibus bill, with twenty-seven fish hatcheries, at this session of Congress, thereby doubling those that now exist.

This one I understand, from the reading of the bill, was to cost \$50,000. Of course multiply that by 27, and you have got a large increase in the appropriations for this session.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Speaker, that being so—

Mr. PADGETT. It will not take more than a minute.

Mr. PAYNE. I have only three minutes, and can not yield.

That being so, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we should not sit here with fish-hatchery bills in our pockets, like the dog in the manger, and say because we can not get ours that this one shall not pass. This is for the great Puget Sound region; a region that produces the principal part of salmon for the country—I may also say for the world—a great big industry which ought to be fostered, and this bill ought to pass whether any other fish-hatchery bill passes at this session of Congress or not. I trust that Members of the House who have not considered this matter will consider it upon the basis of the reasonableness of this proposition; that they will take this hatchery on its own merits, and decide whether it is wise to locate a hatchery there; and if gentlemen recognize that at this time there are twenty-seven demanding recognition, when there are only twenty-eight in the United States now, we can not pass them in this wholesale manner, thereby piling up the total of our appropriations for this session of Congress. I hope they will decide it simply on the merits of the case and vote for this provision for a fish hatchery at Puget Sound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, in what I have to say I have no hostility to the proposition of the gentleman from the State of Washington. I think his project is a meritorious one; but I do think it is a little peculiar, a little strange, that this one, included in the omnibus bill, should be singled out, and that he can get recognition when nobody else can. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] a moment ago declined to yield to a question, and stated that this bill carried \$50,000, and that would mean \$50,000 for the twenty-six others. That is not the fact. The remainder are for \$20,000 each. This is the single \$50,000 proposition in the bill, and all the others are for \$20,000 each. Quite a difference. The gentleman from New York says that in all the history of the country we have established but twenty-eight fish hatcheries. But let it not be forgotten that there is such a demand upon the country, the country realizes the necessity for many more fish hatcheries, and that Congress has been derelict in its duty in this matter, and the committee has felt itself called upon to report twenty-seven bills at the present session of Congress in order to meet the demands and the pressing necessities of the country. While there is a necessity in the State of Washington—and this is a meritorious project—there is a necessity in other States just as great, just as deserving, which have received the sanction and the approval of the committee and which are denied recognition by the Speaker and consideration in the House. Now, I desire to protest against that method of treating other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anyone else who desires time, and I yield to the Chair the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN], who is a member of the committee.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill reported by the committee, now before the House for consideration, because there is an urgent necessity for some immediate action on Puget Sound. That was as I understood the situation when discussed before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am a member. We reported out the omnibus bill providing for twenty-seven fish hatcheries unanimously upon its merits. I had hoped it would receive consideration from the House and its approval in this session. But this bill seems to me, at least, Mr. Speaker, to be one that should receive attention now. The loss of capital during the last year has been over a million dollars. The number of men employed in 1905 was some ten or eleven thousand. Ten per cent less than that were employed in 1906, and unless something is speedily done to relieve the situation about the propagation of salmon, that is going to be a serious matter. I trust, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will receive favorable consideration of the House. I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to heartily favoring action on the omnibus bill, which should pass this House in this session, because the total amount carried in the bill is only in the neighborhood of half a million dollars.

I am still hopeful that the omnibus bill may receive consideration at the hands of the House and when it does that it shall be acted upon favorably.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. Are not the other projects meritorious?

Mr. GOULDEN. They are all meritorious or they would not have been reported; but not to the same extent or degree as this one. This provides for immediate attention in order to save the salmon fisheries of Puget Sound for the benefit of the whole country.

Mr. PADGETT. Is there not a scarcity of fish in other localities that should be provided for?

Mr. GOULDEN. I take it that the fisheries in other localities are of importance, and I may add that the State of New York has a bill pending to provide for a hatchery in that State. I am not unmindful of my duty as a Representative from that State, but I believe that in other localities it is not nearly as necessary or important as that on Puget Sound. No one should stand in the way of any of these bills, all deserving favorable consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. Six minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported an omnibus bill, distributing fish hatcheries through the different States, upward of twenty States being provided for in that bill. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has stated, I, too, have a bill for a fish hatchery, in the State of Michigan, in that omnibus bill, but there is no other provision in that omnibus bill for a hatchery for the propagation of salmon, except this one now asked for by the gentleman from the State of Washington. I know a little something about the catching of salmon on the Pacific coast, and there is no other place on that coast where exactly the same kind of salmon are caught as in Puget Sound. The salmon in the Pacific Ocean live in a certain territory and enter certain inland waters, and no other kind is caught anywhere that is exactly like the salmon of Puget Sound. For that reason I am perfectly willing to pass all other fish-hatchery bills and give to the State of Washington something that is so much needed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want just a moment to explain to the House the condition that exists by comparing the statistics of the last two years, and then I will ask a vote upon the proposition.

The value of the salmon output in the State of Washington during the last year has decreased over \$3,000,000. The number of men employed in 1906 was more than 1,000 less than in 1905, and the amount of capital invested was \$1,000,000 less in 1906 than in 1905, according to a telegram that I received a few days ago from the fish commissioner of our State. Many of the best species of salmon are already practically extinct, and the price of salmon has increased throughout the whole country. This is a matter that affects not only Puget Sound, but everybody in the United States who buys a can of salmon. The price of salmon has increased throughout the whole country on account of the decrease of the salmon in Puget Sound. The value of the output last year, while over \$7,000,000, was a decrease of \$3,000,000 from the year before. I do hope that this House will not, for the paltry sum of \$50,000, cripple this great industry.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to suggest that the State itself is maintaining from 12 to 16 hatcheries and paying out from \$65,000 to \$100,000 every year for their maintenance and operation.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We are doing the best we can in our State, but in spite of that fact the salmon are rapidly decreasing and this should be done for their preservation. I was in favor of the omnibus bill. I worked as hard for it as any man upon the committee. I do hope that no Member of this House will be moved by the motive that simply because he can not get what he wants himself he will refuse to give his support to a meritorious proposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will pardon the interruption, that is not the motive. The motive is that if the House can not give the opportunity to consider all measures of similar character and of equal merit, then one should not be singled out. The objection is not made for the benefit of the individual Member, but in the interest of the House itself and in the interest of fair consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I admit all that the gentleman has said, but I do not believe that they are all of such pressing importance. This project has been strongly urged by the Fish Commissioner. He has said that this is the most meri-

torious proposition of this character in the United States, and that unless something is done the industry will be destroyed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may be true, but the gentleman will admit that each Member who has another bill will say that his bill is the most meritorious.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. To some extent; but there is no other locality where the very existence of a great industry is jeopardized to the extent that it is here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before a vote is taken I ask that the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to send to the House a duplicate of the engrossed copy of Senate bill No. 1462.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send the proposed order to the Clerk's desk. The Chair will state that search has been made in the files of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the bill is misplaced or lost.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The bill is lost for all present purposes. The Clerk will report the proposed order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to send to the House a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 1462) to establish one or more fish-cultural stations on Puget Sound, State of Washington, the original having been lost.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Is it in order on the motion to suspend the rules to consider a Senate bill without the engrossed copy of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Certainly not. In other words, it is in order to make the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill, and the motion which has been made is in order. Debate has been in order, but at the close of the debate, after the bill has been searched for on the files of the committee, and does not materialize, the vote can not be taken; the House can not act upon a bill of which it does not have manual possession.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Speaker, that being the case, the point of order would lie against the further consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill can not be voted upon. It will have to be laid aside until the duplicate engrossed copy is obtained.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I mean. A point of order will lie against the further consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The vote will have to await the materialization of the bill. As many as are in favor of agreeing to the order to request the Senate for a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill will say "aye;" opposed "no."

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CLARK of Missouri demanded a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the question may be again stated, so that the House may understand it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the order.

The order was again read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the order.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLARK of Missouri) there were—ayes 153, noes 50.

So the order was agreed to.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the afternoon session to-day the House take a recess until 8 o'clock for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar under the order already made.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Does that mean all private bills except the bills from the Committee on Claims, War Claims, and the two Committees on Pensions?

Mr. DALZELL. All bills except from the Committee on War Claims, the Committee on Claims, the two Pension Committees, and bills conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAHON. I object.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to suspend the rules and adopt an order that when the House adjourns to-day at 6 o'clock it take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar under the order already made.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, can the order be read?

The SPEAKER. For the information of the House the Clerk will read the order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That hereafter during this session a motion to consider in the House, as in the Committee of the Whole House bills on the Private

Calendar of the classes hereinafter described shall have the same privilege as is given by the rules on Fridays to motions to go into Committee of the Whole House to consider bills on the Private Calendar.

All bills not objected to after five minutes' explanation thereof, reported from committees other than the Committees on Pensions, Invalid Pensions, Claims, and War Claims, excepting bills proposing to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JAMES. I demand a second.

Mr. DALZELL. I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES. Now I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if this motion is agreed to, will it be in order to consider any other business except these matters mentioned?

Mr. DALZELL. It will not.

Mr. JAMES. I have no objection.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the rule is a little misleading. The last clause, where it excepts bills proposing to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims—

Mr. DALZELL. That excludes all bills that propose to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the word "and" ought to be put in there.

Mr. BONYNGE. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the order reads that bills will be in order for consideration except bills coming from the four committees, except bills conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims.

Mr. DALZELL. It doesn't say that.

Mr. BONYNGE. Yes, it does; and under that order bills from the Committee on War Claims conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims will be in order.

Mr. DALZELL. It will not make any difference; they are all subject to objection. No bill can be considered against objection.

Mr. MANN. Under the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania the other day that the order provided an exception to all bills proposing to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, I shall object to them anyway, for it was not intended to cover those claims.

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all; perhaps the word "and" ought to be put in there.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. DALZELL. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Whether or not a bill on the Private Calendar before a committee would be in order under a motion to suspend the rule?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly not.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would like to ask if it is not true if we do not pass this order that there probably will be no chance at the present session of considering these bills on the Private Calendar?

Mr. DALZELL. That is true; unless we have it to-night, there will be no opportunity to consider them.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I think the order is exactly right as it stands. It says all bills not objected to after five minutes' explanation thereof reported from committees other than the Committees on Pensions, Invalid Pensions, Claims, and War Claims, excepting bills proposing to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, shall be in order. That means reported by those five committees, and bills giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims are not in order.

Mr. NORRIS. Would the gentleman say that a bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims could be considered under that order?

Mr. PAYNE. It could not be considered, most assuredly.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the word "and" ought to be in there.

Mr. PAYNE. Not at all; it is not necessary.

Mr. NORRIS. It does not mean it without it.

Mr. PAYNE. It is correct as it is, and means just what it has been interpreted to mean heretofore.

Mr. DALZELL. I think so; but this is not a practical question, because the bills are all subject to objection.

Mr. MAHON. Let me ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. What is the use of bringing men here when the bills will all be objected to?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I can not tell that. A great many gentlemen who are interested in these bills have been clamoring for some sort of an order.

Mr. MAHON. Well, they better go home and get their good dinners.

Mr. DALZELL. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that at the last session of Congress, and at the last Congress, we disposed of, under a similar order, a great many very meritorious bills.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; and destroyed a great many meritorious ones. That precedent is not worth considering.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman state now that he intends now to object to any?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; to every one.

Mr. GARRETT. Then let us not adopt this order, and all may go home and get their good dinners.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and agreeing to the order.

The question was taken; and two-thirds voting in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the order was agreed to.

STREET RAILWAY THROUGH MILITARY RESERVATION, ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 8128) granting to the St. John's Light and Power Company a right of way for street railroad purposes through the United States military reservation of Fort Marion, in St. Augustine, Fla., and through other Government property in said city, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the St. Johns Light and Power Company, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida, and its successors and assigns, authority to construct, maintain, and operate a street railroad, to be operated by electricity or other motive power, over and through the United States Military Reservation of Fort Marion, and over and through such part of Orange street known as "The Lines," the title of which may be in the Government, in the county of St. Johns and city of St. Augustine, on such lines and location as may be approved by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2. That said right of way hereby granted to the St. Johns Light and Power Company shall be subject to termination by the Secretary of War upon sixty days' previous notice; and if said company shall fail or refuse to remove its tracks, poles, wires, and other structures and appurtenances from the reservation within said period of sixty days after notification so to do, then and in that event the Secretary of War may cause the same to be removed at the expense of the said company and without liability to damages therefor.

SEC. 3. That said company shall pay such reasonable annual rental for such right of way and at such time as may be fixed by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 4. That no structure other than said railroad and the necessary poles and wires for the operation of the same shall be placed upon said right of way hereby granted without first being approved by the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question. We passed a bill the other day about a street-car line franchise through one of the military reservations down there. Is this relating to the same matter?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not think we passed one in relation to a right of way. This simply grants the right of way across one corner of the old reservation down there.

Mr. MANN. In St. Augustine?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; and it is completely hedged about. It is absolutely in the control of the Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN. It does not take the place of the bill that was passed the other day?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Military Academy appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the conference report and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24537) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 18, and 20.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed in said amendment insert "twenty-six thousand nine;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment insert "The Members of the Senate and House of Representatives appointed to serve on the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point for the year nineteen hundred and seven are directed to investigate as to the advisability of maintaining a children's school, at Government expense, at said academy, and to report their findings to the next session of Congress;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed in said amendment insert "fifty-four thousand nine hundred and thirty-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed in said amendment, insert "forty-three thousand and twenty-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

J. A. T. HULL,
A. B. CAPRON,
JAMES L. SLAYDEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

N. B. SCOTT,
J. A. HEMENWAY,
JO. C. S. BLACKBURN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

Amendment No. 1 advances the instructor of ordnance and science of gunnery to the grade of a professorship, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 2 relates to the detail of an officer of the Medical Corps to the Military Academy, and the Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 relate to an associate professor of mathematics, and the Senate recedes on both amendments.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out the word "cavalry" from the senior assistant instructors at the academy, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 6 gives additional pay to the constructing quartermaster, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7 increases the pay for length of service fixed by law from eight thousand to nine thousand, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8 is the totals for extra pay of officers on detached service at the academy, correcting the amount to correspond with the bill as changed, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 9 is simply verbal, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10 is simply verbal, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 11 is verbal, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 12 provides for one mechanic and attendant skilled in the operation necessary for the preparation of lectures, etc., and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 13 authorizes the selection of a janitor for bachelor quarters by the superintendent, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 14 corrects the totals, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 15 makes an appropriation for children's school at the Military Academy, and the House recedes and agrees to the same with an amendment providing for an investigation as to the necessity for this appropriation.

Amendment No. 16 provides for a fund for the payment of cadets at the Jamestown Exposition, made necessary by law, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 17 simply corrects the total, and the House recedes and concurs in the same with an amendment.

Amendment No. 18 relates to maintaining and improving the grounds of the post cemetery, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 19 simply strikes out the word "frame," before the words "quarters for civilian employees," without changing the amount appropriated, so that the quarters may be built out of stone, brick, or frame, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 20 provides for the construction of fire-control stations, etc., and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 21 provides for construction of emplacements for two 6-inch breech-loading rifles, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 22 corrects the totals, and the House recedes and concurs in the same with an amendment.

J. A. T. HULL,
A. B. CAPRON,
JAMES L. SLAYDEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HULL. I move that the House adopt the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House agree to the conference report.

Mr. HAY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. HAY. I see from the reading of the statement that the House recedes from the Senate amendment which provides for a school at the Military Academy.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. HAY. I would like to ask the gentleman to state what that is.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the House insisted upon a disagreement to the provision and it all went out, and in lieu thereof was inserted a provision that the Members of the House and Senate on the board of visitors were authorized to make a special investigation of this question and report to the next Congress without binding in any way the action of Congress and without entailing a dollar of expense. I will say to the House that the Senate added about \$33,000 to the bill and the conferees made a reduction, reducing it to \$17,680.

Mr. HAY. I would like to ask the gentleman this, if the permitting of this investigation does not open the door to the establishment of this school?

Mr. HULL. Not unless Congress adopts it. I do not know how they will report. They may report against it. If they report for it it does not affect the judgment of Members of Congress as to future action except as the report may be strong enough to change the views of Members.

Mr. SULZER. Is there any expense attached to this?

Mr. HULL. Not at all. They are to be appointed on the board of visitors as now provided by law—

Mr. SULZER. I have no objection to it.

Mr. HULL. Excluding from it those not Members of Congress. I call for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DEPOSIT OF UNEARNED FEES, ETC., WITH TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 11040.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11040) to authorize the receivers of public moneys for land districts to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States certain sums embraced in their accounts of unearned fees and unofficial moneys.

Mr. LACEY. I ask that the statement be read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 11040, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the whole of the Senate amendments and as a substitute therefor add at the end of section 4 of the bill the following: "Provided, That no homestead entryman shall be required to make payment of the purchase money on any application to make a cash entry until the same shall have been approved by the register and receiver, but such payment shall be made within ten days after notice of such approval."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN F. LACEY,
A. J. GRONNA,
JOHN L. BURNETT,

Managers on the part of the House.

H. C. HANSBROUGH,
KNUTE NELSON,
A. J. McLAURIN.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House make the following statement:

As agreed upon by the conferees, the only effect of the amendment to the House bill is to relieve homestead commuters from payment of the commutation money until their applications to make cash entry shall have been approved by the registers and receivers of the local land offices, and that notice of such approval shall be given and payment made within ten days after such notice.

JOHN F. LACEY,
A. J. GRONNA,
JOHN L. BURNETT.

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The question was taken; and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO FURNISH METAL FOR A BELL.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague [Mr. LAMB] on a conference committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 236) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish metal for a bell.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to deliver to the Pocahontas Bell Association, if the same can be done without detriment to the public service, such condemned historic metal as he may deem proper, not to exceed 2,000 pounds in weight, to be used in casting a bell to be placed on the Virginia building at the Jamestown Exposition.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Provided, That the Government shall be at no expense in connection with this gift.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

MEMORIAL PARK ON WHITE STONE HILLS BATTLEFIELD.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Speaker, I am asked by my colleague [Mr. MARSHALL] to call up the bill (H. R. 25365) providing for the sale of certain lands of the White Stone Hills battlefield for the purpose of raising funds for improving and beautifying such park.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25365) to permit the State of North Dakota to sell a portion of certain lands heretofore granted to it as a memorial park on the White Stone Hills battlefield, for the purpose of raising funds for improving and beautifying such park.

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of North Dakota is hereby authorized and empowered to sell such portion as it may deem wise of the southeast quarter of section 7 and the southwest quarter of section 8 and the northeast quarter of section 18 and the northwest quarter of section 17, all in township 131 north, range 65 west, heretofore granted to said State to be used for the purpose of a memorial park and burial ground of the soldiers killed at the battle of White Stone Hills. The money derived from the sale of said land to be used by the said State only for the purpose of erecting monuments, improving and beautifying such portions of such grounds as it may desire to use as a memorial park.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman how much of this land will be taken away from the park if this bill becomes a law?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this park contains 640 acres, which land was granted to the State in the year 1904. The State has asked to be permitted to sell a portion of this park for the purpose of erecting monuments.

Mr. SULZER. How much of the land does the State want to sell of the land now in the park?

Mr. GRONNA. Well, I do not know, but it is a part of the 640 acres. I do not know how much they want to sell.

Mr. SULZER. This is a very small park, and if you take away the four quarter sections, as the bill reads, it would leave a very small space of ground.

Mr. GRONNA. The gentleman is mistaken. The bill simply provides for the sale of such portions as they may think is advisable.

Mr. SULZER. Why would it not be better to pass a bill appropriating money to put up the monument instead of taking the land?

Mr. GRONNA. I would say to the gentleman there is no timber there. It is simply a noted battle ground where the battle was fought between the Second Nebraska Cavalry and some Sioux Indians, and there are twenty-two enlisted men buried there and one lieutenant.

Mr. SULZER. Another thing: I understand from what the gentleman has said that Congress gave this land to the State of North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. If the State of Dakota now owns the land, it seems to me that the State has the right, through an act of its legislature, to dispose of the land.

Mr. GRONNA. No; they have not, because there is a limitation on it.

Mr. SULZER. On the original act?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. The point I am trying to make is this: Being a very small park, it seems to me it would be bad policy on the part of the State to sell any land to the park in order to put up the monuments. The State ought to pay the money for providing the monuments and keep the land for a park.

Mr. GRONNA. It is the desire of these people to be permitted to sell a portion of it and keep the remainder for this cemetery.

Mr. MANN. Ought not that to have been presented to Congress at the time the act was passed if it is too large? In other words, if I may ask the gentleman, does he think it ought to be the policy of Congress to grant the park a tract of land on the plea that it is to be made into a park in memory of the battle, and then, having obtained too much land, come in with an act of Congress to sell land in order to erect a monument on it? We would have the same proposition from every place in the country where there is public land.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that it is the desire of the people of this section and also of the State to have this done.

Mr. MANN. I think that had better go over until we find out what the effect will be everywhere else. Of course nobody would object to it in this particular place.

Mr. GRONNA. This is a very small matter, and I trust the gentleman will not object to it.

Mr. MANN. It is a very small matter at this place, and therefore the gentleman ought to waive any request. It is a very large matter as applied to the United States as a precedent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RELIEF OF HOMESTEAD AND OTHER ENTRYMEN.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 22588.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 22588) for the relief of homestead and other entrymen who have been required to pay more than the legal fees, commissions, excesses, and purchase money.

Also an amendment in the nature of a substitute, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That in all cases in which homestead entrymen upon final proof of commutation shall have been required to pay more than the lawful purchase money for their lands, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause the excess to be repaid to the entryman or to his heirs or assigns."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of homestead entrymen who have paid more than the lawful purchase money."

SITUATION OF NATURALIZED CITIZENS GOING ABROAD.

The SPEAKER. At the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS], the Chair lays before the House the following House bill, with Senate amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 24122) in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State shall be authorized to issue passports to persons not citizens of the United States as follows: Where any person has made a declaration of intention to become such a citizen as provided by law and has resided in the United States for three years a passport may be issued to him entitling him to the protection of the Government in any foreign country: *Provided*, That such passport shall not be valid for more than six months and shall not be renewed, and that such passport shall not entitle the holder to the protection of this Government in the country of which he was a citizen prior to making such declaration of intention.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of State may issue, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, certificates of nativity to native-born American residents, setting forth the place and date of birth and place of permanent residence in the United States.

SEC. 3. That any American citizen shall be deemed to have expatriated himself when he has been naturalized in any foreign state in conformity with its laws, or when he has taken an oath of allegiance to any foreign state.

When any naturalized citizen shall have resided for five years continuously in a foreign state it shall be presumed that he has ceased to be an American citizen: *Provided, however*, That such presumption may be overcome on the presentation of satisfactory evidence to a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, under such rules and regulations as the Department of State may prescribe: *And provided also*, That no American citizen shall be allowed to expatriate himself when this country is at war.

SEC. 4. That any American woman who marries a foreigner shall take the nationality of her husband. At the termination of the marital relation she may resume her American citizenship, if abroad, by registering as an American citizen within one year with a consul of the United States, or by returning to reside in the United States, or, if residing in the United States at the termination of the marital relation, by continuing to reside therein.

SEC. 5. That any foreign woman who acquires American citizenship by marriage to an American shall be assumed to retain the same after the termination of the marital relation if she continue to reside in the United States, unless she makes formal renunciation thereof before a court having jurisdiction to naturalize aliens, or if she resides abroad she may retain her citizenship by registering as such before a United States consul within one year after the termination of such marital relation.

SEC. 6. That a child born without the United States of alien parents shall be deemed a citizen of the United States by virtue of the naturalization of or resumption of American citizenship by the parent: *Provided*, That such naturalization or resumption takes place during the minority of such child: *And provided further*, That the citizenship of such minor child shall begin at the time such minor child begins to reside permanently in the United States.

SEC. 7. That all children born outside the limits of the United States who are citizens thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 1993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and who continue to reside outside the United States shall, in order to receive the protection of this Government, be required upon reaching the age of 18 years to record at an American consulate their intention to become residents and remain citizens of the United States, and shall be further required to take the oath of allegiance to the United States upon attaining their majority.

SEC. 8. That duplicates of any evidence, registration, or other acts required by this act shall be filed with the Department of State for record.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "authorized," insert "in his discretion."
Page 2, strike out all of section 2.
Change section 3 to section 2.
Page 2, line 10, after "resided," insert "for two years in the foreign state from which he came, or."
Page 2, line 11, strike out "(continuously)."
Page 2, line 11, strike out "(a)" and insert "any other."
Page 2, line 12, after "citizen," insert "and the place of his general abode shall be deemed his place of residence during said years."
Change section 4 to section 3.
Change section 5 to section 4.
Change section 6 to section 5.
Change section 7 to section 6.
Change section 8 to section 7.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question? Will the Senate amendments restore the bill practically to the condition in which it was before the House amended it?

Mr. PERKINS. They do not at all. The amendments, I will say, introduced by the Senate for the most part are formal—none of them at all objectionable.

Mr. MANN. You can move to concur. You do not need unanimous consent.

Mr. PERKINS. Under the order made I can not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the request, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to move to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill which has been read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, what is the nature of the bill and the amendments?

Mr. PERKINS. This bill was passed, as the gentleman may remember, with very little opposition in the House, defining the situation of naturalized citizens who go abroad. The amendments made by the Senate are for the most part formal. Discretion was given to the Secretary of State to issue a limited passport to persons who have lived here for three years and had

not become full citizens. They add to that phrase "in his discretion." The second section authorizes the Secretary of State to give to American citizens certificates as to their nativity. It, however, was stricken out in the Senate. It was a very unimportant provision, on which we are not at all contentious. The only other change is section 3, which provided that in the case of naturalized citizens residing abroad for five years the presumption should arise that they had elected to leave this country. It is now stated in the provisions of almost all of our treaties that that assumption shall arise where a person resides three years in any country other than the one from whence he came, but only two years in the country from whence he came.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Were the conferees unanimous?

Mr. PERKINS. The conferees were unanimous.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF LEASES IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 8063.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire first to ask unanimous consent?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I will first ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 8063) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act approved August 3, 1894, entitled 'An act concerning leases in the Yellowstone National Park,'" approved June 4, 1906.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to amend an act approved August 3, 1894, entitled 'An act concerning leases in the Yellowstone National Park,'" approved June 4, 1906, be, and the same is hereby, so amended that the Secretary of the Interior shall be authorized and empowered to lease, according to the other terms of said amended act, for a period not exceeding twenty years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman, first, whether this bill now reported has the approval of the superintendent of the Yellowstone Park and also that of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I would say to the gentleman that the Secretary of the Interior favorably recommended this same bill with a provision for twenty years last year.

Mr. MANN. In the report on this bill there is a letter from the Secretary of the Interior and the superintendent of Yellowstone Park.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. A year ago it was favorably recommended for twenty years. At that time the Senate passed it that way, but the House committee cut it down to ten years. This bill merely restores the term of lease to twenty years, which is the time that the Secretary of the Interior and the superintendent of the park one year ago recommended.

Mr. MANN. The bill of a year ago passed and became law.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. It did.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman wishes to change the period from ten years to twenty years? Reserving the right to object, I would like the gentleman to explain the necessity for that.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. In the lease given to the company that owned the Mammoth Hot Springs Hotel they are instructed to remove the hotel and build a new one—

Mr. MANN. Is this limited to the hotel site?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Purely to the sites of the hotels.

Mr. MANN. I do not care for further explanation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

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

ADDITIONAL CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 842.

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint two assistant clerks to said committee, who shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of \$6 per day, during the remainder of the present session from the date of certification of such employment.

The resolution was agreed to.

J. G. HIDDEN.

Mr. CASSEL. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 858.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to J. G. Hidden

the sum of \$32.13, being the amount of clerk hire allowance due him as clerk to the late Representative John F. Rixey from February 1 to February 9, 1907, both dates inclusive.

The resolution was agreed to.

R. B. HORTON.

Mr. CASSEL. I also submit the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to R. B. Horton the sum of \$250 for compiling and indexing the reports and hearings of the Committee on Insular Affairs and the acts of Congress of the Fifty-eighth Congress relating thereto.

With the following amendment:

In line 3, after the word "House," insert "miscellaneous items, 1905."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CHARLES A. HAMILTON.

Mr. CASSEL. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Charles A. Hamilton the sum of \$250 for services rendered to the Committee on Agriculture as assistant clerk in connection with the hearings before said committee on meat-inspection legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. CASSEL. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, for the services of a clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills a sum equal to the rate of \$2,000 per annum until otherwise provided for by law: *Provided*, That the same clerk herein authorized shall be in lieu of the session clerk to said committee at \$6 per day now authorized by law.

With the following amendment:

In line 5, after the word "same," strike out "clerk herein authorized."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, how many clerks does that give to that committee?

Mr. CASSEL. No additional clerks. It only continues the clerk during the recess who is now employed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He has nothing to do during the recess, has he?

Mr. CASSEL. He has work to do during the recess, and it was because of the necessity of retaining a man who is experienced in this business that we propose to pass this resolution.

Mr. MANN. Does that committee now have an annual clerk?

Mr. CASSEL. It does not. This makes an annual clerk, that is all.

Mr. GARRETT. What work does the Committee on Enrolled Bills have during the recess?

Mr. CASSEL. There is a good deal of clerical work connected with the files of the committee, indexing, and so forth.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

J. C. STEWART.

Mr. CASSEL. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to pay to J. C. Stewart, out of the contingent fund of the House, the sum of \$100 for services in caring for and regulating the House chronometer during the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress.

With the following amendment:

In line 5, strike out the words "first session of the."

Mr. MANN. I should like to know what this is.

Mr. CASSEL. It is to pay the man who has charge of the weather maps and chronometer out in the hall here \$100 for the two years' service.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

JANITOR, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN NAVY DEPARTMENT, ETC.

Mr. CASSEL. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of House resolution 775:

Resolved, That the janitor whose employment was authorized by the House resolution adopted January 25, 1906, to care for the rooms for the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and the lieutenants' and guard rooms of the Capitol police is hereby continued at the same rate of compensation, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for by law; and in addition to the said rooms he shall also care for the room of the index clerks, and shall at all times be subject to the conditions governing the employment of janitors to committees."

The resolution was agreed to.

ASSISTANT IN DISBURSING OFFICE.

Mr. CASSEL. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1907, payable in equal monthly installments, a sum equal to \$200 per annum as additional compensation as assistant in the disbursing office of the House of Representatives, until his salary at the rate of \$1,600 per annum shall be otherwise provided for by law.

With the following amendment:

In line 5 strike out "as" and insert "to the."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to. The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ASSISTANT IN CLERK'S OFFICE.

Mr. CASSEL. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1907, payable in equal monthly installments, the sum equal to the rate of \$200 per annum as additional compensation to the assistant in Clerk's office of the House, until his salary at the increased rate herein authorized shall otherwise be provided by law.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following to come in at the end of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the resolution the words "*Provided*, That the salaries of the twenty-five messengers now on the Doorkeeper's roll at \$1,100 a year shall be \$1,200 a year."

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order that that is not germane.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. It is not germane.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The committee has submitted a number of resolutions increasing the pay of the employees of the House whose salaries are provided for in the legislative bill. I would like to ask the gentleman if these employees have had their salaries increased during the present session?

Mr. CASSEL. No; we have only tried to equalize these few cases.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hardly believed it possible that after what happened at the last session of Congress any meritorious employee had been overlooked in the legislative bill.

The resolution was agreed to.

CHARLES H. MANN.

Mr. CASSEL. I also call up the House resolution No. 678.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1907, payable in equal monthly installments, a sum equal to the rate of \$300 per annum as additional compensation to Charles H. Mann, superintendent of press gallery, until his salary, at the rate of \$1,500 per annum, shall be otherwise provided for by law.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

In line 4 strike out the word "three" and insert "two;" and in line 7 strike out the word "five" and insert "four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CHIEF PAGES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I also call up the resolution in lieu of House resolution 539.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolution in lieu of House resolution 539.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the two chief pages of the House amounts equal to the rate of \$300 per annum each until their compensation, respectively, at the rate of \$1,200 per annum shall be otherwise provided for by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

JANITOR HOUSE DOCUMENT ROOM.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I also call up a House resolution in lieu of House resolution 638.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution in lieu of House resolution 638.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the janitor employed in the House document room a sum equal to the rate of \$120 per annum until the salary of said position is otherwise provided for by law at the rate of \$840 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

J. M. THOMPSON AND J. J. CONSTANTINE.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I also call up House resolution No. 755.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1907, payable in equal monthly installments, a sum equal to the rate of \$300 each per annum, as additional compensation to J. M. Thompson, as telegraph operator of the House, and to J. J. Constantine, as assistant telegraph operator, until their compensation, respectively, at the rate of \$1,500 per annum, shall be otherwise provided by law.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

In line 4 strike out the word "three" and insert "two;" and in line 8 strike out the word "five" and insert "four."

The resolution was agreed to.

OMNIBUS RESOLUTION.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I also call up the House resolution in lieu of several other House resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to which was referred House resolutions Nos. 547, 760, 761, 780, 782, 789, 849, 854, 871, 873, and 879, have had the same under consideration and recommend the adoption of the following resolution in lieu thereof, viz:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the following-named employees of the House the several amounts hereinafter set forth as additional compensation, viz:

To H. L. Overstreet, assistant chief clerk, \$500.
 To John J. Cameron, assistant official reporter, \$200.
 To J. G. Rodgers, assistant file clerk, \$200.
 To Willis H. Wing, first assistant enrolling clerk, \$200.
 To D. C. Dinger, index clerk, \$300.
 To Harry West, janitor to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, \$280.
 To H. P. Andrews, assistant to the bill and printing clerk by detail, \$250.
 To William H. Topping, clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, \$500.
 To W. L. Stiles, chief janitor, \$300.
 To Edwin L. Williams, clerk to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, \$500.
 To John R. Williams, file clerk, \$250.
 To J. A. Gibson, assistant in the stationery room, \$300.
 To William L. Nash, messenger to the Speaker's table, \$200.
 To William Keith, page in the folding room, \$220.
 To C. S. Hoyt, disbursing clerk, \$500.
 To William Tyler Page, clerk to the Committee on Accounts, \$500.
 To Harry V. Roe, document clerk, \$160.
 To Grant Jarvis, bill and document clerk, \$200.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CASSEL. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. I don't know whether they have left anybody else out of these increases, but I notice two persons who have been left out who I think ought to have their salaries increased, and those are the two reading clerks of the House. Why does the gentleman increase the salary of everybody else in the House, many of whom do not work, and fail to increase the salaries of the men we have been making work very hard? [Applause.]

Mr. CASSEL. I will say that because, as far as I can recollect, there has been no resolution submitted to our committee for that purpose.

Mr. HAMILTON. Oh, I submitted a resolution to the committee.

Mr. MANN. That would show that the gentlemen who are reading clerks are not only efficient but modest, which is more than can be said of many of the rest of them.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to apologize for my mistake. I am mistaken. There was a resolution there, and it was considered. I am perfectly willing, however, to have the amendment made. I want to say this: That this committee has been in session constantly, trying its best to equalize certain conditions.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of offering an amendment to that effect?

Mr. CASSEL. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, then I move to amend the resolution by adding the names of the reading clerks and \$400.

Mr. CASSEL. I will accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution add:

"To E. L. Lampson, reading clerk, \$400.

"To Dennis E. Alward, reading clerk, \$400."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman a question. In this resolution there is a provision made for an increase in the compensation of the clerks to certain committees?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. At present, if I am correctly informed, the compensation of the committee clerks is uniform.

Mr. CASSEL. This resolution does not increase the salaries of any of the clerks or of any persons. It gives them special compensation up to date. The matter of making an increase in their salaries will be considered at the next session of Congress, if that is to be considered at all. This is paying them extra money for the work which they have already rendered to

the House, and it does not give them an annual increase of salary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For instance, if the gentleman will pardon me, there is a provision for an increase in the salary of a clerk to the Committee on Accounts, \$500.

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; he is paid \$500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is that due to the industry of that particular clerk in bringing in these resolutions to increase the compensation of all other clerks?

Mr. CASSEL. No, sir; it is due to the fact that he devotes twelve months in a year to the duties of his office. It is one of the offices constantly open; it is never closed, and he is on duty twelve months out of the year. In proportion to the amount of pay that others get, this is not an unreasonable compensation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the present compensation?

Mr. CASSEL. Two thousand dollars—the same as all other clerks to committees.

Mr. HULL. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Have they not increased some clerks to committees?

Mr. CASSEL. We have in other resolutions, but not in this.

Mr. HULL. Then there is no clerk to a committee in this resolution?

Mr. CASSEL. Oh, yes; special compensation to clerks to committees, yes; but there is no annual increase to the salary of any clerk to a committee.

Mr. HULL. I understand that; but there is special compensation in this resolution?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Did the gentleman investigate the resolution for the increase of the compensation of the clerk to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. CASSEL. I suppose we have. We have investigated them all.

Mr. HULL. I will say, in my judgment, that there is not a clerk of the House who does more continuous work than does he, or who has more matters to look after. I would like the privilege of offering an amendment inserting the same compensation that you have given to other clerks.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the resolutions and amendments to a final passage.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSEL. For a question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there are two employees of this House engaged in work for this House—three—two of whom get less salary than any other employees of the House. They are the two men who are engaged as drivers upon the wagons that carry out the documents from the Doorkeeper's room. They get only \$50 a month, and they drive the wagon, handle all the heavy mail and documents sent out, and attend to that work ten months in the year, in all kinds of weather, and they get less than any other employee on the roll of the House. I think their salaries ought to be increased also.

I also want to say, in my judgment, the amount given for increase of salary of Mr. Cameron, which was only \$200, is not enough, comparing it with the increases we have given to salaries of others. We know his work, and we know his efficiency, and this resolution only provides for an increase to him of \$200, and I think it ought to be at least \$300; and I want to make those two amendments particularly to this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I will accept the two amendments.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to increase the amount to John J. Cameron, Assistant Official Reporter, from \$200 to \$300; and I wish to add to the resolution that the two drivers employed under the Doorkeeper in the folding room shall be increased \$240 each.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, let me say that an amendment under this resolution can only be made in a lump sum, appropriate to them for past services.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is not for past services.

Mr. CASSEL. Then it would not be germane to this resolution. I am sorry to raise that question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then make it \$240 for past services.

Mr. CASSEL. I accept the amendment offered in that way. Now I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The amendment will be reported, so the House will understand it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 5 so as to read: "John J. Cameron, Assistant Official Reporter, \$300;" and add to the resolution "to two drivers employed under the Doorkeeper in the folding room, \$240 each."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. I am not opposing this increase—if I did that would be the end of it—but I notice that heretofore they have mentioned names. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois and by the gentleman from Georgia named names. Ought the names to be mentioned here?

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposes that identifies them.

Mr. BARTLETT. That identifies them.

Mr. KEIFER. We will give you the names.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the resolution "to Charles E. Moss and W. H. Bell, employed under the Doorkeeper in the folding room, \$240 each."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the increase of salary apply to those gentlemen whose names are called or will it carry to the position itself?

The SPEAKER. It carries it to the men for work heretofore performed.

Mr. GARRETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment reported increasing the salary of the reading clerks, to which I am not opposed, mentioned names. Will that carry it to those gentlemen or carry it to the position?

The SPEAKER. To the gentlemen for work heretofore performed.

Mr. GARRETT. It is all for past services?

The SPEAKER. Certainly, as the Chair understood it.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SELECTION OF LANDS.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 7994) authorizing the State of North Dakota to select other lands in lieu of lands erroneously entered in sections 16 and 36 within the limits of the abandoned Fort Rice and Fort Abraham Lincoln military reservations, in said State.

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of North Dakota be, and is hereby, authorized to select, in lieu of lands embraced in homestead entries made and erroneously allowed prior to the passage of this act for lands in sections 16 and 36, within the limits of the abandoned Fort Rice and Fort Abraham Lincoln military reservations, in said State, other unappropriated surveyed nonmineral public lands of equal area situated within the limits of said State, in the manner provided in the act approved February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. L. p. 796), entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated for other purposes;" *Provided*, That such selection of lands by said State shall be a waiver of its right to the lands embraced in said homestead entries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this simply to give the right to select lieu lands in place of regular numbered section lands which the State failed to get.

Mr. GRONNA. I will state to the gentleman it is to permit a few settlers to keep their land in a military reservation that belongs to the State, and the State wants them to keep it. They can not prove up under the present law, and the State will lose nothing. It will be permitted to take other lands in their place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is an exchange of lands?

Mr. GRONNA. That is all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And for the benefit of the State?

Mr. GRONNA. For the benefit of the State and these settlers. The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

LAND FOR NORTH DAKOTA STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6134) providing for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota of certain tracts of land for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State Historical Society.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that bill is on the Private Calendar, and I suggest—

Mr. GRONNA. This is a Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The House, under the order heretofore made—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Speaker, I will state that it is reported by the committee. It is a Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Private Calendar, and it will come up to-night, if it is reached. That is the objection of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The Chair was not aware that it was on the Private Calendar.

SUBSIDY BILL.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House, the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the merchant marine bill.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] will occupy the first half hour.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIRDSALL] the balance of the time on this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIRDSALL] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. BIRDSALL. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this measure has taken a wide range for several days, and it occurs to me that it would be advisable to take some soundings and get back, if we can, to the real question that is involved in this discussion. In February, 1906, the Senate passed what is known as the "Gallinger bill," a cargo-subsidy bill. This was the evolution or the result of an investigation made by a joint Commission of the two Houses appointed two years ago. That Commission consisted, upon the part of the House, of three members of the Merchant Marine Commission, of Republican tendencies—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MINOR]; of the Democratic membership, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT], and Mr. McDERMOTT, from New Jersey. This committee, acting with a like committee on the part of the Senate, spent much time in investigating questions relating to our merchant marine. They visited the principal ports of the country upon the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Great Lakes. As a result of their investigations there was brought forth the bill that I have referred to, known as the "Gallinger bill," a bill which provided for granting subsidy to ships of all classes, whether sail or steam, at the rate of \$5 per ton on ships engaged in foreign trade for the term of twelve months, \$4 a ton for six months, and \$2.50 per ton for the shorter period of three months. It granted a cargo subsidy to the vessels engaged in deep-sea fisheries along the coast of Maine and upon the Pacific coast.

Now, this bill, the result of long labor upon the part of this commission, was passed in the Senate on February 15, 1906, came to this House, and was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In that committee it met its death. It would be interesting, if I had time, to go over the struggle that was in progress for a year over that bill, but it is now ancient history. The bill, I may say, has been killed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. [Applause.]

There are in this world many "doubting Thomases," and I hear it whispered about here in the House and elsewhere that this bill is "the voice of Jacob, but the hand of Esau." [Applause]. It is voiced not only here, but in the public press, and I desire, Mr. Chairman, to have the Clerk read in my time the following brief editorial, which I clipped from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 27.

The Clerk read as follows:

A STEP TOWARD SHIP SUBSIDIES.

The House at Washington has agreed to settle the question of ship subsidy at 3 o'clock on Friday afternoon. At that time the miserable little substitute for the Senate bill will be brought to a final vote.

It is a mere makeshift. The Senate bill was bad enough. It was all right as far as it went, but it did not go very far. The House has presumed to take liberties with it, and the result is a measure of trifling value when the whole vast subject of restoring the American flag of commerce to the ocean is taken into consideration.

But it is something. It commits Congress to the principle of building up foreign trade in American-built vessels through Congressional aid, and at least opens the way to something better.

Unquestionably it ought to be passed, but—what a bill! It is a cowardly contrivance.

Mr. BIRDSALL. Now, as I observed, there are "doubting Thomases" outside of the Chamber as well as in the Chamber, and the impression has gone abroad through the country, as I remarked, that while this is the "voice of Jacob, it is the hand of Esau."

Now, I think it is due to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.

GROSVENOR] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] that I set against a statement of that character the statement made in the opening paragraph of the majority report upon this bill, as follows:

This measure is not a general ship subsidy. It does not give a dollar of subsidy or bounty to cargo vessels of the tramp type. It does not give a dollar of subsidy or bounty or mail subvention or anything else to any company for operating a fast passenger service to Europe.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, for this reason: I believe that the general principle of ship subsidy has met its defeat, and that it is now dead, possibly for years to come, at least. Its mangled remains are down in the archives of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. [Applause.] And the superscription, to which I presume is appended the signature of the chairman of that committee, is "Murdered in the house of its friends." No better assurance need be given the country that the vicious principle of ship subsidy is dead than that it has been abandoned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who for years has been its chief prophet. And I want these facts to go to the country so that there may be no uneasiness upon the subject, and that we may all understand it is as dead as Caesar, and that now what is brought in here has been obliterated by black lines, and not a man in the House "so poor as to do it reverence."

Now, having put this testimonial to the patriotic motives and actions of the gentleman from Ohio upon record, knowing that his innate modesty would prevent him from suggesting it, I do want to say that I have some regret at the expressions that the gentleman made toward his fellow-members of the committee at the time of the adoption of this rule. I am sorry that he is not present in the Chamber; but he will follow me, and will have an opportunity to set himself right if I misquote or misconstrue him. The gentleman impugns not only the motives, but the intelligence of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HINSHAW], a member of the committee, impugned as well the intelligence of that membership of this House who represent what is called "the cornfields" of this country, and went further to threaten the gentleman from Nebraska and other gentlemen upon this committee who have disagreed in their views with him—and the President, if you please—upon this question, to a certain extent, with defeat in their districts. I would rather consider these as words spoken in haste, unworthy the distinguished gentleman from the State of Ohio. But the gentleman from Nebraska needs no defense at my hands. He is the peer in intellect and in character of any man upon the floor of the House. [Applause.] Why, Mr. Chairman, good men have come from the cornfields. Lincoln, Washington, Grimes, and Harlan, and a host of men have come from the cornfields, and the cornfields have furnished, as the gentleman from Michigan yesterday said, the sinews of war and the sinews of commerce of this great country. Why, sir, up to a brief period the entire balance of trade in favor of the United States was derived from exports of agricultural products from the cornfields of the West and the cotton fields of the South. Within the last fifteen years over \$6,000,000,000 have been added to our national wealth by balances of trade in favor of the cornfields and the cotton fields of our country. Are gentlemen to be laughed at and to be ridiculed because they represent these great interests and, perchance, have the courage of their convictions to stand up against raids upon the National Treasury? Why, sir, great men have come from the cornfields. Look over the list, if you please, of the men who have risen in this country to power and fame. Where have they come from? From the great cities? From the heat of commercial conflict? No; on the contrary, from the field of labor and from the farm. There amidst the fragrance of clover blossoms and the perfume of a thousand flowers are laid the habits of simplicity, of industry, and of economy that marked the after life. [Applause.] Why, gentlemen, the present occupant of the White House is the only great man that was ever actually born in the city of New York. [Laughter and applause.]

As I remarked at the outset, this discussion has taken a wide range, and in it we have had appeals to passion, to our patriotism, to our prejudice. I yield to no man in my reverence for and devotion to the flag of our country; that flag that waved in triumph over Cornwallis's army at Yorktown; that established American citizenship at New Orleans; that waved in triumph from the heights of Chapultepec and over the halls of the Montezumas, and received beneath its sheltering fold our erring brothers at Appomattox; that flag that shone above the clouds at Lookout Mountain, that in our later day has given freedom to the Gem of the Antilles and is now spreading the light of the civilization of the western world in the far-off islands of the sea; that symbol of the power and the glory and the might of

80,000,000 of Americans. But, sir, I like patriotism that is void of greed [applause] and that does not measure its devotion by the liberality of grants from the National Treasury. [Loud applause.]

Now, then, I have flung my Pegasus so high that I am using all my time, and I shall have to get back to the earth and back to this bill. And what is it? I have assured you that it is not a ship-subsidy bill. It is in plain words an amendment of the postal act of 1891, and is an endeavor to provide for an extension of our mail lines in certain directions upon the sea. Now, let us consider the bill in that light; let us disabuse our minds of passion and prejudice and consider it, then, as a plain, simple, business proposition. This bill provides, upon the Pacific coast, for two new lines, one north of Cape Mendocino, and one south of Cape Mendocino. It provides for the establishment of the mail line on the northern route, as follows:

From a port or ports on the Pacific coast of the United States north of Cape Mendocino to Japan, China, and the Philippines on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$350,000 a year or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$700,000 a year.

Substantially the same provisions are made for the line south of Cape Mendocino, which is required to touch at Hawaii.

Now, is there any necessity for this contract upon these Pacific lines? If so, is the amount which we propose to pay for it a reasonable amount? Nobody anticipates that the amounts for which the contract will be secured will be materially less than the maximum amount fixed by the bill. Is it a good business proposition to go into it? Let us consider the situation for a moment. The lines from Seattle to Japan and China are already firmly fixed and established. The ships owned by James J. Hill can not be competed with either by domestic or foreign ships. Their construction, their great capacity of 20,000 tons each, make it absolutely impossible for any other ship of ordinary size, speed, or construction to compete with them, because it is perfectly apparent that the same motive power which will move, for instance, forty-five cars in a railroad train can be operated at relatively the same expense as on a train which carries but ten or fifteen cars. Consequently the increased capacity of these great ships, while not necessitating a very much larger crew than the ordinary five or six thousand ton ship, enables them to stand in the front rank and makes other ships powerless to compete with them.

Now, I say—and I think the testimony before our Commission justifies the statement—that even these great ships could comply with the requirements of this bill in the matter of speed. What are those requirements? That the ship shall be able to steam four hours in ordinary weather at a speed of 16 knots an hour. The testimony of Mr. Cramp, one of the greatest shipbuilders of this country, the testimony of an expert from San Francisco, and of at least two or three others before our committee was that a ship capable of running 14 or 14½ knots an hour under ordinary conditions could upon its trial speed develop 16 or even 18 knots an hour. The reason is plain. Upon the speed trials the ship is given every advantage to develop its speed. Its machinery is carefully looked after. It is ballasted just right. Further than that, they go to work and pick over the coal by hand that is to be used in its furnaces, and, as explained by Mr. Cramp, a man stands at the furnace door, and the moment the door is opened the fireman throws in the coal.

Everything is worked to perfection, so that it is possible for a ship sailing ordinarily 14 or 14½ knots to develop a speed of from 16 to 18 knots an hour. So that I say it is perfectly competent and it is entirely likely that this contract with the requirements contemplated by this bill could be secured by these ships, and the consequent result would not be the addition of a single vessel to the Northern Line from Seattle. So as to the Pacific Mail Line. There is no question that several of the Pacific Mail ships are now 16-knot ships and would be entitled to receive a contract of this character. These ships are now carrying our mails at a compensation satisfactory to them. Why, then, should we increase the compensation by contracts of this character? I undertake to say that the mail facilities will not be materially advanced by reason of the establishment of these two lines. Let me call your attention, gentlemen, to the report of the superintendent of the division of foreign mails relating to our present mail facilities upon the Pacific Ocean. He says:

By means of steamers sailing three or four times a month from San Francisco and three or four times a month from Seattle or Tacoma, mails for Japan and China have been dispatched not less than seven times a month.

These mails have included articles for the Philippines, but mails for the Philippines have also been dispatched by Army transports, which sailed from San Francisco for Manila about every twenty days. Correspondence for Japan and China has also been forwarded to Vancouver, British Columbia, for dispatch per steamers leaving that port

about every three weeks, when the delivery of the correspondence would be thereby expedited.

Mails for the Australasian colonies have been dispatched from San Francisco once every three weeks by means of the contract steamers of the Oceanic Steamship Company, the transit time from San Francisco to Sydney being twenty-one days, and mails being delivered en route at Pago Pago.

Advantage is also taken of the opportunities offered for the dispatch of correspondence for those colonies by means of the Canadian Line of steamers sailing from Vancouver, British Columbia, once every four weeks.

The Oceanic steamers and those from Vancouver, above referred to, call at Honolulu, and most of the steamers en route from San Francisco to Japan and China usually call at Honolulu. Including the service under domestic mail contracts between San Francisco and Honolulu, there were from seven to ten opportunities a month for communication by mail with Hawaii, and generally there are not less than eight.

Now, then, the establishment of this contract service upon these two lines of the Pacific coast would do what? If you say that in consideration of this contract they ought to carry all the mails, then you reduce the service upon these trans-Pacific mails to fortnightly or monthly service. If you say that notwithstanding these contracts mails will be dispatched—as they undoubtedly will be dispatched by the Post-Office Department by every available means, as they are now dispatching from New York City and from Philadelphia, notwithstanding the great lines, as they are now dispatched at every available opportunity—if you say that mails will be so dispatched by vessels whenever an opportunity is afforded, then you are simply adding that much; you are simply donating to the trans-Pacific lines the amount of the several contracts, or substantially so.

Now, what is the cost of this service for seven, eight, and sometimes ten times a month? According to the report of the superintendent of the Division of Foreign Mails, our mails are dispatched over the Pacific Ocean, and this total cost of the Department now is \$447,248.67, and we propose to give, upon this line of the North Pacific, \$700,000 for a fortnightly service. Gentlemen, this is a business proposition. Let us consider it from a business standpoint.

Can any gentleman suggest a good reason why we should reduce the mail service and pay more for the deficient service? No, Mr. Chairman; the lines on the Pacific Ocean are now firmly established; trade with the Orient is an established fact, and will continue to grow under existing conditions. I have no doubt, sir, that Cape Mendocino is the line of demarcation between the influence of J. J. Hill and the Great Northern and the Harriman lines; but this does not influence me in the settlement of this question. If they gave equally good service at as low a cost, it would be immaterial, in my mind. We are not here to aid or injure any particular interest, but to solve this question, if we can, in the light of reason and common sense; and, considering the question from a business standpoint, I am opposed to the extension of the two Pacific lines to the Orient from the Pacific.

Now, let us examine the facts with relation to the Oceanic Line from San Francisco to Australia. Upon this line the Oceanic Steamship Company is now under contract to carry the mail on a monthly service at \$283,000 per annum. This contract with the Government runs until 1911, so there is yet four years unexpired. Now, without providing further service or creating any additional burden upon the steamship company, we propose to increase their pay under the contract by \$200,000. It is claimed, and possibly it may be true, that the steamship company is losing money, but that is not a sufficient reason for us to put our hands into the money bag and make them a donation of \$200,000 per year, which in the aggregate will add \$800,000 to their compensation for the unexpired term of their contract. There is neither rhyme nor reason in such a proceeding. If the steamship company succumbs, then let us readvertise the contract and let it to the lowest bidder, thus proceed as we ought on business and not on charitable lines. Let us take a firm stand also on this line, and insist for once at least that this contract with the Government shall be faithfully adhered to and performed. At the proper time amendments will be offered to the bill striking out the provisions thereof relating to the two Pacific lines, and the paragraph relating to the Oceanic Line to Australia. I sincerely trust, sir, that the amendments will prevail.

If these lines be stricken from the bill, and it be so amended as to require all ships on the South American lines to be hereafter constructed, and be so further amended as to require the Postmaster-General to let the contract to the lowest bidder at the highest rate of speed, then I am authorized to say on behalf of the entire delegation from the great State of Iowa, which I have the honor in part to represent, that it will support the remainder of the bill. I am unalterably opposed to the principle of cargo or tonnage subsidy. First, because it is wrong in principle

and contrary to my notions of the functions and purposes of government. Governments are instituted for the purpose of keeping the peace and compelling us to settle our grievances by arbitration rather than by arms; by arbitration not by blows; but it is not instituted to make any man richer or poorer, and the only purpose should be to protect all alike in the exercise of their individual powers and enterprises as comembers of a common society.

I am sorry to say that somehow in these late times we have come to look too much for Government aid, to expect the Government to make us richer or poorer, and the consequence of it is to fill our halls with the representatives of special interests, capital and labor alike demanding some legislation which will enhance a particular interest. This is all wrong, and I hope the day is not far distant when our lobbies will be cleared of them and the money changers scourged from the temple. I am opposed to the subsidy principle again because it is impracticable and would be wholly inefficient if extended now to rehabilitate our merchant marine. No, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, we are not a seafaring people and will never again become such until our necessities drive us into that occupation. We have a young and energetic civilization that is now and has been for fifty years engaged in developing and building up our internal resources. That little civilization which a hundred years ago was gnawing indentations on the western slope of the Alleghenies has spread throughout the Middle and great West, making farms, building cities, developing the mines and forests, the great systems of transportation, and the thousands of factories, and notwithstanding the fact, sir, that more than a million immigrants seek our shores annually, still the cry is for more men to labor in the fields, the mines, the forests, and the factories. By and through our beneficent system of protection we have builded up a standard of wages and standard of profit to capital unknown elsewhere in the world, and this very prosperity for our capital and labor forms an insuperable obstacle to the building up of our merchant marine.

Gentlemen speak of its profitable condition prior to 1850 and seek for the cause of its decline. In my judgment, it lies in the fact that since the civil war throughout every department of industry capital has been more profitably engaged, labor more universally employed at better wages than at any period in our history or in the history of any nation on the globe.

What inducement is there for the young men to become seamen? Wages upon the sea range from \$18 to \$30 per month, a pittance when compared with the wages prevalent throughout all the trades on land. Capital is employed profitably on land in manufacturing, in building, and in speculations. Why should it seek the peril of the sea? Under existing conditions the cost of ship construction in the United States is 25 to 30 per cent higher than upon the Clyde or at Amsterdam. The cost of operation and maintaining the ship is 30 to 35 per cent higher than of foreign ships. The rate of transportation is now confessedly so low that Americans under the conditions named can not engage profitably either in shipbuilding or in operation. Given a ship free of cost, the American owner can not operate it under our laws and employ American labor without a loss. He can not get the cargo at a rate which affords a profit. The simple proposition, therefore, of the ship-subsidy advocate is to make this business profitable by paying the margin of loss from the Treasury of the United States. I am opposed to it, and if I know the sentiment of the farmer and business men of my district and State it is in opposition to the proposition.

When the time arrives, if it ever should, when our elbows touch, when capital and labor alike are seeking employment at a low margin of profit, then we may turn again to sea, but until that time arrives we may expect foreigners to do our ocean transportation.

Within our own country, and within our legitimate sphere of action, we can protect American labor against foreign labor; but when our domain steps out to sea, and when the pilot leaves our ship in the harbor, it enters upon the broad ocean in competition with the world. If we enter upon the policy of subsidy, where will it end? We start at the outset with a handicap of 25 per cent in cost of construction and 30 per cent in cost of operation and maintenance against us. We can expect that foreign nations, for the protection of their interests, will likewise enter upon the policy of subsidy and meet any advantage granted or gained by our builders and operators from Government bounties. I have no fear of this Government entering upon the bounty system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the substitute report here—the Gallinger bill—which passed the Senate, provides as follows:

That the act entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce,"

approved March 3, 1891, be, and hereby is, amended by adding thereto the following section:

SEC. 10. That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts for a term of ten years, with citizens of the United States, for the carrying of mails on steamships hereafter built in the United States and registered in the United States, or now duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens any corporation created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof, a majority of the stock of which shall be and shall continue to be owned by citizens of the United States), between ports of the United States and ports on the routes and for the amounts hereinafter prescribed.

First. From a port or ports of the Atlantic coast of the United States to Brazil, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$300,000 a year, or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$600,000 a year.

Second. From a port or ports of the Atlantic coast of the United States to Argentina, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a monthly service at a monthly compensation not exceeding \$400,000 a year, or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$800,000 a year: *Provided*, That a vessel receiving compensation for mail service pursuant to contract on a voyage on this route shall not also receive compensation for mail service pursuant to contract on said voyage on the first route as described above.

Third. From a port or ports of the United States on the Gulf of Mexico to the Isthmus of Panama, on steamships of the United States of not less than 14 knots speed, for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$75,000 a year, or for a weekly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$150,000 a year.

Fourth. From a port or ports of the Pacific coast of the United States to the Isthmus of Panama, Peru, and Chile, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$300,000 a year, or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$600,000 a year.

Fifth. From a port or ports on the Pacific coast of the United States via Hawaii to Japan, China, and the Philippines on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$350,000 a year or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$700,000 a year.

Sixth. From a port or ports on the Pacific coast of the United States north of Cape Mendocino to Japan, China, and the Philippines on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$350,000 a year or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$700,000 a year.

Seventh. From a port or ports of the Pacific coast of the United States, via Hawaii and the Samoan Islands, to Australasia, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed for a service once in three weeks at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$200,000 a year, in addition to the compensation now provided pursuant to contract under this said act of March 3, 1891: *Provided*, That the requirements of this section as to the rates of speed shall be deemed to be complied with if said rates are developed during a trial of four hours' continuous steaming at sea in ordinary weather in water of sufficient depth to make the test a fair and just one and if the vessels are maintained in a condition to develop such speed at any time while at sea in ordinary weather. This trial shall be made under the direction and supervision of a board of naval officers which the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint upon the application of the owner or owners of the vessel to be tested: *And provided further*, That all the provisions of the first nine sections of this act are hereby made applicable in all respects to the services provided for in this section: *Provided, however*, That the specific rates of compensation described in section 5 of this act shall not apply to the services provided for in this section, and that all ordinary repair or overhauling of a steamship employed and paid for carrying mails under this section shall be made in the United States, except in cases where drydocking is necessary and no American dry dock of sufficient capacity shall be within a distance of 500 miles of the location of said ship when the repairs shall be needed.

SEC. 2. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act in whole or in part whenever in its judgment the public interest shall so require, without, however, impairing in any wise the obligation of any specific contract then in force which shall have been entered into under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. 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 fisheries of the United States, including the coastwise trade of the Atlantic and Pacific and the Great Lakes, 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, 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 by either 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. They shall also possess such qualifications, receive such instruction, and be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon proper audit by the Auditor of the Navy Department, 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 such officer, petty officer, or man thus enrolled and employed in the merchant marine or fisheries, including the coastwise trade of the Atlantic and Pacific and the Great Lakes, as hereinafter provided, an annual retainer as follows: For each officer of the line or Engineer Corps having the rank of lieutenant in 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; for each seaman, first class, \$36; for each seaman, second class, \$30; for each seaman, third class, \$24. Such retainer shall be paid at the end of each year of service on certificate, by the Secretary of the Navy, that the member of the Naval Reserve has complied with the regulations and has served for at least six months of the preceding twelve months on

vessels of the United States in the merchant marine or fisheries. The total number of officers, petty officers, and men enrolled in the Naval Reserve shall not at any time exceed 10,000.

SEC. 4. That this act shall take effect on July 1, 1907.

It is not a subsidy measure, but an amendment to the postal act of March 3, 1891, under which we have been extending our ocean mail service. The act of 1891 contains provisions requiring the construction of ships used in mail service upon plans and specifications made by the Secretary of the Navy, to the end that they may be easily converted into armored cruisers or transports in time of war, and also provides that the Government may purchase them, if the necessity therefore should arise, at their face value upon appraisal. It is no doubt true that our Navy and our commerce would be practically helpless without an auxiliary fleet of merchant vessels, and it is probable that this is the cheapest manner in which they can be obtained.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that if certain amendments were made to the bill eliminating the Pacific lines and leaving the South American lines alone in the bill and further amended by providing for the construction of entirely new ships, we would support the bill. The countries of Central and South America are properly within our legitimate sphere of influence. We have for nearly a hundred years accepted the Monroe doctrine, and we must maintain it for the security and peace of the Western Hemisphere. We should cultivate friendship and trade with our neighboring countries in South America, and the first essential requisite for that purpose is speedy means of communication.

My information from the Post-Office Department is that at the present time the average time of communication from New York and Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres is twenty-five days, and the fact is that most of our mail for those ports is sent by way of Europe. The American consul at Falkland Islands is a resident of my city, and is compelled to go abroad by way of Liverpool. Now, there is a great trade in South America and we should grasp it.

The following extracts from our trade and consular reports show the condition we are now in with reference to trade in that quarter of the world:

CONSUL GUENTHER'S TESTIMONY.

Germany has forty-three large steamships in her South American service, and six more are nearly ready for launching. The forty-nine vessels aggregate 217,195 gross tons. Most of them are of recent construction, nineteen having been built in the years 1900 to 1905. They ply on four routes, all starting from Hamburg, connecting the latter port with the La Plata States and Brazil. Germany's flourishing export trade to South America, it is believed, is mainly due to this direct and prompt transportation service. In a letter furnishing the foregoing information Consul Guenther, of Frankfurt, Germany, says that an English journal, speaking on this service, quotes the following from an American merchant in Buenos Aires:

"We here have no parcels-post connection with the United States, lacking which my firm is obliged to order every year many thousand dollars' worth of goods from Europe which I would prefer to get from home. We even have no regular mail service with the United States. Reply letters from there take three months ere they reach us here, whereas letters from Europe consume only a fortnight in getting here. Steamers from the United States always contain petroleum in their cargo, and for that reason are not allowed to enter the inner harbor, but are obliged to discharge their freight on lighters, which causes delay and inconvenience. Goods arriving from Europe can be disposed of within five days while goods from New York require four weeks after their arrival here before we can dispose of them. That this condition handicaps trade with the United States needs no further demonstration."

OUR MINISTER TO CHILE.

Hon. John Hicks, our minister to Chile, emphasizes the need of an American ocean mail service on the west coast of South America in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of December 11, 1905:

"One of the great difficulties in the way of a closer commercial connection between the United States and Chile is in the lack of good shipping facilities. The passenger and much of the freight traffic of the entire west coast of South America is in the hands of two companies, the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, English, and the South American Steamship Company, a Chilean corporation. Both companies receive a subsidy from the Chilean Government and they alternate in the dispatch of ships between Panama and Valparaiso. Naturally they are in a combination or trust, and it seems difficult to bring about any change or improvement in their methods of doing business. When these steamers take from twenty-five to thirty days between Panama and Valparaiso it can readily be seen that American trade must suffer, for the trip could easily be made in ten days. So long as this condition exists and steamers can come from Europe almost as quickly it will be a difficult matter to increase American business on this coast."

OUR CONSUL AT MONTEVIDEO.

Consul O'Hara, at Montevideo, explains the relatively small trade between Uruguay and the United States as due primarily to lack of swift and regular steamship communication, and also to the fact that Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy have merchants of their own nationality in Uruguay representing their steamships and pushing their goods and doing their utmost to prevent the sale of American merchandise. The consul says, in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of December 11, 1905:

"The same people who push our merchandise aside and force that of others to the front push our country aside and say that while we are a great producing nation we have no facilities for marketing our products. Here we are forced to silence. The records show that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, there were exported from this

country to the United States goods to the value of \$3,998,175 American gold, and that not one dollar's worth of this amount left this port on an American vessel.

"It is estimated that not 1 per cent of North Americans who travel abroad include South America in their itinerary, while not more than 20 per cent of Latin Americans traveling abroad seek the United States in their voyaging. Although more of them come to us, except in the case of Mexico, than we send to them, interchange of travel is so small as to have little beneficial effect. There are several reasons for this condition, among which is our lack of steamship facilities.

"On this point, indeed, too much can not be said, not only because it is very important, but because it can and should be immediately changed. The advantage is now entirely with Europe, and the disadvantage is wholly with the United States. This is not in any sense an argument for or against so-called 'ship subsidies,' but a plain, square statement of fact. At the present time there is not one first-class, fast, up-to-date express passenger or mail steamer running between any North American port and the ports of the great nations of South America. In contrast to this is to be noted the remarkable fact that Europe has nine different lines of large, commodious, modern, fast steamers giving frequent and excellent service between its chief ports and those of Latin America. Many of these boats will rival those of the northern trans-Atlantic lines in the luxury of their accommodations."

"It is true that there seems to be an abundance of freight steamers between the United States and South America, but no South American—and the number of those who travel is increasing annually—will take a freight, cattle, or small steamer for the United States when he has the selection of many lines of passenger, express, and fast steamers."

In his annual report for 1906, our Postmaster-General speaks in the following emphatic manner concerning our postal facilities with South America:

Foreign governments are steadily increasing the speed of their fast mail steamers and requiring them to have fixed and regular sailings. The mail steamers of other countries leaving ports of the United States, will more and more absorb our foreign mail transportation until such time as the United States provides an adequate compensation for the outward voyage of steamers of equal speed and regularity of sailings. Congress authorized the Postmaster-General by the act of 1891, to contract with owners of American steamships for ocean mail service, and has realized the impracticability to command suitable steamers in the interest of the postal service alone by requiring that such steamers shall be of a size, class, and equipment which will promote commerce and become available as auxiliary cruisers of the Navy in case of need. The compensation allowed to such steamers is found to be wholly inadequate to secure the proposals contemplated. This is especially true as to Australasia and several of the countries of South America with which we have cordial relations, and which, for manifest reasons, should have direct mail-communication connections with us. The unprecedented expansion of trade and foreign commerce justifies the prompt consideration of an adequate foreign mail service. Expenditures to this end seem fully warranted also from the standpoint of a proper naval establishment, inasmuch as the vessels performing service are so built as to be readily converted into auxiliary cruisers. Favorable legislation on this subject is urgently needed.

The President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor have likewise recommended the establishment of speedy lines of mail communication.

Our ocean mail service now has annually to its credit a profit of about \$3,000,000. We can afford to expend a portion at least of this for the further extension of our mail facilities upon the ocean, and I believe, sir, that first of all we should commence with our neighbors on the south. If I believed that this bill were in any sense a cargo subsidy or entering wedge for bounties from the Treasury, I should oppose it in toto. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, the debate that is about to terminate, as far as the general debate is concerned, has been a very interesting one, and I am now charged with the duty of completing it so far as the affirmative of this question is concerned.

Of course, it will be impossible for me to even refer to much of the argument and denunciation that have been made on the other side of this question, and I shall confine myself to a very few of the suggestions that have been made by the opponents of the bill, and answer, as far as I may be able, some of the objections.

I am very much surprised that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIRDSALL], in the closing hours of the debate, should seek to prejudice me in the estimation of the House of Representatives by making any allusion in a critical manner to what I said about cornfield statesmen. Everybody who has read the papers understood that a certain Senator called himself, with much self-approbation, a "cornfield statesman." I referred to him, and everybody understood it, and it was neither magnanimous nor fair in the gentleman to criticize me. I have hoed more corn, and continued to hoe corn longer, in my young days than any other Member in this House, in my opinion, and I certainly have never sneered at anybody because he hoed corn. [Applause.] I do not believe interstate commerce could prevent the shipment of the corn, although I hoed it when I was only 16 years of age.

Mr. SULZER. We will accept the gentleman's apology. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I may not have an opportunity to reply to the Bates bill argument put forth by the proxy of that gentleman on the floor, and therefore I will simply say that every proposition in it has been repudiated by men of all parties and all opinions upon this great question years ago.

We passed in this House since I have been a Member of it a very strong ship-subsidy bill. It was the real thing. It had been passed in the Senate; it came over to the House; it was fully debated; amendments were offered to it, and some of the amendments agreed to, and then the bill was passed. Fortunately, under our system of legislation we have a way of putting down a record of how men vote, and it may be that between this and the close of the five-minute debate I may have occasion to call the attention of one or two gentlemen to their record, and it will amuse the people of the country greatly when they read it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes I have I want to take up some of the objections. In the first place, yesterday it was stated that it was impossible to get out of the record of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries answers to certain questions that had been propounded in regard to the cost of running a ship, and various items in detail of everything connected with the ship. Eight thousand copies of the hearings before the committee, as I stated yesterday, were published, and here are detailed statements of the cost in the various shipyards of the United States of the building of the ships; and here is, down to the pay of the cooks and the coal heavers, the expense of running these great ships, every item, thoroughly itemized and set out.

COST OF MAINTAINING OCEAN MAIL STEAMSHIPS UNDER THE LAW OF MARCH 3, 1891.

On pages 372-380 of the hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, April 4 to 13, 1906, the Oceanic Steamship Company, of San Francisco, operating a mail service to Australasia under the law of 1891, submits detailed statements of the wages on its 6,000-ton 16-knot American steamers, as compared with British and Japanese steamers of the same class, and a summary of the entire cost of operation of the Oceanic Line, as follows:

Statement showing annual loss operating on mail route No. 75.

Total value of vessels in service:		
Sierra	-----	\$921,539.91
Sonoma	-----	923,546.95
Ventura	-----	903,582.54
Total	-----	2,748,669.40
Fixed annual expenses not included in operating account:		
Interest on bonds, \$2,405,000 at 5 per cent		120,250.00
Depreciation, 5 per cent per annum on \$2,748,669.40		137,433.47
Insurance, 2 1/2 per cent per annum on \$2,748,669.40		75,588.40
Taxes		12,400.00
Advertising		13,452.00
Officers and agencies management		57,812.00
Total	-----	416,935.87

Total gross receipts from all sources.

	1902.	1903.	1904.
Passengers, freight, mail pay	\$1,364,159.63	\$1,484,205.55	\$1,452,918.53
Total expenses operation	1,318,184.52	1,436,390.93	1,885,948.10
Net earnings	15,975.11	47,815.02	66,970.43
Fixed expenses	416,935.87	416,935.87	416,935.87
Less net earnings operating account	15,975.10	47,815.02	66,970.43
Net loss per annum	400,960.77	369,120.85	349,965.44
Average annual loss for past three years			373,349.02

American steamship Sonoma v. Japanese steamship America Maru. SONOMA; BETWEEN SAN FRANCISCO AND AUSTRALIA. [Gross tonnage, 6,200 tons.]

Number of men.	Rating (all-American crew).	United States gold.	
		Rate per man per month.	Amount of pay per month.
	Officers:		
1	First officer		\$125.00
1	Chief engineer		175.00
1	Purser		125.00
1	Doctor		60.00
	Mate's department:		
1	Second officer		75.00
1	Third officer		55.00
1	Carpenter		50.00
1	Boatswain		40.00
4	Quartermasters	\$35.00	140.00
13	Seamen	35.00	465.00
3	Cadets	20.00	60.00
1	Messboy		25.00
3	Deck boys	15.00	45.00
	Engineer's department:		
1	First assistant engineer		120.00
1	Second assistant engineer		90.00
1	Third assistant engineer		80.00
1	Fourth assistant engineer		75.00
1	Fifth assistant engineer		70.00
1	Sixth assistant engineer		65.00
1	Electrical engineer		70.00

American steamship Sonoma v. Japanese steamship America Maru—Continued.
SONOMA, BETWEEN SAN FRANCISCO AND AUSTRALIA—continued.

Number of men.	Rating (all-American crew).	United States gold.	
		Rate per man per month.	Amount of pay per month.
Engineer's department—Continued.			
1	Refrigerating engineer.....		\$70.00
1	Second refrigerating engineer.....		60.00
3	Water tenders.....	\$60.00	180.00
3	Oilers.....	50.00	150.00
3	do.....	45.00	135.00
1	Storekeeper.....		40.00
3	Cadets.....	20.00	60.00
20	Firemen.....	50.00	1,000.00
24	Coal passers.....	40.00	960.00
2	Mess boys.....	25.00	50.00
Steward's department:			
1	Chief steward.....		100.00
1	Second steward.....		50.00
1	Second-cabin steward.....		40.00
1	Steerage steward.....		35.00
3	Stewardesses.....	25.00	75.00
1	First cook.....		75.00
1	Second cook.....		50.00
1	Third cook.....		40.00
1	Fourth cook.....		35.00
1	Fifth cook.....		30.00
1	Sixth cook.....		25.00
1	First baker.....		70.00
1	Second baker.....		50.00
1	Third baker.....		35.00
1	First butcher.....		55.00
1	Second butcher.....		35.00
1	First pantryman.....		40.00
1	Second pantryman.....		30.00
1	Third pantryman.....		25.00
1	Porter.....		30.00
1	First messman.....		30.00
1	Second messman.....		25.00
1	Third messman.....		25.00
1	Saloon watchman.....		25.00
1	Steerage watchman.....		20.00
1	Second-cabin pantryman.....		30.00
1	Storekeeper.....		50.00
1	Silverman.....		30.00
1	Printer.....		30.00
1	Janitor.....		20.00
25	Waiters.....	25.00	625.00
157	Total per month.....		6,520.00
	Total per annum.....		78,480.00

AMERICA MARU, JAPANESE LINE BETWEEN SAN FRANCISCO AND HONG-KONG.
[Gross tonnage, 6,307 tons.]

Number of men.	Rating.	European or Asiatic.	Equivalent in United States gold.	
			Rate per man per month.	Amount of pay per month.
Saloon officers:				
1	First officer.....	European..		\$100.00
1	Chief engineer.....	do.....		150.00
1	Purser.....	do.....		100.00
1	Surgeon.....	do.....		60.00
1	Freight clerk.....	do.....		75.00
Deck department:				
1	Second officer.....	Asiatic.....		55.00
1	Third officer.....	do.....		40.00
1	Fourth officer.....	do.....		15.00
1	Junior officer.....	do.....		7.50
2	Do.....	do.....	\$6.50	13.00
1	Carpenter.....	do.....		15.00
1	Carpenter's mate.....	do.....		11.50
6	Quartermasters.....	do.....	{ 4 at 11.00 2 at 10.00 }	64.00
1	Boatswain.....	do.....		15.00
1	No. 2 boatswain.....	do.....		11.75
2	Deck engineers.....	do.....		21.00
26	Seamen.....	do.....	{ 6 at 6.75 8 at 7.25 6 at 8.25 6 at 8.75 }	200.50
1	Mess boy.....	do.....		2.50
1	Storekeeper.....	do.....		10.25
1	Lamp trimmer.....	do.....		9.75
Engineer's department:				
1	First assistant engineer.....	European.....		75.00
1	Second assistant engineer.....	Asiatic.....		65.00
1	Third assistant engineer.....	do.....		55.00
4	Junior engineers.....	do.....	{ 1 at 45.00 1 at 35.00 1 at 30.00 1 at 10.00 }	120.00
1	Electrician.....	do.....		25.00
12	Oilers.....	do.....	{ 1 at 15.00 1 at 12.00 10 at 10.50 }	132.00
12	No. 1 firemen.....	do.....		108.00
16	Firemen.....	do.....		136.00

American steamship Sonoma v. Japanese steamship America Maru—Continued.
AMERICA MARU, JAPANESE LINE BETWEEN SAN FRANCISCO AND HONG-KONG—continued.

Number of men.	Rating.	European or Asiatic.	Equivalent in United States gold.	
			Rate per man per month.	Amount of pay per month.
Engineer's department—continued.				
16	Coal passers.....	Asiatic.....	{ 5 at \$7.50 11 at 7.00 }	\$114.50
2	Mess boys.....	do.....		5.00
1	Storekeeper.....	do.....		10.50
1	Boiler maker.....	do.....		20.00
Purser's department:				
2	Assistant freight clerks.....	do.....	{ 1 at 25.00 1 at 12.50 }	37.50
1	Storekeeper.....	do.....		25.00
1	Steward.....	European.....		90.00
1	Steerage steward.....	Asiatic.....		17.50
1	Stewardess.....	European.....		20.00
1	Baker.....	Asiatic.....		20.00
1	Second baker.....	do.....		7.50
1	Butcher.....	do.....		25.00
1	Second butcher.....	do.....		2.50
1	Pantryman.....	do.....		15.00
1	Second pantryman.....	do.....		7.50
1	First cook, after galley.....	do.....		22.50
1	Second cook, after galley.....	do.....		17.50
1	Third cook, after galley.....	do.....		7.50
1	First cook, forward galley.....	do.....		8.50
2	Second cooks, forward galley.....	do.....	7.50	15.00
2	Third cooks, forward galley.....	do.....	6.50	13.00
1	Fourth cook, forward galley.....	do.....		6.00
1	Cook, steerage.....	do.....		17.50
1	Do.....	do.....		12.50
1	Saloon watchman.....	do.....		12.50
1	Steerage watchman.....	do.....		10.00
5	Steerage waiters.....	do.....	{ 3 at 7.50 2 at 6.50 }	35.50
2	Officer's mess men.....	do.....	2.50	5.00
24	Cabin waiters.....	do.....	7.50	180.00
1	No. 1 waiter.....	do.....		17.50
1	Barkeeper.....	do.....		10.00
1	Scully man.....	do.....		7.50
1	Chow boy.....	do.....		.25
180	Total per month.....			2,509.00
	Total per annum.....			30,108.00

Excess of cost of wages per annum to American steamship, \$48,372.

Wages paid on Orient Pacific Liner Orizaba, 6,300 tons (British Australasian mail service).

	Rate per man per month.	Amount of pay per month.
1 first mate.....	\$60.00	\$60.00
1 second mate.....	45.00	45.00
1 third mate.....	40.00	40.00
1 fourth mate.....	30.00	30.00
1 surgeon.....	50.00	50.00
1 purser.....	75.00	75.00
1 assistant purser.....	31.25	31.25
1 carpenter.....	41.25	41.25
1 carpenter's mate.....	25.00	25.00
1 boatswain.....	35.00	35.00
2 boatswain's mates.....	26.25	52.50
2 masters at arms.....	26.25	52.50
1 storekeeper.....	22.50	22.50
24 able seamen.....	20.00	480.00
4 ordinary seamen.....	10.00	40.00
5 deck boys.....	5.00	25.00
1 chief engineer.....	105.00	105.00
1 second engineer.....	80.00	80.00
1 third engineer.....	65.00	65.00
1 fourth engineer.....	55.00	55.00
1 fifth engineer.....	50.00	50.00
1 sixth engineer.....	45.00	45.00
1 seventh engineer.....	52.50	52.50
1 eighth engineer.....	60.00	60.00
1 electrician.....	50.00	50.00
1 tenth engineer.....	50.00	50.00
1 winchman.....	27.50	27.50
1 storekeeper.....	26.25	26.25
4 Lg. firemen.....	25.00	100.00
1 chief steward.....	67.50	67.50
1 second steward.....	40.00	40.00
1 barkeeper.....	20.00	20.00
1 assistant barkeeper.....	15.00	15.00
1 storekeeper.....	30.00	30.00
1 barber.....	.25	.25
1 bedroom steward.....	20.00	20.00
1 saloon waiter.....	20.00	20.00
1 second saloon steward.....	25.00	25.00
1 steerage steward.....	25.00	25.00
1 printer.....	20.00	20.00
6 general servants.....	17.50	105.00
27 general servants.....	15.00	405.00
1 general servant.....	5.00	5.00
1 general servant.....	7.50	7.50
4 stewardesses.....	17.50	70.00
1 G. S.....	20.00	20.00
1 first-class pantryman.....	25.00	25.00
1 second-class pantryman.....	20.00	20.00

Wages paid on Orient Pacific Liner Orizaba, etc.—Continued.

	Rate per man per month.	Amount of pay per month.
1 chief cook.....	\$50.00	\$50.00
1 second cook.....	30.00	30.00
1 third cook.....	20.00	20.00
1 vegetable cook.....	15.00	15.00
1 scullion.....	15.00	15.00
1 steerage cook.....	25.00	25.00
1 assistant steerage cook.....	15.00	15.00
1 baker.....	45.00	45.00
1 second baker.....	25.00	25.00
1 third baker.....	15.00	15.00
1 butcher.....	30.00	30.00
1 assistant butcher.....	15.00	15.00
1 F. serang.....	12.96	12.96
1 first tindal.....	9.07	9.07
1 second tindal.....	8.42	8.42
1 third tindal.....	7.97	7.97
1 cassub.....	7.97	7.97
1 donkeyman.....	7.12	7.12
1 second donkeyman.....	7.12	7.12
6 greasers.....	6.48	38.88
36 firemen.....	5.50	198.00
1 C. T. serang.....	8.10	8.10
26 trimmers.....	3.86	100.36
2 bliandary.....	6.48	12.96
1 topass.....	4.53	4.53
Total per month.....		3,534.96
Total per annum.....		42,419.52

NOTE.—The above monthly pay roll is 45.9 per cent less than the monthly pay roll of the Oceanic Steamship Company's steamer *Sonoma*. Up to May 1, 1905, the mail subsidy paid by the British Government to the Orient Line was \$425,000 per annum. After that date a new contract was made giving \$600,000 per annum, the concessions made by the contractor being the employment of white crews only and a small increase in speed. The change from mixed crews to all white men will result in an estimated annual cost to the company of about \$120,000.

Comparison of wages—American Pacific Mail steamers—Cost of wages and maintenance with white crews and with present crews, part white and part Asiatic.

[Statement of Mr. R. P. Schwerin, vice-president and general manager Pacific Mail Steamship Company. Report of the Merchant Marine Commission, vol. 3, p. 1407.]

Steamer.	Actual cost per annum with present mixed crew of white men and Asiatics.		
	Wages.	Feeding.	Total.
China.....	\$38,106.24	\$12,410.00	\$50,516.24
Korea.....	61,032.36	20,140.00	81,172.36
Siberia.....	61,032.36	20,140.00	81,172.36
Mongolia.....	58,364.64	18,863.20	77,227.84
Manchuria.....	58,364.64	18,863.20	77,227.84
Total.....	276,900.24	90,416.40	367,316.64

Steamer.	Cost if white men were substituted for Asiatics.			Increased expense, white men.
	Wages.	Feeding.	Total.	
China.....	\$80,580.00	\$28,221.80	\$108,801.80	\$58,285.56
Korea.....	132,603.00	48,767.65	181,370.65	100,198.29
Siberia.....	132,603.00	48,767.65	181,370.65	100,198.29
Mongolia.....	120,903.00	45,230.65	166,133.65	88,905.81
Manchuria.....	120,903.00	45,230.65	166,133.65	88,905.81
Total.....	587,592.00	216,218.40	803,810.40	436,493.76

So much for that proposition. The most elaborate pains were taken to give to the country and to the House of Representatives the fullest possible information. But it was stated—and I now desire to go into that a little more in detail—that the operation of one of these great ships was a certain figure, which does not appear in the RECORD this morning, but I hope it will appear exactly as it was read yesterday, and then I will put into the RECORD the cost of running one of the North Atlantic 16-knot steamers on the proposed route from New York to Brazil; and the cost of the vessel is not \$600,000. No man can build a ship that can carry this contract for \$600,000 nor for less than twice that money. Why is it necessary to bring in padded figures to bewilder the listeners? I will read to you the statement and then I will read to you who makes the statement. It was handed to me by Admiral Bowles this morning. The cost of the vessel is \$1,200,000, and you can not build one of these ships that can carry this mail under this contract for less money than that. For the wages of officers and crew of 118 men, subsistence of crew, repairs, depreciation 5 per cent,

insurance, interest on investment, miscellaneous stores, and shore expenses, \$384,815. So that you have built your ship at an expense of \$1,200,000, and at the end of the year you have added \$384,815 more to the outlay of the owner of the ship.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. What is the tonnage of these ships? Mr. GROSVENOR. The tonnage must be not less than twelve to sixteen thousand tons.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is there anything in the bill that prescribes that?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is the old law. They are to be built under the existing law. Think of that. Here we are just ready to vote, and I am asked a question how these ships are to be built! The bill itself is the law of the land and has been ever since 1891.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I just asked you about the tonnage of it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It describes the size of the ship, it describes it must be built under the supervision of the Navy, it must be in condition to be turned into a war vessel, it must be built to carry four big guns—just such ships as the 20-knot ships now in the American Line. Two of those were built with a view to this identical statute, under which every one of these ships must be built. Now, then, this is a very curious way of computing. Here is a contract that will take, at least calculation, four ships, to be always fitted up and to be always ready to go, and when the gentleman wants to figure on it he takes the cost of one ship and the expense of running that ship one year, and then he puts down the subsidy for the mail contract and subtracts the cost of the ship and the cost of running it a year and says that the subsidy is too great, forgetting that he is figuring on one ship, while it will take not less than three and probably four to carry the contract.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am very much interested in what the gentleman said in reference to the old law. As I understood the gentleman, he said it provided for a 12,000-ton ship.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I say they will be that, but you can not get the speed without increasing the size of the ship.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The highest provided in the law was 8,000 tons and 20 knots.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; but they could not carry the mail at 16 knots an hour.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Those 16-knots-an-hour ships were only, to be of 5,000 tons.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The law is just where it stands, and my point is this: When you add to the speed of the ship, you have got to add to the construction of the ship, and we have no 16-knot ships except these four American liners between New York and Europe.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand the gentleman, and I do not want to misunderstand him. I understood from his answer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] that the ship the estimated cost of which he was giving there would be of 12,000 tons.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did—6,000 tons. I made an entire mistake from my own paper. It is 6,000 tons to a 16-knot ship. It is in the speed of the ship where the trouble comes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman—
The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I have not time enough to yield. As four vessels of this type is the lowest number which will make the required schedule of twenty-six round trips per year in the Brazil service, allowing each vessel seven round trips, the annual cost of operation of the line will be \$1,539,300. The proposed subvention of \$600,000 is 38 per cent, or a very moderate proportion of the fixed charges. The conservative operation of such a line, to insure the regularity of schedule exacted under penalty by the law of 1891, would require at least one additional vessel, or five in all, for this Brazil line.

For the Argentine line larger steamers of greater cost would be required, and at least two more steamers would be necessary, to maintain the same schedule—that is, they would have to have seven vessels in that line.

With due consideration to the additional distance of a thousand miles run on the outward voyage, the proposed subsidy of \$800,000 for this line is a less proportion than the above. These estimates are vouched for by the New York Shipbuilding Company, the Boston Steamship Company, the Maryland Steel Company, the Fore River Shipbuilding Company, and the Newport News Shipbuilding Company. Then I will put into my remarks the estimate of the tons of coal to run a 16-knot steamer. Fuel consumed at an average speed of 15 knots, 120 tons per day. I have personally been on a ship where the fuel reports of the consumption of coal showed 240 tons of coal per day, and that is the lowest estimate to drive a ship 20 knots. I will put

this in my remarks. Then I will put in prices of the cost of coal, and you will find that there has not been an estimate made on this floor—though it had been sanctioned by whom I care not—that did not misrepresent the facts by more than 50 per cent of the actual cost of construction and maintenance. Now then, it has been said that there is necessity for only one line to South America. I never traveled over that route, but I have been furnished with some calculations. It seems to be necessary to explain that ocean steamers of the first class do not run on wheels. The subsidy is not for the purpose of constructing a line of double track to Rio and extend it to Buenos Ayres, but it is for the purpose of the construction and operation of a group of steamers running from New York, first, with passengers and freight for the ports of Bahia, Pernambuco, and Rio, and returning from Rio loaded with freight for American ports. Second, a group of steamers running from New York to Argentina with passengers and freight to that section of South America and returning loaded with the freight and products of that country for ports in the United States. No one line can efficiently serve both purposes. These separate lines are intended to serve large areas of productive country, the centers of which are a thousand miles apart. Now, that answers the whole of this proposition.

In the great subsidy bill passed by the House of Representatives in the Fifty-first Congress, for which so many gentlemen who are now opposing this bill voted so earnestly and so often, there was no such limitation of speed put into that bill as we are putting into this one. Now, it is said—and I only refer to these things to show what an accumulation of misinformation we have had—you could take the Ward Line, which is an American line, and carry this mail to South America with the Ward Line ships, and that a Ward liner, the *Morro Castle*, and others are available for the new route to South America. It is both absurd and impossible, because the fastest of these ships mentioned are under contract with the Government under five and ten year contracts, under the law of 1891, to carry the United States mail to Cuba and Mexico.

One of their contracts runs to 1912. These ships were built for that trade and they are adapted to that trade and they are needed in that trade. They could not be diverted to South America without destroying the Cuban and Mexican commerce of the Ward Line and without violating formal contracts with the Government for which penalties are imposed. As to two of these ships named in the piece read yesterday, they are only 14-knot steamers, while 16-knot steamers are expressly required under the operation of this bill. As to the vessels mentioned as under construction in the Morse Company, now let us see what pabulum we have been fed on. It was said there were some ships being built by the Morse Company that could be well taken right up and put in the South American trade to carry these mails down to the stormy ocean, to the stormy gulf, and deliver our mails at 16 knots an hour. Here are the ships, from Long Island Sound and New England, coast passenger steamships, high sided, of shallow draft, and almost as unfit as Mississippi River steamboats for the long routes to South America. They were not even remotely intended for long voyages at sea, but were designed to leave port at night and get to their destination the next morning. Not one of them could steam out to Brazil without burning her cabin and upholstery for fuel. Eight hundred thousand dollars for a line to Argentina and \$600,000 for a line to Brazil may seem very large, but the British Royal Mail to the West Indies, Brazil, and Argentina required for its establishment years ago with small, slow steamers, scarcely half the size of those proposed in this bill, a subsidy of \$1,350,000 a year. The German line of steamers established a few years ago to the East Indies by way of the Suez Canal is composed of small and less expensive steamers than those proposed in this bill, and has a subsidy for fortnightly service of one million three hundred and thirty thousand a year, and for four years has earned no dividend whatever. The British and German ships cost less to construct and less to maintain than do American ships. The opinion expressed by practical shipowners since this bill was framed is that these subventions are sufficient, but no more than sufficient, to create fast lines of 16-knot steamers to South America. Both of the steamers on subsidized lines from Europe to South America are of less than 16 knots. The requirements of this bill on American shipowners, therefore, are very severe.

Now, it has been said on this floor—and I know the source from which it has come—that Germany does not subsidize the Hamburg-American Line. No more misleading statement than that can be made by any living man. Not only is the mail pay of the Hamburg-American Line greater than the pay of any other line running out of Germany, but the Hamburg-American line has a contract with the German Government by which the

German Government reduces the railroad charges to the emigrant and it goes as a subsidy to the Hamburg-American Steamship Line, and out of that source of revenue comes one of the most opulent of their profits. And the Government of Germany would no more permit one pound of her freight or one head of her passengers to be carried upon any ship other than a German-made ship than she would commit any other breach of duty that she claims to owe to her citizens.

Now, then, here is a very simple matter. A gentleman the other day read, or had read from the Clerk's desk, a leading editorial article from a New York paper opposing American ships, as several of them do, and advocating practically the turning over of the business of the country to foreign ships. I hold in my hand a page of that paper. Gentlemen will see some green checks over the advertisements. That entire speech is covered with the advertisements of ocean mail steamship companies and two or three coast-line companies. There is on that page, as permanent matter, the advertisements of seventy-four foreign steamships. How many American do you think? Thirteen; and two-thirds of those are coastwise. Now, certainly I do not claim that any great newspaper in the United States is ever actuated in any of its editorial performances by any money that they can make out of their position, but I will undertake to say that if this newspaper will stand for this bill and publish the arguments in favor of it it would lose a gold mine inside of fifteen hours after the first publication. If ever there was a lobby determined and persistent, hedging up and shutting up and closing up the avenues of information to the American people in favor of any measure or against any measure, we have had that to contend with in the case of this attempt to carry into execution the purpose of this bill. Not an hour of this session of Congress has been without their presence. The London Times correspondent has sent to his paper, and the clippings have come back to me, the most ardent wishes against the passage of this bill, and I put into the Record the day before yesterday, as a part of my speech, the declaration made in the London Times that it was the foreign steamship companies in this country to whom they were indebted for the defeat of the bill at the last session of Congress. There has not been one day during the last few months that this agent of a London newspaper has not sought for information to show to the people across the water that there was no danger that the American people would rise to their duty and do anything upon the subject of this subsidy bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have presented this question fairly and fully to the House of Representatives. Let us state what it is. Let us state now, briefly and tersely and to the point, what this is all about. We adopted a system a great many years ago of paying a given amount of money in a round sum per annum to carry our mails into the foreign countries of the world. I said the other day that it was a Democratic proposition originally, and somebody on the other side of this House said that I said this was a Democratic measure.

I said nothing of the kind. I said that the idea, the principle, that we were carrying out in this bill was inaugurated by the Democratic party, and down to the Fifty-first Congress, when my friend from Ohio and I stood together and voted for one real ship-subsidy bill, the Democratic party had never made opposition in any form to the original purpose that was inaugurated in 1891 in the postal-service bill. We were not satisfied, and so there was passed in the Senate a thoroughbred, real ship-subsidy bill, a bill that gave subsidies upon the cargo; and a very large number of Republicans in this House stood for it. It was on that occasion, on that bill, that the Speaker of the House now, then a Member of the House, made the speech that was read by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES]; and he opposed the bill at that time upon special and distinct grounds that he stated; but in the end—and the gentleman did not do justice to the Speaker's position—when an amendment was put in the bill that changed its character very materially, the Speaker voted for the bill and I voted against it. I had voted for the bill at every stage in roll call after roll call as long as the semblance of the Senate bill was maintained; and when it was destroyed, as I thought, I voted against it. I made a very great mistake in judgment in doing so, for even had the bill passed in its emasculated form it would have developed to something of extreme value to the people of the United States. So that I congratulate any present Member of the House who was a Member of that House and voted for the bill that he was nearer right than I was. Then this is to carry out a line of policy of this Government which does not differ from this in principle. Supposing now that we were paying a subsidy—and as we are—to the American ships that carry our mail to Liverpool and we pass a bill providing that those ships should go—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired for general debate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I had thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly I have not occupied thirty minutes. I began at 10 minutes to 2 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman began at 20 minutes to 2.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that he began at 20 minutes to 2. The clock here indicates that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That clock does not run very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate began at 10 minutes after 1 in the general debate, there being one hour left. Before the Clerk reports the bill the Chair, with the indulgence of the committee, will state that the proposition before the House is an amendment in the form of a substitute to Senate bill 529, and the Chair will treat it as one paragraph, to be read through entirely before amendments are offered.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that the whole substitute shall be read before amendments are offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would modify that by stating that the whole of the first section will be read. There are a large number of paragraphs in the first section, and the entire section will be treated as one paragraph.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Is it to be understood, Mr. Chairman, that there is not to be an opportunity to move to strike out one of those separate paragraphs, such as 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5?

The CHAIRMAN. After the reading of the first section is concluded, gentlemen will be recognized to offer amendments to any part of the section.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. To any part, as if offered at the time of reading?

The CHAIRMAN. As if offered at the time of reading. All bills except revenue and appropriation bills are read by sections. The Chair will state, although it may not be necessary, that as this is a substitute amendment, only one amendment can be pending at a time. An amendment to an amendment offered here would be out of order as an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read an article from the American Federationist for March, as a supplement to my speech of Tuesday last, and to have the same printed in the Record:

SHIP SUBSIDY—THE CHARLATANISM OF ITS "PROMOTERS."

In the January issue of the American Federationist we published an article in which was exposed some of the deception, forgery, and bribery as part of the methods of the "promoters" of ship-subsidy legislation. The exposure was so complete that it rather staggered the "promoters" and their hangers-on. In desperation the spokesman of the "promoters," Alexander R. Smith, of Cleveland (he who figured so conspicuously and unenviably in the exposé), issued a circular, which he sent to every Member of Congress. It was a labored effort to explain how he was caught in his scheme of meddling in the affairs of organized labor, trying to place it in a false position, and how he managed to play upon the weakness of an uninformed man. The circular then proceeds, by indirection, to declare that the American Federation of Labor and its representatives, and particularly its president, have not the interests of labor at heart.

Measuring men by his own standard, Mr. Smith, who never manifested activity in any public matter unless he was sure as to what there was in it for himself, insinuates that labor and its representatives are prompted by the same motives in regard to ship-subsidy legislation. Congressmen generally, and particularly those who have had some experience with Mr. Smith's former exploits, as well as his activity in the ship-subsidy promotion scheme, wholly disregarded his circular. Others, unacquainted with his tactics, desired information from the American Federation of Labor. Among the latter was the Hon. THOMAS SPIGHT, and to whose request a response was made. The letter is sufficiently comprehensive and important to warrant its publication, and we therefore print it here. It is as follows:

"HEADQUARTERS AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1907.

"HON. THOMAS SPIGHT,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter to Mr. Arthur E. Holder, a member of our legislative committee, in which you inclosed copy of a circular issued by Mr. A. R. Smith, of the Merchant Marine League—in other words, one of the chief promoters of the ship-subsidy bill—was, as you requested, turned over to me. You desire an expression of opinion from me on the matters referred to in Mr. Smith's circular.

"You will, of course, note that Mr. Smith throughout the circular refers to the opposition of labor to the ship-subsidy bill as Samuel Gompers and his organization. The very spirit of that designation is unquestionably intended to belittle the intelligence of the men composing the great trade-union movement of the country, which constitutes the American Federation of Labor, and also is intended to convey the notion that, regardless of the wishes or the interests of the men of labor, my personal prejudices or interests dominate the whole labor movement. I refer to this simply to call attention to the petty methods which Mr. Smith employs to cast odium upon the oft-repeated declarations of the rank and file of the organized wage-earners of our country.

"No one who knows the attitude of labor and how that attitude

is ascertained; no one who has any knowledge of the efforts which I have endeavored to put forth in the interests of the working people and of all the people of our country, would for a moment give credence to any statement made by Mr. Smith which in any way reflects upon the labor movement or the cause which it represents, or myself, either personally or officially.

"Take Mr. Smith's own version of his negotiations with Mr. Weeks and it is quite clear then that he took advantage of the weakness of a poor and uninformed man. However, the affidavit voluntarily made by Mr. Weeks shows clearly that Mr. Smith wantonly undertook to suborn him, and that he (Mr. Smith) falsely made it appear that the organization of the Marine Trades Council of New York authorized the issuance of appeals to the labor organizations of America, when, as a matter of fact, no such authority was either asked or given; that a counterfeit letter head of the Marine Trades Council was made at the instance of Mr. Smith; that a new motto which he invented was placed on the head of the counterfeit letter head; that the name of Mr. Weeks was put to documents without his consent or the consent of the Marine Trades Council, from which body the appeal was supposed to have emanated.

"We are not wholly dependent upon the statement of Mr. Weeks, but it is corroborated by the voluntary affidavit of Mr. Story in the district attorney's office of the city of New York.

"As a matter of fact, the whole transaction is of a character which Mr. Alexander R. Smith is well known to have practiced on previous occasions.

"A little more than eight years ago, when Mr. Smith could neither persuade, cajole, nor bring his other 'peculiar' influences to force me into line to help ship-subsidy legislation, he left my office uttering threats as to what he would do. What he did do was to bring a lobby to the convention of the American Federation of Labor for the double purpose of having the convention change its attitude and declare for ship subsidy, and to punish me. Just before that convention I met with a serious railroad accident, and could only attend the convention for less than a half hour of the ten days' session; yet the convention rejected, with but one dissenting vote, the proposition to indorse ship subsidy, the author of the resolution being the only one who voted for it.

"It is one of the adroit tricks of those who have a bad case to abuse and asperse the motives of anyone who differs from them. It is a favorite trick of those who are antagonistic to the labor organizations to say, among other things, that it is foreign in origin and has no place in our country, forgetting, or trying to hide the fact, that like causes produce like results, and that the industrial conditions of our country naturally produce the great organizations of labor here.

"Organized labor of America favors the building of ships to the fullest in the United States. It believes in the fullest extension and development of our industrial resources. We have urged the passage of a bill to prevent the wholesale towing of unfit or undermanned vessels. The passage of such a bill would compel the building of an immense number of vessels properly manned and which would possess their own propelling power. What has Mr. Smith, or any of those who favor ship subsidy, said in the interest of such a bill? They have allowed it to remain in committee and have never uttered a word but in opposition to it.

"American workmen, I repeat, favor the building of American ships to carry American passengers and American commerce to any part of the world, but they do not believe that a subsidy is necessary to accomplish that purpose. They believe that the principle involved in the proposition of subsidy is vicious and contrary to American principles.

"The insinuation contained in Mr. Smith's circular that either other representatives of the American Federation of Labor or I are working in the interest of foreign shipbuilders in foreign countries is a malicious, false, and contemptible utterance. While I am not authorized to speak for any other men in the labor movement, yet I am confident they have never, and, so far as I am concerned, I am positive I have never, had any conference or communication, directly or indirectly, with any foreign shipbuilders, shipowners of foreign countries, by representatives or otherwise, upon any subject remotely referring to the question under consideration, or, for that matter, to any other question.

"Then, again, letters which organizations have sent favorable to the passage of the ship-subsidy bill were sent under the false impression that they were aiding a measure which was asked by organized labor of the country, and they were wholly unconscious that the circular was issued under a forged signature, upon a counterfeit letter head, and without authority or consent from the organization from which it purported to emanate, and that it avoided the mention of one of the particular features of the ship-subsidy bill (the conscription provision) to which labor is particularly opposed.

"Your attention is called to Senate bill 529, of the Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, Report No. 6442, upon that bill. Together with other representatives of labor, I had occasion to appear before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on several occasions, conveying labor's protest against the passage of the so-called 'ship-subsidy bill,' particularly upon the ground that it contained provisions which made conscription (compulsory naval service of seamen) a condition precedent to their employment on privately owned vessels.

"In discussing that bill, it may be necessary to call attention to the fact that the advocates of the bill questioned the accuracy of our contention on this latter point, and asserted that the naval service required is of a voluntary character.

"It is true that the language employed in the bill gives the superficial appearance that such service, if undertaken, would be voluntary; but upon an examination of the language and its practical application, there is no escape from the conclusion that it means, and is intended to mean, compulsory naval service in time of peace or war as a condition upon which seamen can find employment in privately owned vessels; in other words, that seamen would be required to sign articles enlisting in the naval reserve before they would be permitted to earn their own livelihood and to support those dependent upon them.

"For your information I quote the provisions of the bill bearing upon this subject. The bill is known as "Senate 529 of the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress." The provisions referred to are as follows:

"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 fisheries of the United States, including the coastwise trade of the Atlantic and Pacific and the Great Lakes, 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. * * * 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. They shall also possess such qualifications, receive such instructions, and be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

"A vessel shall not be entitled to the subvention (subsidy) above provided for unless, during the period of employment in the foreign 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."

"The bill then proceeds to prescribe the continual increased proportion of the constantly increased number of those seamen employed in privately owned vessels who shall have been enrolled in the naval reserve."

"It will be observed that the bill provides that enrollment of seamen is compulsory; that it prescribes that they shall be enrolled for a period of four years, compelled to render service in time of war, and subject, in times of peace, to the instructions and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy. And, further, that the vessels can not receive the subsidy unless there is a constantly increased number of seamen who shall have been enrolled in the naval service. It is not difficult to understand that if the owners of vessels can only receive the subsidy upon the condition that their seamen shall have enrolled themselves in the naval service, that these owners will insist upon their seamen signing the articles of enlistment in order that they may be employed."

"The theory, declared the American Federation of Labor at its last convention, upon which the bill is drawn and the reasons given by its advocates are that we have not the vessels needed as auxiliaries to the Navy and not all the men needed to man the Navy in time of war. Accepting these contentions as facts, it is contended therefore that the cost of building a vessel in an American shipyard and the cost of sailing a vessel under the American flag in the foreign trade is so much higher than that under other flags that a subsidy is necessary. It is further contended that with an adequate subsidy we shall have more vessels, and having more vessels, we shall have all the native or naturalized seamen needed."

"That we have not now the necessary number of native or naturalized seamen needed for the merchant marine and the Navy is a fact not disputed; it is patent to all who are at all acquainted with maritime conditions. The American boy is not seeking the sea as a means of livelihood, and the American man at sea is seeking and finding more agreeable and more remunerative employment on shore."

"There is employed at present, according to the census, about 120,000 men as seamen or deep-sea fishermen under our flag, and among the seamen from 10 to 15 per cent are either natives or naturalized; the rest are men owing allegiance to other flags and not subject to draft upon order of the President."

"If the seamen and fishermen employed in our fisheries and our coastwise and lake trades were either native or naturalized Americans, the number of men necessary for the Navy could at any time be obtained. The difficulty, therefore, lies not so much in the number of men as in the number of men available, and the primary cause is that for some reasons the American does not seek the sea or remain there. If the American does not seek the coastwise trade, where there is no competition with the foreign vessels, and small wages and onerous conditions are not caused thereby or an excuse therefor, there seems to be no reason why he should seek employment in the foreign trade, where the shipowner has the reason of competition for the wages and conditions which he imposes upon the seamen. The American ceased to go to sea because he could do better on shore than he possibly could at sea, where, no matter what his industry and thrift, he could not and can not earn sufficient upon which to keep a family."

"As to the cost of operating a vessel under the American flag, the contention that American vessels in the foreign trade provide better quarters, more and better food, that they carry more men and pay more wages than vessels under other flags, is not based upon facts. When the steamers *Paris* and *New York* were placed under the American flag, the number of firemen and coal passers and of able and ordinary seamen was reduced."

"The wages of sailors and marine firemen depend upon the port in which they are engaged and the voyage they are about to make, and not at all upon the flag under which the vessel sails; and our law, enacted in 1884, gave to the shipowner the right to hire his crew in a foreign port, bring them to the United States and back to a foreign port without reshipping them in the United States. This puts him on an absolute equality as to wages, exclusive of officers, with any country with which he trades. He pays English wages if he trades with England, French wages if he trades with France, and Chinese wages if he trades with China; the law gives him this privilege, and he avails himself of it to the fullest extent."

"The other costs of operating a vessel are coal, lubricating oils, and provisions; like other vessels, he buys it where it is cheapest. If it be a sailing vessel, it consists in spars, canvas, ropes, and blocks, and these things we furnish to other nations to a very large extent."

"Since the organization of our Government no industry has been as well cared for through absolute authority over the men employed therein, through immunities granted and special privileges conferred, as has been the merchant marine. By law enacted in 1790 the seaman was made the property of the vessel upon which he served. If he sought to withdraw himself from the servitude of his master, he could be and he was arrested, put in prison, there to remain until called for by such master. If he succeeded in escaping from his service and his master, he could be and he was pursued from State to State, or from one country into another, forcibly returned to his master, and compelled to continue the labor on pain of imprisonment. When involuntary servitude was taken off the negro by war and the thirteenth amendment and the statutes revised accordingly, the vessel's ownership of the seaman remained undisturbed. Conditions as to quarters on board, food, and working hours were by Congress left at the discretion of the owner. Some improvements have been made, but the seaman's status yet remains that of a serf or a peon. He is still compelled to live in a place 6 feet long, 6 feet high, and 2 feet wide. In this place he has to eat, to live, and to sleep, when off duty. It has been described as too large for a coffin and not large enough for a grave. He is still compelled to sign away in the foreign trade a certain sum of the wages to be earned in order to obtain employment. He must obey any order from the master or any other officer or go to prison. But if crippled for life by injury thereby received, he has no remedy. He must in obtaining employment compete with the unskilled and destitute, not only in this country, but from all nations and races. The vessels are un-

dermanned, both as to skill and number, and the shipowner is resisting every improvement by every means within his power."

"In the meantime the shipowners have been relieved of risks arising from acts of God or dangers of the sea through a system of insurance; arising from piracy through the present imperfect policing of the seas; from those arising from popular local disturbances through damages paid by such localities or States; of liabilities to the shipper, passenger, or seaman through limited liability laws and judicial decisions; of taxes on floating property by several States; of fees to be paid for the enforcement of navigation laws, except in some unimportant instances; of care and cure of sick seamen, cost of which is now borne by the Public Treasury, and the burial of dead seamen, who are handed over to the coroner and then buried by the community; of the duty to carry a certain number of citizens in the crew of the vessel; of the duty of training men for the sea service now done by foreigners or in training ships at public expense. In addition to this he may carry as many or as few men as he pleases, with such skill or lack of skill as he chooses; he may carry as much cargo on deck and load his vessel to any depth that he thinks profitable. There are no laws or regulations on these subjects."

"He may hire and, in a foreign port in the foreign trade, by assistance of the police, keep the cheapest men that can be found in any part of the world."

"Under our coastwise navigation laws he has an absolute monopoly of all trade from one American port to another."

"Under the act of 1892 he may make contracts to carry the mail, through which he receives more pay for this service than he pays in wages to every man and boy employed on his vessel as a seaman in any capacity."

"Having been relieved of risks and liabilities, and having been given immunities as have been herein mentioned, and having driven the American from the sea, thereby weakening our Navy, and now employing and thereby training foreigners and men of alien and antagonistic races, making them ready to be employed by other navies, he insists upon continuing these conditions, while he urges Congress to further tax the whole American people to help him carry on his private business."

"The convention then reiterated its condemnation of any such legislation, and especially against this bill with its un-American provision for conscription."

"In passing, it may not be amiss to say that the workmen of our country, the organized workmen, are no less patriotic than any of our citizens in other walks of life. In all the great events and vicissitudes, when the honor, the interests, and the safety of our country have been at stake none more promptly, zealously, and patriotically enlisted and offered their services and lives under the flag of the Republic than did the men of labor. We have lost none of our love for and devotion to our country. The past is but a presage of what the toilers of America will do should the necessity ever arise, but we can not refrain from entering an emphatic protest against an attempt to subvert a principle of civilized government, and particularly republican institutions, by a system of conscription and compulsory military or naval service, especially in times of peace, even if conscription and compulsory service are hidden disingenuously behind the subterfuge that they are voluntary."

"You will please note the substitute for Senate bill 529, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, that section 3 in its entirety is a practical restatement of the provisions of the compulsory naval-service feature of the original bill. Every organization in the boiler making, shipbuilding, and kindred trades has gone on record deliberately and repeatedly as opposed to ship-subsidy legislation. Mr. Smith in his circular quotes a so-called 'United Boiler Makers' Association.' You should know that this so-called 'united boiler makers' is composed of a few locals of the Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-Ship Builders of America, which seceded from the parent organization upon an entirely different subject and in no way related to the ship-subsidy proposition. It forms but a very insignificant part of the trade in the United States. It assumed this position simply as a matter of pique and antagonism because of the other differences which exist."

"I should be glad to submit to you originals and copies of the correspondence which passed between Mr. Smith and Mr. William J. Gilthorpe, secretary-treasurer of the Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-Ship Builders of America, in which it is clearly shown that the efforts of Mr. Smith, acting for the promoters of ship subsidy, in trying to suborn Mr. Gilthorpe and induce him to follow just such a course and practice with his organization were the same as he (Mr. Smith) used in his scheme to suborn Mr. Weeks."

"It may not be uninteresting for you to know that there is not a promoter of ship-subsidy legislation but who has antagonized in Congress every bill of a tangible character which might favorably affect the interests of the working people of our country—the eight-hour bill, the bill to regulate and limit the abuse of the issuance of injunctions, the bill to accord to seamen the right of ownership in themselves, and all other measures for which labor has asked at the hands of Congress."

"There are other additional interesting matters in connection with this subject which I hope for the opportunity to present to you for your consideration, but this letter is already too long to attempt of its incorporation here."

"Very truly, yours,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,

"President American Federation of Labor."

In the first session of the present Congress the ship-subsidy "promoters" brought a body of half dozen "labor" men to Washington, who, without authority, and, in fact, against the distinct declarations of their organizations, made a pretense that they were voicing the sentiments of labor when they hypocritically asked for ship subsidy "in the interest of labor." These "labor" men were and are well known to be out of touch and sympathy—and some out of membership—with organized labor. While in Washington at the time, they were seen and heard wrangling as to the money consideration they received from the ship-subsidy "promoters" for their dirty part in the dirty business."

It seems to be the part assigned by the "promoters" to Mr. Alexander R. Smith to seek out some poor, weak-kneed men in the labor movement to cajole, flatter, or hoodwink them; if these fail, to suborn or bribe them. In our efforts to advocate, protect, and further the interests of the toiling millions of our country we have at times run counter to these men, and in every instance the origin of their having "gone wrong" was immediately traceable to the ship-subsidy "promoters," of which Alexander R. Smith is the conspicuous figure."

We can find no more fitting description of the work and methods of the men engaged in the effort to fasten ship subsidy, and particularly conscription, upon the people than our opening characterization of them in the January article in the American Federationist: "In all our

country there is not a more corrupt gang than the well-known coterie who are engaged in the scheme to 'promote' ship-subsidy legislation." We commend to ship-subsidy "promoters" the well-known, but oft despised, couplet:

"What a tangled web we weave,
When first we practice to deceive!"

The Clerk read as follows:

That the act entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce," approved March 3, 1891, be, and hereby is, amended by adding thereto the following section:

"Sec. 10. That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts for a term of ten years, with citizens of the United States, for the carrying of mails on steamships hereafter built in the United States and registered in the United States, or now duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens any corporation created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof, a majority of the stock of which shall be and shall continue to be owned by citizens of the United States), between ports of the United States and ports on the routes and for the amounts hereinafter prescribed.

"First. From a port or ports of the Atlantic coast of the United States to Brazil, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$300,000 a year, or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$600,000 a year.

"Second. From a port or ports of the Atlantic coast of the United States to Argentina, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a monthly service at a monthly compensation not exceeding \$400,000 a year, or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$800,000 a year: *Provided*, That a vessel receiving compensation for mail service pursuant to contract on a voyage on this route shall not also receive compensation for mail service pursuant to contract on said voyage on the first route as described above.

"Third. From a port or ports of the United States on the Gulf of Mexico to the Isthmus of Panama, on steamships of the United States of not less than 14 knots speed, for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$75,000 a year, or for a weekly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$150,000 a year.

"Fourth. From a port or ports of the Pacific coast of the United States to the Isthmus of Panama, Peru, and Chile, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$300,000 a year, or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$600,000 a year.

"Fifth. From a port or ports on the Pacific coast of the United States via Hawaii to Japan, China, and the Philippines on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$350,000 a year or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$700,000 a year.

"Sixth. From a port or ports on the Pacific coast of the United States north of Cape Mendocino to Japan, China, and the Philippines on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$350,000 a year or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$700,000 a year.

"Seventh. From a port or ports of the Pacific coast of the United States via Hawaii and the Samoan Islands to Australasia, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed for a service once in three weeks at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$200,000 a year, in addition to the compensation now provided pursuant to contract under this said act of March 3, 1891: *Provided*, That the requirements of this section as to the rates of speed shall be deemed to be complied with if said rates are developed during a trial of four hours continuous steaming at sea in ordinary weather in water of sufficient depth to make the test a fair and just one and if the vessels are maintained in a condition to develop such speed at any time while at sea in ordinary weather. This trial shall be made under the direction and supervision of a board of naval officers which the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint upon the application of the owner or owners of the vessel to be tested: *And provided further*, That all the provisions of the first nine sections of this act are hereby made applicable in all respects to the services provided for in this section: *Provided, however*, That the specific rates of compensation described in section 5 of this act shall not apply to the services provided for in this section, and that all ordinary repair or overhauling of a steamship employed and paid for carrying mails under this section shall be made in the United States, except in cases where drydocking is necessary and no American dry dock of sufficient capacity shall be within a distance of 500 miles of the location of said ship when the repairs shall be needed."

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, in line 11, on page 16, the following:

"From a port or ports of the United States on the Gulf of Mexico to Brazil, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a monthly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$300,000 a year, or for a fortnightly service at a maximum compensation not exceeding \$600,000 a year."

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, the bill, as originally proposed, contemplated two lines from some port or ports on the Atlantic coast to the east coast of South America—one line to Brazil and one line to Argentina.

The purpose of the amendment I have offered is to give an additional line of communication between a port on the Gulf and Brazil. It has developed clearly here that a very substantial business is now going on and can be greatly promoted from some port on the Gulf to South America. To-day a very large tonnage, particularly of coffee, comes from Brazil to New Orleans. Moreover, it will give opportunity for the promotion of our commerce with South America, and enable the products of

the great Mississippi Valley and the manufactures of the Central West to reach, in the cheapest way, the ports of South America. The two lines from the Atlantic coast provided for, with a fortnightly service, would give from the Atlantic ports to Rio Janeiro a weekly service, each one of those lines being proposed for fortnightly service, and no doubt the Postmaster-General, in his submission of proposals, would demand that those lines so arrange their time of departure that one vessel would leave the Atlantic coast each week for Brazil, of course with a continuation as far as Argentina and Uruguay every other trip.

Now, this connection of a line from a Gulf port will add a further fortnightly service to Rio Janeiro, where again the cargoes are transhipped on the fortnightly leaving ships for the more distant southern ports.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman believe that if this amendment which he now proposes is adopted one of the lines from New York could be abandoned, leaving one line simply from New York, by way of Rio Janeiro to Buenos Ayres.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman's proposition is that if we establish this line from the outlet of the Mississippi Valley, from a Gulf port to Brazil, we could omit from the bill the provision for one of the lines from Atlantic coast ports to South America. I should very much regret to see that done. Of course, if in the judgment of the committee you want to keep this matter down to the lowest possible expenditure, that would be one phase of it; but if we are seeking here to do what we believe to be most necessary for the interests of the United States in the development of commerce with South America, it should be remembered that the greater part of the demand for our manufactures and the greater part of our commerce with South America will be on the east coast, and I think we could well provide for three lines running from our ports.

Mr. BIRDSALL. Why not provide that this line shall also touch in Central America?

Mr. LITTAUER. Right on that point, I want to say that all of these lines run from some given port to some other given port. There is nothing, however, that precludes their stopping on the way. There is no reason at all why the line running from the Gulf port to Panama should not stop at Honduras.

Mr. BIRDSALL. I agree with the gentleman perfectly, but the question is whether the Postmaster-General would require it under this provision.

Mr. LITTAUER. The Postmaster-General can require it, and then another thing, these mail subsidies are not given to pay all the expenses of the conduct of these lines. They must be made profitable by the carriage of passengers and freight, and surely the opportunity of getting more freight from an intermediate port will not be neglected by the line.

Mr. BIRDSALL. I believe that the Gulf line ought to touch at a Central American port.

Mr. LITTAUER. I believe it will, but what port would the gentleman suggest? If we attempt to suggest a particular port by legislation, I think we will make a mistake.

Mr. BIRDSALL. The point in my mind was that the amendment ought to say that it should touch at some Central American port.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes this a better bill, or nearer to a constitutional bill from my standpoint, than the bill would be without it. It increases the number of ports from which these subsidized vessels are to go in carrying our commerce from this country and coming back into those ports in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another, nor shall vessels bound to or from one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

This constitutional question was discussed in February, 1879, by one of our great lawyers and statesmen, and at that time, of course, a Member of this House, John Randolph Tucker. He took the position that a similar provision in the then pending bill to the one now offered and various other propositions was giving preference to one port over those of another, and was clearly in the face of this constitutional provision. He spoke to the amendment that provided for a subsidy to a ship running from New York to a port in his own State, Virginia. With the kind indulgence of the House, I shall read the words of that great man:

Now, I am for privileges to none and equal justice to all. The proposition is to grant this aid or subsidy for a steam line between New York via the city of Norfolk, in my own State of Virginia, to Brazil; and a steam line from New Orleans via Galveston to Brazil. This is giving a preference to the ports of one State over the ports of another

State, which are in competition in the matter of commerce with foreign countries. The Constitution inhibits any preference given to the ports of one State over another by any regulation of commerce. I therefore am bound, even if this was a subsidy to my own loved Commonwealth of Virginia alone, to vote against it, because I am bound to support the Constitution of the United States. I therefore shall vote against it, although there is a bait to me as a Virginian, for there is to be a steam line to go from New York to Brazil by way of Norfolk.

Now, sir, it is not only this, but as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Baker] has shown from a description of the character of vessel that is to carry the mails, it is for John Roach, and John Roach alone. It is a contract for ten years to give a privilege to John Roach over all the other citizens of this country in the carrying trade between the United States and Brazil. I can not vote for it, therefore, because it gives preference to one State over another and because it gives preference to one citizen of the United States over all the other forty-eight millions of citizens. For these reasons I shall vote against these propositions.

I do not know what became of that bill; I think it was finally defeated. And now we have in this bill the exact proposition. I do not find in the debates on this bill in 1879 anywhere—and I have run through them in the House—where any man in the House disputed Mr. Tucker's proposition of law. Here is a proposition in this bill to subsidize ships going away from certain ports in the United States to other ports, *not all*, in the United States. It gives preference over ships that go to those ports; it gives preference over the commerce that goes to those ports; it gives especial privileges to those ports and to the commerce that goes thereto and the ships that are regulated by this subsidy.

It seems to me it is a very plain proposition that we are making fish of one and fowl of another unless we subsidize all the vessels from all the ports of the United States. Under the authority I have quoted, under the words of the Constitution, we are flying into the face of the Constitution, which prohibits these invidious distinctions and preferences to some over other ports.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment. I have prepared an amendment which accomplishes practically the same result. If the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] carries, there will be two lines running from the Atlantic seaboard to South America—one to Brazil and another to Argentina.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I should like to see adopted and the amendment of the gentleman from New York voted down. Should that be done, we will have only one line on the Atlantic seaboard running to Argentina, with stops at Brazil or Rio Janeiro, and another line running from the Gulf of Mexico to Brazil.

When we come to examine our trade relations with those countries we find that practically all of our exports to Argentina are manufactured products. That is natural in view of the fact that Argentina has the same climatic conditions as the United States. Practically all of our exports to Brazil are food products. We ship some manufactured products also, but the great percentage of exports to Brazil are food products.

The natural outlet from the United States for our food products is to the Gulf. I believe that two lines to South America are ample. If this amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] should be voted down and mine should then be adopted, this bill would add to the amount of mail subsidies that are now provided \$1,443,000, making a total of \$5,250,000 a year. That compares well with the subsidies paid by the most progressive countries of the world.

Mr. LITTAUER. How does the gentleman get at the \$5,250,000?

Mr. POLLARD. We already pay \$1,500,000 a year under the act of 1891, and the present bill carries \$3,750,000, making a total of \$5,250,000, or thereabouts. That, as I say, will place the United States on a comparatively equal footing with the most progressive countries of the world. England pays in mail subsidies \$6,000,000 annually. France pays \$5,000,000 in mail subsidies and three and a half million in tonnage subsidies. The most progressive nations of the world to-day are only paying subsidies for fast-mail service, no subventions being paid on tonnage subsidies other than by France; and it seems to me that all that is needed at this time is for the United States to stand shoulder to shoulder or in the same rank with Great Britain in the matter, and we will do that if we carry no more than is now contained in the bill. Consequently I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York will not prevail.

Mr. PAYNE. Would it not answer the same purpose that the gentleman has in view, if the amendment of my colleague should be adopted, by moving afterwards to amend by striking out one of these other lines? If the House would agree to that, it would accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. POLLARD. It would accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not mean to intimate that I am for that later motion, but that would leave the parliamentary situation the same in the thing to be accomplished; so that the better way, it seems to me, would be to adopt my colleague's amend-

ment, and then the gentleman would be in order to move to strike out one of these lines.

Mr. LITTAUER. As I understand the gentleman's proposition, it is preferable to have a line to Brazil running from a Gulf port than from the Atlantic coast proper?

Mr. POLLARD. Yes.

Mr. LITTAUER. If my amendment should be adopted, then the gentleman may offer an amendment striking out that part of the amendment as amended.

Mr. POLLARD. That will be all right. I am content with that action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Let us have the amendment again reported.

There was no objection; and the amendment was again reported.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, before beginning to speak to this amendment I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman want to speak to this amendment?

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall speak partially to the amendment. My request, however, I do not care to have granted upon condition. I have not yet spoken to the bill, and if the gentleman from Ohio desires to object, I hope he will exercise that privilege without attempting to put conditions upon my speaking.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is withdrawn, and the gentleman is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this amendment, and when I shall have voted for the amendment, if it is incorporated in the bill and the bill comes before the House, I shall take great pleasure in voting against the entire bill. I do that because I believe, if we are to have subsidies, there is no reason why the country as a whole should not be treated equally. Subsidies are bad enough in any way. They are worse when they become simply sectional subsidies. Therefore I shall do what I can to perfect this subsidy bill, and shall then do what I may be able to defeat the bill.

Now, it is proper that I should give somewhat briefly, as I must, within the time I have, some of the reasons why I shall oppose the bill as a whole. In my humble judgment it proceeds upon an entirely wrong conception of the subject. It does not undertake to change in the slightest the conditions under which the American merchant marine now operates. It does not undertake to make conditions favorable for the building of American ships, for the operation of American vessels, or the growth of the American merchant marine. It does undertake simply to provide that as to certain lines the Government will agree to pay, in consideration of the carrying of mails, certain sums, and by the payment of those sums it undertakes to make profitable what is assumed in advance is an unprofitable business, for it follows, as a matter of course, that no subsidy can be decently sought for a line that could be operated profitably without that subsidy. It follows that when you give a subsidy you pay it on the assumption that the line is necessarily an unprofitable one. Now, my belief is that a great American merchant marine will never be created until we make conditions such that the business itself is profitable as a business for carrying freight from nation to nation, and not simply profitable by virtue of a special Government contract. You can create a merchant marine by subsidies to the extent that you open the Treasury of the country, and to that extent only. You can not build any single line beyond what you pay to exist, and to the extent that you create a particular line by paying it a false bonus for work performed, you put every competing line at a disadvantage.

Every line that is subsidized under this bill makes more difficult the operation of American ships in competition with that line between the ports that it will serve. In my humble judgment, some day the American people will approach this question on a broad scale. Heretofore we have been engaged in supplying largely a home market. To-day, despite our boasting, the exports of the United States per capita do not compare favorably with many countries much less in size and in greatness. The export business of the United States, outside of that covered by agriculture and the products of agriculture, is almost insignificant in comparison with the size and magnitude of the country. Now, there will be ships to carry trade when there is trade to be carried, and not before. You can in a meas-

ure help by communication between country and country, but, speaking broadly, it follows that the ships will be there when the trade is there, and will not before the trade is there. So when America reaches, as she is now reaching very rapidly, the point where her manufacturers will not be content any longer with the home market, but will be seeking the markets of the world, then something will be done to enable American ships to carry that surplus product. As it is to-day we can not build an American ship in competition with foreigners, and we can not build it because this great economic truth lies at the root of it. What is one man's finished product is another man's raw material, and to the extent that you give protection to one man's finished product you handicap the man who has to use that finished product as a raw material. The testimony taken by the Merchant Marine Commission showed the very great handicap American shipyards were under by virtue of the exorbitant prices charged for steel by the steel trust. The raw material of the shipbuilder is the finished product of the steel trust, and that product has been protected by our tariff laws from the original pig iron through each stage of its manufacture up to the finished steel, and as each bit of protection has added its quota to the cost, the shipbuilder, being the last user of the article, is heaviest handicapped. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] boasted a day or two ago that the shipbuilder had free raw material for ships intended for the foreign trade. Now, there is no deception so great as a half truth. He failed to tell the whole story. Fortunately, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] very clearly set forth in his speech the real facts relative to the use of foreign material duty free in shipbuilding. The provision in the law that permits foreign materials to be purchased duty free also provides that ships built of such material shall not engage in the coastwise trade for more than two months in any one year. The gentleman showed by the letters he put in the Record that shipowners are not willing to buy ships that can not be transferred to the coastwise trade should conditions make it advisable.

No man is going to build an American ship out of foreign steel brought in bond, when as a result of that he must forever keep that ship out of the coastwise trade, no matter what may happen in the future. If we had free the materials for shipbuilding, not only for ships engaged in the foreign trade, but in the coastwise trade, the American shipyards would not only be furnishing the ships for the American merchant marine, but they would be furnishing ships for the world at large. The reason we can not build now is not so much the cost of labor as it is the fact that the shipbuilders are not able to standardize the different pieces used in constructing a ship, and they are not able to standardize because the demand for American ships is not sufficiently great; but once let them be in a position where they can compete, not only for ships for America but ships for the world, and they will be able to standardize. They will be able to do then what they have already done on the Great Lakes—build a ship as cheaply as it can be built anywhere in the world. It is a curious fact that to-day our coastwise trade is nearly one-half composed of wooden vessels, and yet the day of the wooden vessel has gone, never to return. We are using wooden vessels because in the coastwise trade, where we have given a monopoly to our American ships, the price of building the iron ships is prohibitive, and shipowners, in order to get from under this prohibition, are using antiquated wooden vessels. If the shipyards were given a fair opportunity, not to build a few ships at an extravagant price, made possible by a contribution out of the Public Treasury, but were given an opportunity to get their material as cheaply as any other people can get it, American ingenuity, American labor, the cheapest because the most intelligent, would be able to build ships cheaper than any other country in the world.

It has been well said that the building of a modern ship is but the uniting of a steam engine and a steel bridge, and this statement shows the absurdity of the argument that because of the price of labor, American-built ships must cost more than foreign-built ones. We build steel bridges and locomotives cheaper than any other country. The added price of labor is more than compensated by its intelligence and, consequently, productiveness. The real trouble lies, as I have said, in the cost of material, held at an artificial price by tariff protection and the steel trust, and by the limited demand, which prevents standardizing. But I must leave the general subject to notice the particular bill now under discussion, and the arguments now put forth in its behalf. Much has been said about subsidizing certain ships solely for the purpose of providing better mail facilities. The old idea of a subsidy for all ships, the tonnage idea, was abandoned by the committee, and they now hope by this disguise to get the nose of the camel into the tent, and subsequently bring in the whole animal. But if you

will examine the provisions of this bill you will find that it can not stand justification on the ground that they now claim for it. There was not a line of testimony heard, and despite the statement made just a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], there is absolutely now no evidence before our committee or before the Committee of the Whole House showing the material, essential facts—what the ship will cost in the first instance. They can not figure that cost, because there is nothing that determines what the size of the ship shall be. This bill provides that the ships shall be able to maintain upon certain lines a speed of 16 knots. It does not say whether the ship shall be a 5,000-ton ship or a 16,000-ton ship. It does not provide for any limitation in this regard whatever, and even if the provision of the act of 1891 applied to this law in regard to the size of the ships, which is open to grave doubt, it would only require as a minimum size for 16-knot ships 5,000 tons, a ridiculously small ship.

I ask any man of intelligence how he is going to determine what is a fair sum to pay for a subsidy that will enable a line to be operated at a fair profit upon the investment, when he does not know in the first instance what the investment is going to be? Unless you can start out with knowledge of how much money is necessary to build the ships, all your other data falls. You not only do not know that, but not knowing the size of the ship, it is impossible to determine what the operating expenses are going to be. Not only is that true, but there is not a bit of evidence in regard to what the receipts will be from freight carried—not even an estimate. That is necessarily a matter that must be left in some doubt. But some of us, before we vote away the money of the country, would like to have a little bit nearer figure than the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER], that because the British Government gave to the Cunard Line a contract, which, according to his figures, represents the payment of 10 per cent upon the amount invested, therefore we should pay these sums for these lines. The Cunard contract provides for the fastest steamers afloat—for 24 to 26 knot steamers. The very moment you go from a 12-knot steamer up every additional knot of speed adds greatly to the cost of running. When you get up to ships of 20-knot speed, the additional cost for additional speed becomes almost prohibitive; and yet, upon that flimsy basis, upon the basis that the British Government has seen fit to vote 10 per cent to the Cunard Company for the fastest ships afloat, we are told that we must vote a 10 per cent subsidy to these people. And we are told that without having any real proof as to what the cost of these ships is going to be. Is there any man within the sound of my voice who dares to stand here and say that he knows and can guarantee that these ships will of necessity cost a given sum, that the operating expenses will amount to a certain sum, and that the amount of trade will yield, even approximately, a certain revenue, all the things that should be known in order intelligently to make a contract?

Why not throw off the mask? Why not quit talking about giving a subsidy for mail service and that you are only giving what you think is necessary in order to enable the lines to endure? What you are doing is this: You are simply compromising down to the point where you could get a bill on this floor voted for. [Applause.] In committee you put in everything you could make stand and stick, and then you bring the bill out and undertake to demonstrate that it is based on scientific principles. I am violating no secrets of the committee when I say that the bill was offered by a Member who was that day made a member of the committee and was immediately voted out of the committee. And this House is to expend what amounts to thirty-odd millions of dollars upon that sort of information. For my part, even though I believed in the principle, I should not be willing to vote thus ignorantly the people's money. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky be allowed ten minutes more.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not ask that indulgence.

Mr. WALDO. Mr. Chairman, unless I am allowed the same time, I shall have to object.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made, and we do not need to discuss that.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the debate is exhausted on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER].

Mr. SHERLEY. The following statement, taken from the report of the superintendent Division of Foreign Mails of the Post-Office Department, shows the actual mail service now had:

CONTRACT OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

The contract ocean mail service upon the eight routes now in operation has been performed to the satisfaction of the Department and of the contractors.

The distance traversed, the amount paid as mileage, the weights of the mails, and the amount which would have been paid for the same service at the allowance of the full sea and United States inland postage upon the eight routes in question are as follows, viz:

Route 36, New York to La Guaira, 26 trips; statute miles traveled, 63,315½; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile.....	\$63,315.20
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 16,051 pounds; other articles, 248,637 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	45,572.56
Excess of cost of contract service on route 36.....	17,742.64
Route 37, New York to Maracaibo, 27 trips; statute miles traveled, 68,760.9; mileage paid, at 66½ cents a mile.....	45,840.60
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 2,835 pounds; other articles, 59,561 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	9,300.88
Excess of cost of contract service on route 37.....	36,539.72
Route 57, New York to Southampton, 51 trips; statute miles traveled, 190,659½; mileage paid, at \$4 a mile.....	762,638.40
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 449,194 pounds; other articles, 2,397,901 pounds; amount of full sea and inland postage thereon.....	910,542.48
Excess of sea and inland postage over cost of contract service on route 57.....	147,904.08
Route 69, New York to Tuxpan, 52 trips; statute miles traveled, 130,884; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile.....	130,884.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards 8,465 pounds; other articles, 155,066 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	25,949.28
Excess of cost of contract service on route 69.....	104,934.72
Route 70, New York to Habana, 53 trips; statute miles traveled, 72,398; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile.....	72,398.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 818 pounds; other articles, 16,908 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	2,661.44
Excess of cost of contract service on route 70.....	69,736.56
Route 74, Boston, Philadelphia, and New York to Port Antonio, Jamaica, 98 trips; statute miles traveled, 172,162; mileage paid, at 66½ cents a mile.....	114,774.66
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 4,211 pounds; other articles, 51,589 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	10,864.72
Excess of cost of contract service on route 74.....	103,909.94
Route 75, San Francisco, Cal., to Sydney, New South Wales, 15 trips; statute miles traveled, 124,942½; mileage paid, at \$2 a mile.....	249,885.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 24,499 pounds; other articles, 540,483 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	82,437.04
Excess of cost of contract service on route 75.....	167,447.96
Route 76, San Francisco to Tahiti, 10 trips; statute miles traveled, 42,180; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile.....	42,180.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 382 pounds; other articles, 5,208 pounds; amount of full sea and inland postage thereon.....	1,027.84
Excess of cost of contract service on route 76.....	41,152.16
Aggregate excess of cost of contract service.....	393,559.62

Under date of February 14, 1905, bids were invited for the service from San Francisco to Tahiti for a period of ten years from July 1, 1905, and on the 1st of June, 1905, the bid of the Oceanic Steamship Company to perform the service (10 trips a year), at the rate of \$1 a mile, was accepted.

The ocean mail contract service should be credited also with the carriage of the closed mails of foreign origin forwarded during the year from this country by means of steamers under contract with this Department.

The weights of said closed mails amounted to 27,465,589 grams (60,561 pounds) of letters and post cards and 123,759,003 grams (272,889 pounds) of other articles, for the conveyance of which steamers not under contract would have been entitled to compensation at the rate of 5 francs per kilogram of letters and post cards and 50 centimes per kilogram of other articles; or to a total sum of \$38,447.04. Deducting that sum from the "aggregate excess of cost," we find as the net excess of cost of the contract service \$355,112.58.

TRANSATLANTIC MAILS.

As heretofore, the mails for Great Britain and the Continent of Europe have been dispatched by every fast steamer, and when two fast steamers sail on the same day or succeeding days, the mails have been as a rule assigned to the one whose previous record gave reason to believe that it would deliver the mails sooner on the other side of the Atlantic. Other things being equal, preference has been given to steamers sailing under the flag of the United States, and especially to those under contract with this Department, at a compensation of \$4 for each mile traveled from New York to Southampton.

Steamers flying the flag of the United States, but not under contract, are allowed for their services all the postage collected on the mails they carry from this country; that is to say, 5 cents a half ounce (\$1.60 a pound, or \$3,200 a short ton) for letters and post cards and 1 cent for 2 ounces (8 cents a pound, or \$160 a short ton) for other

articles. In the case of a steamer conveying the mails under a foreign flag compensation for the service is allowed at the rate of 44 cents a pound (or \$880 a short ton) for letters and post cards and 4½ cents a pound (or \$90 a short ton) for other articles, calculated on the actual net weight of the mails conveyed.

The transfer service in New York Harbor, whereby the fast mail steamers arriving from Europe are met at the quarantine station by a special mail steamer, which receives the mails and conveys them as rapidly as possible to the various wharves, whence the mails for the city of New York are immediately sent to the post-office in that city, and those for inland destinations are forwarded by the first outgoing trains, has been continued without accident or interruption.

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN AND WEST INDIAN MAILS.

There have been no radical changes in the service to these countries during the year. Our communication with the west coast of Central and South America has been regular and reliable, about eight times a month, by means of steamers plying between New York and Colon; and to Venezuela we have a weekly service, by means of the Red "D" Line, which is performing contract service between New York and La Guaira and other ports of Venezuela, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891. Contract service is also performed once a week by the New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company between New York and Habana, and once a week between New York and certain Mexican Gulf ports via Habana. Besides, there is additional through service with Cuba by means of steamers plying three times a week from Tampa, Fla., and once a week from New Orleans, La., and Mobile, Ala., to Habana, Cuba, and by means of steamers of the Munson Line sailing from New York twice a month for northern Cuban ports. The service from Tampa is performed under a domestic contract, and does not come under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891. With Porto Rico we have mail communication regularly once a week by means of steamers of the Red "D" Line and by means of steamers of the New York and Porto Rico line, which sail on alternate Saturdays from New York and irregularly twice a month from New Orleans, the latter service being performed under a domestic-mail contract from New York for San Juan, and also irregularly about once a month from New York to Porto Rico.

With Jamaica we have contract ocean-mail service by means of steamers of the American Mail Steamship Company, sailing twice a week from Boston or Philadelphia for Port Antonio, Jamaica. Besides, Hamburg-American steamers of the Atlas Line sail regularly every Saturday from New York for Kingston, and steamers of the Royal Mail Line sail every two weeks from New York to Kingston.

Communication with the other West Indian islands has been maintained without material change, and principally by means of the New York and Cuba Mail, Quebec, Hamburg-American (Atlas), Clyde, Booth, Royal Dutch West India Mail, Trinidad, Bahamas, Demerara, Royal Mail, Peninsular and Occidental, and Earn lines of steamers.

With British Honduras (Belize), Guatemala, and the Republic of Honduras we have regular communication by means of steamers which sail every Thursday from New Orleans. By steamers sailing from the same port every Thursday for Nicaragua and every Friday for Costa Rica we have regular weekly communication with Nicaragua and Costa Rica and frequent, although irregular, communication with Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Republic of Honduras, and Panama; and from Mobile, Ala., we have frequent, although irregular, service with Progresso, Mexico; Bocas del Toro, Panama; Belize, British Honduras, and the Republic of Honduras.

By means of the Lamport and Holt, Sloman, American Rio Plata, Norton, Barber, Prince, Booth, Tweedie Trading, and Houston lines, mails for Brazil and the River Plata countries have been dispatched 177 times by steamers sailing from New York for those countries direct—for Brazil 83 times, and for the River Plata countries 94 times. Correspondence for Brazil and the River Plata countries is not, however, held for dispatch by these steamers, but is forwarded via England when that course will expedite its delivery at destination.

TRANS-PACIFIC MAILS.

By means of steamers sailing three or four times a month from San Francisco and three or four times a month from Seattle or Tacoma, mails for Japan and China have been dispatched not less than seven times a month.

These mails have included articles for the Philippines, but mails for the Philippines have also been dispatched by Army transports, which sailed from San Francisco for Manila about every twenty days. Correspondence for Japan and China has also been forwarded to Vancouver, British Columbia, for dispatch per steamers leaving that port about every three weeks, when the delivery of the correspondence would be thereby expedited.

Mails for the Australasian colonies have been dispatched from San Francisco once every three weeks by means of the contract steamers of the Oceanic Steamship Company, the transit time from San Francisco to Sydney being twenty-one days, and mails being delivered en route at Pago Pago.

Advantage is also taken of the opportunities offered for the dispatch of correspondence for those colonies by means of the Canadian Line of steamers sailing from Vancouver, British Columbia, once every four weeks.

The Oceanic steamers and those from Vancouver, above referred to, call at Honolulu, and most of the steamers en route from San Francisco to Japan and China usually call at Honolulu. Including the service under domestic mail contracts between San Francisco and Honolulu, there were from seven to ten opportunities a month for communication by mail with Hawaii, and generally there are not less than eight.

Mails for China, Japan, and the Australasian colonies are forwarded from San Francisco to Honolulu, to be transferred there to steamers sailing from Vancouver and calling at Honolulu en route to those countries; and mails for the United States arriving at Honolulu by steamers bound for Vancouver are transferred to steamers sailing from Honolulu to San Francisco. By such transfers the delivery of the mails so transferred is expedited by three or four days.

Inasmuch as great stress has been laid on the statement that under contract service on route 37 the Government made a saving of \$147,904.08, it may be well to call attention to the fact that if the 449,194 pounds of letters and post cards and the 2,397,901 pounds of other mail matter had been carried by the faster steamers of the foreign lines it would have cost the Government \$305,550.90, or \$457,087.50 less than was paid the subsidized American line. The profit claimed in the Post-Office

report is based on the idea that if not carried by the subsidized American line it would have had to be carried at the sea and inland postage rate of \$1.60 a pound for letters and 8 cents a pound for other articles, whereas it could have been carried for 44 cents and 4 cents a pound, respectively, the price paid foreign ships.

Statement showing list of steamers from New York to Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, and Rosario during 1906.

Sailing date.	Name of steamer.	Net registered tons.
January 1	Sierra Blanca	2,338
January 5	Soldier Prince	2,029
January 10	Silvia	1,295
January 12	Repton	1,852
January 13	Whitgift	2,842
January 24	Homer	1,641
January 26	Hostilius	2,025
January 27	Merchant Prince	2,021
January 31	Etona	1,600
January 31	Hampstead	2,207
February 3	Jessie Burns	2,211
February 12	Ardova	2,271
February 12	Gymeric	2,159
February 15	Ripley	2,508
February 17	Kohorius	2,126
February 20	St. Quentin	2,170
February 24	Pilar de Larrinaga	2,691
February 26	Queen Olga	2,146
February 28	Melderskin	2,538
March 2	Milton	1,676
March 3	Italian Prince	1,998
March 13	Hellenes	2,029
March 14	Taurus	2,763
March 20	Domingo de Larrinaga	2,651
March 29	Sark	2,304
April 7	Coronda	1,779
April 14	Casilda	2,519
April 22	Mercedes de Larrinaga	2,700
April 26	Hilaris	1,993
April 26	Crown Prince	1,626
May 6	Hornby Castle	2,359
May 6	Equita	2,139
May 12	Beatrice	2,139
May 15	Norman Prince	2,235
May 17	Avonmore	1,629
May 18	Otto Sverdurp	2,291
May 19	Linda	1,562
May 22	St. Hugo	2,290
June 4	Arabistan	2,045
June 6	Horace	2,133
June 10	Hortensius	2,125
June 10	Croydon	2,410
June 13	Miguel de Larrinaga	2,668
June 13	Etona	1,600
June 21	Pilar de Larrinaga	2,691
June 21	Hostilius	2,025
June 23	Merchant Prince	2,021
July 4	Whitgift	2,842
July 11	Sallust	2,308
July 11	Italian Prince	1,998
July 12	Asuncion de Larrinaga	2,693
July 19	St. Irene	2,028
July 19	Ripley	2,508
August 1	Horatius	2,297
August 4	Coronda	1,779
August 5	Coniston	2,173
August 7	Drumgarth	2,353
August 10	Cavour	3,151
August 14	Mercedes de Larrinaga	2,700
August 17	Tronto	3,055
August 21	St. Quentin	2,170
August 25	Welsh Prince	3,218
August 29	Sandhurst	2,768
September 1	Christian Bors	2,788
September 2	Casilda	2,519
September 8	Taurus	2,765
September 9	Hilaris	1,993
September 13	Rauma	1,933
September 20	Strathairly	2,783
September 27	Otto Sverdurp	2,291
September 30	Hornby Castle	2,359
October 2	Queen Louise	2,170
October 5	Etona	1,600
October 7	Croydon	2,410
October 7	African Prince	3,183
October 10	Balaclava	2,745
October 17	Woodfield	2,306
October 18	Canova	3,009
October 25	Archmaree	3,078
October 28	Pecine	1,463
November 1	Volga	2,851
November 4	Whitgift	2,842
November 4	Hortensius	2,125
November 22	Cavour	3,151
November 24	Athalie	1,404
November 26	Arabistan	2,045
November 27	Italian Prince	1,998
December 1	Honorius	2,126
December 5	Miguel de Larrinaga	2,668
December 9	Auchenarden	2,351
December 11	Soldier Prince	2,029
December 15	Persiana	2,616
December 16	Coronda	1,779
December 23	Drumlanrig	2,772
December 26	Christian Knudson	2,489
December 27	Harmodius	2,213

Statement showing shipping facilities, etc., from New York with Brazil.

NORTH BRAZIL.

Booth Line to north Brazil, Booth & Co., agents, have steamers about every ten days to Para, Manaus, Maranham, Ceara, and Parnahyba. This line uses British steamers, the carrying capacity of which will average about 3,000 tons. The rates on general cargo are about 25 cents to 40 cents per cubic foot; case oil, about 35 cents per case; lumber, about \$15 per 1,000 superficial feet.

BRAZIL.

The following lines, Lamport & Holt Line, Busk & Jevons, agents; Prince Line, Busk & Javons, agents; Sloman Line, Funch, Edye & Co., agents, work together, and their sailings are about as follows: Lamport & Holt Line, a sailing monthly; Prince Line, three sailings every two months; Sloman Line, three sailings every two months. The ports at which these steamers call are Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, Santos, Pernambuco, Macelo, and Victoria. Each steamer does not call at all ports, the lines arranging the order of ports as best suits the trade. The carrying capacity of these steamers will average about 3,000 tons.

In opposition to these lines are the Lloyd Brazileiro, John C. Seager Company, agents; Tweedie Line, Tweedie Trading Company, agents. The Lloyd Brazileiro is subsidized by the Brazilian Government, and we understand when first started it was their intention to run only Brazilian steamers; but these were rather small for the trade, and, owing to the success they have met with, the New York agent of this line has found it necessary to charter at least two steamers a month to Brazil ports. The Lloyd Brazileiro steamers will carry on an average of about 2,500 tons each, but the steamers which the line charter will average in carrying capacity about 4,500 tons each. This line has only been in operation since about September last.

The Tweedie Trading Company, in both the River Plata and Brazil trades, carries on a more or less guerilla warfare. Their service is not regular, and most of their steamers which sail from New York call at a southern United States port for rosin or lumber; consequently the service is not desirable for ordinary general cargo shipments.

The rates of freight on general cargo vary from 18 to 30 cents per cubic foot; lumber, \$15 per 1,000 superficial feet; case oil, 20 cents per case, free from alongside—that is, shippers have to send lighters to take the freight from the steamer; rosin, \$1.10 per barrel of 280 pounds.

With the exception of the Lloyd Brazileiro, the steamers used in this trade by the above firms are practically all British steamers. Occasionally a Norwegian steamer is chartered, and the Lamport & Holt Line at times use some Belgian steamers, which they operate.

The Lamport & Holt Line employ the *Tennyson* and *Byron*, which are passenger steamers, in this trade and have practically a monopoly of the passenger traffic between New York and Brazil and River Plata ports, as well as the passenger traffic homeward. These steamers alternate in monthly sailings.

Statement showing shipping facilities, etc., from New York with Argentine Republic, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Bolivia.

These countries are reached by the steamers which load here for River Plata ports, i. e., Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, and Rosario. Occasionally a steamer will stop at Bahia Blanca or La Plata.

The lines operating the River Plata service are: Norton Line, Norton & Son, agents; Lamport & Holt Line, Busk & Jevons, agents; Prince Line, Busk & Jevons, agents; Houston Line, R. P. Houston & Co., agents, which lines have a weekly service, each line having a steamer every four weeks. Tweedie Line, Tweedie Trading Company, agents; Barber Line, Barber & Co. (Incorporated), agents; American Rio Plata Line, Howard Houlder, Rowat & Co. (Limited), agents, which latter three lines work in opposition to the first four named lines, and while they have no definite set date for the dispatch of their steamers, they advertise them as nearly as possible to the expected sailing date. I would mention that it is very rarely that these steamers sail on their advertised sailing dates, as they do not leave until they are fully loaded, and, of course, condition of deliveries and weather conditions always affect sailing dates, but are never taken into consideration when the date advertised is fixed.

I inclose herewith a list giving the name and net registered tonnage (taken from Lloyd's) of each and every steamer which sailed during 1906 from the port of New York to River Plata ports. Taking these steamers on an average of about 6,000 tons freight capacity each, would show that about 600,000 tons of cargo was shipped from New York to River Plata ports during the year 1906. I think you can figure that there was at least this amount, and I should not be surprised if it reached 750,000 tons. I have not had an opportunity to go into the carrying capacity of each individual steamer.

All of these steamers are foreign ships, and over 90 per cent of them fly the English flag.

The Norton Line, Lamport & Holt Line, Prince Line, Houston Line, and American Rio Plata Line are operated by English firms, the representatives here being merely agents. The Tweedie Line and the Barber Line are operated by New York firms, they chartering the steamers necessary to load on the berth; and while they are apparently independent, I am inclined to think that both of these firms are supported by English owners.

All of these steamers from New York to River Plata ports carry United States mail, being paid according to the quantity carried.

There is no direct passenger service between New York and River Plata ports, as the American passenger laws are too stringent. In fact, these steamers have no passenger accommodations; but if they had, under the British Board of Trade regulations, even this would not permit of their carrying passengers under the requirements of the United States law. All passengers from New York to Argentina go by way of Brazil by the Lamport & Holt Line of steamers, or via Europe.

Rates of freight.—The last three lines mentioned above are in opposition to the first four named, and consequently rates have been fluctuating during 1906 and also during 1905, owing to this competition. Rates have varied during the year from 7 to 20 cents per cubic foot on ordinary general cargo. Included under the heading of "General cargo" is a considerable quantity of agriculturals and binder twine, shipped from this country to the Argentine Republic, on which rates vary from 12 to 16½ cents per cubic foot, depending entirely upon the kinds of implements shipped; on lumber, \$11 and \$12 per 1,000 superficial feet; rosin, about 80 cents per barrel of 280 pounds; case oil, about 20 cents per case; plain and barbed wire and nails, \$3.60 per ton of 2,240 pounds. Steel rails and car material, which, of course, go forward in large quantities, are usually booked under special con-

tract. These rates would be considered fair under normal conditions; but unfortunately the River Plate ports are congested, owing to the large quantity of cargo being imported into the Argentine, the facilities there being limited, and steamers have been experiencing delay in the discharge of from two weeks to three months. While I state above that the rates would be considered fair, there has been no money made, owing to these conditions and because the lines were fighting among themselves. Statistics will show you how the importations from the United States into the Argentine through River Plate ports compare with imports from other countries.

The Norton Line and the Houston Line steamers and some of the steamers of the Barber and Tweedle lines are the only ones which carry cargo from the River Plate ports to Boston and New York via ports in Porto Rico and Cuba. The steamers of the other lines taking freight from New York to the River Plate carry cargo from River Plate ports to European ports or go to Brazil for a cargo to Europe or the United States.

[Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, February 25, 1907.]

MISLEADING REPORTS ON SHIPPING FROM CONSULS—MARITIME INTERESTS BELIEVE INTENDED TO AID SUBSIDIES—CONSUL-GENERAL IN THE ARGENTINE CREDITED WITH SAYING THAT ALL AMERICAN GOODS IMPORTED ARE SENT BY WAY OF ENGLAND—THE SITUATION IN BRAZIL SET FORTH.

Shipping interests at this port identified especially with South American trade are astounded at statements regarding shipping that are being printed from time to time in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, issued by the Bureau of Manufactures. They are very frank in saying they believe the object of such erroneous statements is to bolster up the schemes of the subsidy hunters with information which, for the reason it is published by the Government, will be regarded as authentic.

The head of one of the largest shipping firms in this city said in course of a conversation on Thursday:

"The Consular Reports published by the Government under date of February 21 include a statement by the consul-general of the United States situated in the Argentine that is incomprehensible in that it is absolutely contrary to facts, and coming from such an official source and published as it is officially by the Government, the document is in every way erroneous, misleading, and a danger to the actual conditions, as the information is distributed broadcast throughout our country under the official cloak of our Government, and must necessarily be accepted by nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of one thousand as truthful.

"The consul-general states that all American goods imported in the Argentine Republic from the United States go by the way of England. Both our own Government and everybody in the trade know that this statement is absolutely without foundation, and that no goods whatsoever in the ordinary course of trade are dispatched to the Argentine Republic via England or any other European port. There is almost a daily service of steamers direct from the United States ports to the Argentine Republic, ranging from 3,000 to 10,000 tons capacity each.

"In the same issue of the Consular Reports we turn to the United States consul in Brazil making statements that are almost as contrary to the facts as the statements that we have alluded to above.

"One can not help but think that the trend of all this published matter is in furtherance of the subsidy schemes now being pushed before Congress, and one hesitates to think that the public servants of the United States Government would so belittle themselves and pervert the truth for political purposes. Furthermore one must criticize most severely the General Government for publishing such glaring false statements."

In part, the item regarding shipping to Argentina referred to follows: "Consul-General Alban G. Snyder calls attention to the fact that there is practically no direct trade communication between the United States and Buenos Ayres, all American goods imported being sent by way of England. Mr. Snyder shows the bad effects of this situation, and tells in the following letter what should be done toward improving American trade in Argentina:

"The service between Europe and Buenos Ayres is regular and the trips are frequent, taking but from sixteen to twenty days, whereas voyages to the United States frequently take from twenty-five to fifty days. The chief improvement in the matter of shipping facilities between the United States and Buenos Ayres should be the establishment of a fast steamship line between the two countries, as the present service may be considered the greatest drawback to the upbuilding of American trade with the Argentine Republic.

"During the year 1905 but one cargo of lumber and one of car materials arrived in Buenos Ayres from the United States, this being about from 1 to 2 per cent of the number of foreign vessels arriving at this port. In the same period of time eight American sailing vessels left Buenos Ayres for the United States, none carrying cargo. Only one American steamship has called at the port in the past two years. During the year named 143 (mostly English) vessels cleared from Buenos Ayres carrying hides and skins, hair, quebracho wood, extract of quebracho wood, and wool. While there are but five American export and import firms in Buenos Ayres, American goods are handled by many commercial houses, which number about 300.

"The principal imports into Buenos Ayres are dry goods, preserved goods, manufactured articles, oils, machinery and tools, agricultural implements, lumber, and railroad materials. Of these England furnishes 34 per cent; Germany, 15 per cent; United States, 13 per cent; Italy, 10 per cent, and France, 9 per cent."

The report of Consul-General George Anderson, as reported in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, is as follows:

"Consul-General George E. Anderson, under date of December 20, furnishes the following in regard to lack of United States tonnage in the trade with Brazil:

"For several months past there has been a notable lack of tonnage in shipping from the United States to Brazil. This state of things is not only unusual, but it reflects most significantly upon the general shipping situation between Brazil and the United States. The bulk of such trade has consisted of coffee, which has long employed many thousands of tons of shipping each year. In earlier days the flour, lard, and preserved-meat trade of the United States with Brazil offered considerable employment for this shipping on a return trip from the United States to Brazil after voyages with loads of coffee for American ports. The shipping between the two countries was profitable and prosperous. Gradually, however, the trade of the United States with Brazil in flour and provisions has declined until there is very little employment for ships on that account sailing from American or Brazilian ports. In the meanwhile American consumption of coffee has continually increased, causing a one-sided situation, with no return freight. A three-cornered trade route was then built up, vessels sailing

with coffee from Brazil to an American port, thence to an European port with American products, then to Brazilian ports with European goods. This triangular route caused a further decline in America's Brazilian sales, with the decreased freight facilities for shipments of goods. Thus it has been difficult to improve steamship service between the two countries, and talk of and, perhaps the necessity for, a ship subsidy to aid American interests in this line have followed."

[Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, February 25, 1907.]

GOVERNMENT SERVICE FOR SUBSIDY GRANTERS.

Has the Government Printing Office and the consular service been put to use to help the ship-subsidy granters in their effort to reach into the Public Treasury for profits for a new combination of capital? A pamphlet of 44 pages has been issued from the Government Printing Office with the label "Memoranda of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the substitute for S. 529." It is not an official document of the committee and has never been submitted to the House or to any public authority and "ordered printed." By whom it was prepared does not appear, but it is made up of a farrago of statements, quotations, and references after the exact manner of the "campaign documents" of the Merchant Marine League in support of the subsidy policy. It is not sent out in the ordinary way as an official document for the public, but is distributed privately for the evident purpose of affecting public opinion and securing support for the pending subsidy bill. Is this a legitimate use of the Government Printing Office and the resources provided for the service of the public?

Is it a mere coincidence that in the single number of the Daily Consular and Trade Reports for February 21 there appeared simultaneously in front of everything else quotations from reports from consuls at leading South American ports complaining of a lack of shipping facilities, a lack that notoriously does not exist unless "under the American flag" is to be implied, and suggesting the need of such facilities to help American trade to those ports? It certainly is not a coincidence that much more is implied in the editorial sentences introducing these quotations than can be found in the quotations themselves. For instance, on the front page the editor in Washington starts off with the statement: "Consul-General Snyder calls attention to the fact that there is practically no direct trade communication between the United States and Buenos Ayres, all American goods imported being sent by the way of England." This statement is so notoriously contrary to fact that one naturally scrutinizes the passage quoted from Mr. Snyder's report for the basis of it. No ground for it is to be found there, though Mr. Snyder does say, being thereto prompted, perhaps, from Washington, that "the chief improvement in the matter of shipping facilities between the United States and Buenos Ayres should be the establishment of a fast steamship line between the two countries." The fact is that there is regular and frequent communication with all the River Plate ports, ample for all the trade requiring them.

Consul-General Anderson is said to furnish "the following in regard to lack of United States tonnage in trade with Brazil." The "following" in this case conforms better than the other with the introductory line, but is almost equally far from the facts. It represents that the Brazilian trade is dependent upon the triangular route via Europe, and says that much of the extra tonnage employed late last year in bringing coffee here from Rio de Janeiro "has been unable to meet the present demand in American ports for tonnage for South America, particularly for Brazil." Evidence of this inability to meet the demand is not found in the American ports themselves.

Skipping over to Chile, the Washington editor of this consular information finds that Consul Winslow, at Valparaiso, reports that "the shipping facilities between the United States and Chile are not what they should be in order to develop business between the two Republics." What this consul says is that the two lines from New York "under the British flag" charge a rate that is "fair" and render a service that is "very satisfactory, considering everything." But he is prompted to add, whether by suggestion from superior authority does not appear, that "there should be one or two lines for this coast sailing under the American flag" and that "something should be done to encourage American shipping if the United States is to get the trade it should have in this part of South America." He conceals the fact that the lines "under the British flag" are owned and managed by Americans and anxious to do all they can to develop the trade, and would gladly carry the American flag if the benevolent Government did not make it impossible.

The lively editor jumps back to Montevideo, and remarks that Consul O'Hara reports that "American trade communication with Uruguay appears to be limited and insufficient." Mr. O'Hara says nothing to imply that, unless "American trade communication" means communication by American vessels, though he does say, under the prompting that seems to have gone along the South American coast with remarkable simultaneousness, that "one of the first steps to be taken in improving the commercial relations between the United States and Uruguay would be to establish a first-class steamship line between the two countries."

It is evident on the face of these publications that the Government service and the public money have been used directly in these cases, not to furnish facts and information for the public and enable it to form a fair judgment for itself, not even to serve a partisan purpose for the Administration, which would be sufficiently reprehensible, but to promote the efforts of that clique of capitalists and promoters who are hunting for subsidies from the public Treasury to give them a promise of profit in their schemes. It is a disreputable business, for which it is to be hoped the head of the Administration or any Department thereof is not responsible and which ought to be discontinued and reprimanded.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTAUER. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 15, line 21, omit the words "in the United States;" page 15, line 22, omit "or now duly registered."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I do not believe the committee know what they are voting upon, and I ask the Clerk to report the amendment again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 21, omit "in the United States;" page 15, line 22, omit "or now duly registered."

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, the purport of this amendment is to prevent the use of any ship now built upon any of the lines proposed to be established by this bill. Now, the entire intent of this amendment is that those vessels can not be used to carry out the purposes of any of these three routes. The omission of the words "in the United States" is simply to perfect the English. The omission of the words "or now duly registered" would prevent shipping on any ship that now sails the sea on any of these lines, and gentlemen can easily understand its bearing—

Mr. KAHN. Would it affect the ships that are now the property of the Oceanic Steamship Line?

Mr. LITTAUER. It would. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the committee, I would like, for the time being, to withdraw my amendment that I may perfect it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. LITTAUER. It has been withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I reserve the right to object, and it can not be withdrawn without unanimous consent.

Mr. LITTAUER. I am asking unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not given my consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington object?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I reserve the right to object until I have an opportunity to hear from the gentleman on the construction of his amendment.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I object to this.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What purpose does the gentleman pretend to effect by his amendment? I think it would except the ships now running in the Oceanic Line.

Mr. LITTAUER. Why the very purpose of this bill in its seventh section is to add an additional amount of subsidy for the continuation of this line, in order that it may continue. I know that there will be given two additional ships to carry on the Oceanic Line, but there is no valid reason, if the committee will continue the Oceanic Line, why three ships of 16 knots speed, meeting the very requirements of ships that have been built in the United States should not be included.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I believe I shall object to the withdrawal of this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from New York a question. If the object of this bill be to obtain transportation of mail, what difference does it make whether the mail be transported on ships already built or ships hereafter to be built?

Mr. LITTAUER. The primary object of the bill is mail transportation; one of the incidental objects is to build up the shipbuilding interest of the United States in connection with it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has answered my question, and I have elicited the information which I desired, to wit, that one of the incidental objects was to build up, at the expense of the people generally, this particular business, and the mask of this bill to transport the mail is off. [Applause.]

Mr. POLLARD. As I understand, the gentleman from New York has offered two amendments, one to line 21 and another to line 22. I want to make inquiry if the vote will be first taken on the first one that is offered?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman calls for it, it is divisible, and that demand would be in order.

Mr. POLLARD. I call for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will then be on the first amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 15, line 21, by striking out the words "in the United States."

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the second amendment.

Mr. LITTAUER. I would like to inquire whether I have the right to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

Mr. LITTAUER. Can not I perfect it?

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee will be in order, the Chair will endeavor to explain the situation. The committee will simply suspend business until order is restored.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on this amendment, I desire to state that if it be adopted I will offer a further amendment excepting the ships of the Oceanic Line.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We will consider that when we get to it. But I object to its being withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 22, after the words "United States," strike out the words "or now duly registered."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KAHN. Division! [After a pause.] I withdraw the demand for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The request for a division is withdrawn. The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to add after the words "United States," in line 22, the words "excepting the *Sonoma*, *Ventura*, and *Sierra*, of the Oceanic Line."

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 22, after the words "United States," insert "excepting the *Sonoma*, *Ventura*, and *Sierra*, of the Oceanic Line."

Mr. SULLIVAN. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. This is an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. SULZER. I should like to have some explanation of this amendment.

Mr. LITTAUER. I will be pleased to give the gentleman an explanation. The object of this amendment is—

Mr. SULZER. It seems to be to make flesh of one and fowl of the other.

Mr. LITTAUER. Are you going to do this answering? My answer to the question that you ask—

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen should refer to their colleagues in the third person.

Mr. LITTAUER. My answer to the question asked by my colleague from New York is that the object here is to except the three ships of the Oceanic Line, so that they may be continued in their present service. They are ships already under contract, for which one of the provisions of this bill provides more ample mail subsidy.

Mr. SULZER. Are not these ships that are specially excepted already in commission?

Mr. LITTAUER. They are.

Mr. SULZER. Then why except them?

Mr. LITTAUER. Because they are ships built in the United States, performing a service such as this bill seeks simply to amplify, and meet all the desirable objects to be attained from the purposes of this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. The intention is to provide for additional ships.

Mr. LITTAUER. In order to take advantage of the provisions of the bill more ships will have to be built.

Mr. SULZER. I desire to say to my colleague from New York that it seems to me to be a very strange procedure to exempt these three ships of the Oceanic Line, and not exempt two or three ships of Mr. Hill's line, such as the *Dakota* and *Minnesota*.

Mr. LITTAUER. I should like to call the attention of my colleague to the fact that they are already exempt in this bill, in another place.

Mr. SULZER. Why not exempt them all?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do not believe it would be desirable. The purpose of the amendment just adopted is that all the ships that take advantage of the other provisions of this bill shall be newly built in the United States.

Mr. SULZER. These are newly built.

Mr. WANGER. Is it not the purpose of your amendment to make these three ships eligible for route No. 7?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes.

Mr. WANGER. Then why not offer your amendment at the other place, so that those steamships will not be withdrawn from the service in which they are now engaged and put upon route No. 1 or one of the other routes than No. 7?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do not think that is a contingency which we need to provide against.

Mr. WANGER. It seems to me they need not be confined to that particular route.

Mr. KAHN. These three ships that are excepted are running on route No. 75. The ships of the Harriman line and the ships of the Hill line have never accepted a contract from the United States to carry the mail. They are not in the service of the United States to-day.

Mr. SULZER. Supposing one of them came in and accepted one of these contracts?

Mr. LITTAUER. They can not do it.

Mr. SULZER. Why not except all the Oceanic Steamship Company's vessels?

Mr. LITTAUER. Because they are already in the service, receiving a subsidy under the act of 1891.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that these ships of the Oceanic Steamship Company, which, according to the statement of the gentleman from California, are operated at a loss, are losing because they were voted to be built on a single hearing by the board of directors without sufficient examination of their design; that their construction is faulty, that it takes twice as long to load and unload them as competing merchant ships, and for that reason it is impossible for them to succeed in competition with properly constructed ships.

Mr. LITTAUER. But they do sail at 16-knot speed.

Mr. SULLIVAN. And for that reason the Government is asked to step in and pay for the blunders of the company which built them. Is that true?

Mr. LITTAUER. Not at all, as far as my information goes.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Have you inquired upon that point?

Mr. LITTAUER. All I know is that they do meet the requirements of the act of 1891, which allows a mail subsidy to 16-knot ships.

Mr. FORDNEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to speak on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to oppose the amendment?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered excludes from the former amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York the three ships, the *Sonoma*, the *Ventura*, and the *Sierra*. They are the three ships running from San Francisco to Australia under their contract under the law of 1901. That same company, the Oceanic Steamship Company, have two other ships that have a speed of 16 knots.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. LITTAUER. What are the names of the two other ships?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have not the names of the two ships here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The *Sibeosa*, the *Manchuria*, and the *Korea*.

Mr. FORDNEY. I say the Oceanic Company has five ships to-day, as shown by the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, which have a speed of 16 knots. The Pacific mail have five ships of 16 knots, and you are excluding all those ships except the three mentioned simply to give to the other side of the House a little bit of sop to get them to vote for a line from New Orleans. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen here have stated that the Oceanic Steamship Company is likely to go into the hands of a receiver unless additional aid is given at once. Let me call the attention of gentlemen that have referred to the condition of the Oceanic Steamship Company's financial condition, and ask them if they have any proof that the funds of the company have not been handled in a like manner as those of the Chicago and Alton Railroad have, as was shown by the papers this morning, by Mr. Harriman? You have not offered a scintilla of evidence as to the judicious management of the funds of that company, although that company themselves show, as I stated before, they have received from the Government in subsidies over \$60,000 more than the entire cost of their labor employed on these three ships now operating from San Francisco to Australia.

Mr. WILSON. And they receive a subsidy from Australia.

Mr. FORDNEY. And receive a subsidy from Australia, the gentleman says. As I said before, what became of the money received from the freight that this company carried? They claim that they have increased our trade with Australia over \$43,000,000 in the last three years. Gentlemen, this is absolutely absurd to exclude all other ships sailing under the American flag to-day, in favor of those three ships owned by what is known as the "Spreckels Line."

In the name of common sense, what good reasons do you give why these three ships should be favored and all others excluded? You are too late, my friend [Mr. LITTAUER], in discovering your error on the first amendment, and you are trying to get back to where you started from. [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTAUER. Before the gentleman sits down, I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say that the subsidy now paid this line is greater than the amount paid out for wages.

Mr. FORDNEY. I say that the subsidy paid last year to that line, as shown by their own statement, is over \$290,000, and by their own statement they show the cost of labor on these three ships to be \$235,400.

Mr. LITTAUER. In that connection let me say that there was paid \$235,000 for wages and \$283,000 or \$293,000 for subsidies. Now, the gentleman asks what becomes of the money paid for freight that the ships carried. Does not the gentle-

man know that there are other expenses in running a steamship line besides wages? Doesn't he know that the crew have to be fed, and do not the furnaces have to be fed?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; they have to be fed and they have to be clothed, and so do my wife and children, but I am not asking the Government of the United States to subsidize me for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, these matters are not so complicated that they should cause a disturbance of the peace. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York was to get rid in this bill of the cry that the gentleman from Michigan and others have been making that we were subsidizing the Hill and Harriman lines. It had been shown how enormously rich these two lines were, and it was thought that in building new American ships it might be well to exclude from the operation of this subsidy any ships that are now built—that is, exclude them from what?

Why, exclude them from making contracts to carry the mail? That is all. Now, in the case of the Oceanic Line, it turns out that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] did not know—or he would not have made this impassioned speech—the Government has a contract with that line to continue to carry the mail for seven years more. Now, then, let us look at it. The Government made this contract with the Spreckels Line, if you please, to carry this mail for ten years, and three years of it have expired. During those three years they have constructed three fast ships, at a cost of nearly two million and three-quarters. Would it not be beautiful—and I would like to have the gentleman from Michigan answer this question—would it not be a plain violation of the contract of the Government with the Spreckels Line to now come in here and say that those three ships that they built under the contract, complying with the contract, should not carry the mail under the contract that the Government itself has made with the Spreckels line? That is the condition we are in.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I will not yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thought the gentleman asked me a question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman did not seem to know that we had a contract running seven years with the Spreckels Line to continue to carry the mails.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I know it as well as the gentleman does.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then I will ask the gentleman a question. Would you come in here with an act of Congress and destroy the instrumentalities which that contract was being complied with?

Mr. FORDNEY. That company entered into a solemn contract to do a certain thing, and when you enter into a contract with me you expect me to carry it out to the letter of the law, but the gentleman's bill now proposes to increase that amount to be paid them under their contract \$200,000 beyond the amount they agreed to carry the mail for. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, certainly. Is there any doubt about that? It has been done a thousand times; it will be done a thousand times, when the gentleman from Michigan and myself are forgotten.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Suppose that the Government discovered that that steamship company was making a profit of \$200,000 above a reasonable amount; would it be reasonable for the Government to come and ask them to pay it back under the contract?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, no such conditions exist.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; but the shoe is now on the other foot.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is so easy to get up and make declaratory statements of facts that are not facts. Imagination runs riot here—pure imagination. We know that the ships of the Oriental Line have been offered in the market for sale.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I would not attempt a speech upon this occasion did I not deeply feel the responsibility that should rest upon every Member of this House. This measure, in my judgment, is the culmination of the evils of protection. It is the beginning of a governmental policy of paternalistic greed hitherto unknown, and which is unwarranted either by the letter or the spirit of the Constitution. It is boldly proposed to tax all the people from thirty to sixty millions of dollars within the next decade to swell the fortunes of less than a dozen millionaire shipowners. Republican graft and robbery have been presented in many hideous forms, but this is the climax of political debauchery. If the great masses of the

people could fully understand and appreciate the full effect of this measure, there would be a revolution of public sentiment such as was never known before. Or if they understood the clandestine and tyrannical methods adopted to rush this measure through this House—giving in the closing hours of the session only five hours for the discussion of a policy carrying millions of dollars—they would sweep the party in power into oblivion at the very next turn of the political wheel.

No one not blinded by avarice or stupefied by that imbecility resulting from long political wrongs can contemplate this measure without misgivings of its virtue. Those who believe in equal rights to all and special privileges to none will condemn it, and likewise will be the verdict of the toiling millions, who believe it is nothing less than robbery to take the fruit of one man's toil and give it to another. It is condemned by all political philosophy. No class of statesmen, save those now swaying the rod of empire, ever dared such a usurpation. The teachings of Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, as well as all other American statesmen who have had the welfare of the American people at heart, are diametrically opposed to such a policy. The greatest jurists of the country have written its condemnation in letters of gold. Judge Cooley wrote:

However important it may be to the community that individual citizens should prosper in their industrial enterprises, it is not the business of government to aid them with its means. Enlightened states leave every man to depend for his success and prosperity in business on his own exertions. * * * It may therefore be safely asserted that taxation for the purpose of raising money from the public to be given or even loaned to private parties in order that they may use it in their individual business enterprises is not recognized as a public use. In contemplation of law it would be taking the common property of the whole community and handing it over to private parties for their private gain, and consequently unlawful.

The Supreme Court, in the case of the Loan Association v. Topeka (20 Wallace), speaking along this line, said:

The power to tax is, therefore, the strongest, the most pervading of all the powers of government, reaching directly or indirectly to all classes of the people. * * * This power can as readily be employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other, if there is no implied limitation of the uses for which the power may be exercised. To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it on favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortunes is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation.

It will be remembered that when this measure came from the Senate it had all the brands and earmarks of an outright ship-subsidy bill, but its friends, in order to hoodwink the public and to deceive the rebellious members of the dominant party, have changed the dress of the monster by giving it the appearance of necessary ocean mail legislation. To further intensify this deception the chairman of the committee says:

It can not be too strongly emphasized that all that is proposed in this present bill is to apply the well-established policy of the United States to ocean routes not reached in a satisfactory way by existing ocean mail legislation.

Now, to the unwary this seems very plausible. Indeed, all will admit that in this day of commercial expansion our ocean mail facilities should be extended in keeping with the ever-growing commerce of the world; but while on the surface this measure purports to be legislation in behalf of our ocean mails, underlying it are to be found all the hideous provisions of an outright ship-subsidy bill.

The amount appropriated per annum may appear, when compared with the naval or pension appropriation, insignificant to some, but all such should remember that it is to be a continuing subsidy and will, in the fixed period of ten years, amount to perhaps \$60,000,000. And also, they should remember that it is the initiation of a permanent system of graft that will increase as the years come and go. From the few millions per annum at present it will grow into tens and even hundreds of millions in the near future. When we embarked upon our present Philippine policy no one thought that in less than a decade it would have cost approximately \$700,000,000, nor did anyone believe forty years ago that the small amount then appropriated for pensions would ever have grown to \$150,000,000 per annum; nor that when the Government undertook to provide for the rivers and harbors that that appropriation would ever have been increased to the enormous sum of \$90,000,000 now carried by the bill recently passed. So it must be apparent to everyone that this measure, bearing upon its face a modest sum and apparently for legitimate purposes, will some day grow to be a monster of iniquity to scourge our children.

But just here let me say a word to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] who, in response to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], intimated that the representatives of the cornfield in this body were incapacitated to pass upon the merits of this question. In this he may be partially correct. But he should remember that behind these cornfield

statesmen is an honest yeomanry, earning their bread in the sweat of their faces, and that with them forbearance has almost ceased to be a virtue; that one of these days they will rise in their might and cause his political kith and kin to cry for the mountains to fall upon them and hide their iniquity. That statesman is either blinded by ignorance or pompadored by vanity who fails to reckon with the rights of the farmer in his legislative deliberation. They are, indeed, the salt of the earth and contribute more of the taxation for the support of the Government than any other class of American citizens. They have been taxed in season and out of season.

They have never reaped any substantial benefits from any policy inaugurated by the party in power. In truth, every act of the Republican party has been diametrically opposed to their well-being. It has made it possible for the trusts to rob them of the greater part of their earnings and has isolated their products from the markets of the world; yet in spite of this they have prospered. God has given them energy, intelligence, and fertile fields from which, together with unremitting toil, they are enabled to reap the fruits of many rich harvests. They are the coming factors in American politics, and many who now scorn them will live to tremble at their power.

Mr. Chairman, there is another proposition involved in this bill, and that is the entire appropriation will be gobbled up by the steamship lines now in operation. These lines belong to the owners of the Northern Pacific, the Southern Pacific, the Standard Oil Company, and a few other railroad companies. According to Lloyd's Register the Standard Oil Company owns sixteen ships engaged in international commerce. The Great Northern Railroad, owned by Mr. Hill, owns a large number of steamers plying between Seattle and Hongkong, and the Southern Pacific, or Mr. Harriman, owns quite a number operating between New Orleans and the West Indies. These are the real beneficiaries under this bill. It is for them and not the public that this measure is being railroaded through Congress.

But it is contended that the owners of these ships can not share in this bounty because their ships do not make the required time of 16 knots per hour. This argument is puerile. How long would it take them to convert their slow-going vessels into vessels making the required 16 knots per hour; or how long would it take them to add one or more vessels to their present number, and thereby reap the full amount of this appropriation?

It is said by the friends of this measure that it is intended to provide adequate mail facilities to South America and the Orient, and it proposes to give the shipowners a subsidy of hundreds of thousands of dollars to make from twelve to twenty-four trips per year over each of the mail lines mentioned, and that this is to continue for a period of ten years. And to one of the lines from the Atlantic seaboard to Argentina it is proposed to give \$800,000 annually to carry the mail bimonthly, or \$33,333 for each trip. Practically a similar rate of pay is provided for all the other lines mentioned in the bill. In the period of ten years Rockefeller, Harriman, Hill and company will receive \$8,000,000 on the line from New York to Argentina, and on all the lines provided for in the bill they will practically receive \$60,000,000—a sufficiency not only to provide the few mail steamers required, but will equip for themselves a great commercial fleet. This is, indeed, a handsome present that our Republican friends propose to make these multi-millionaires out of the earnings of millions of our hard-pressed people.

Then, too, Mr. Chairman, the test required by this bill to determine whether or not the ship makes 16 knots per hour is a fraud upon its face. The bill says—

That the requirements of this section as to the rates of speed shall be deemed to be complied with if said rates are developed during a trial of four hours' continuous steaming at sea in ordinary weather in water of sufficient depth to make the test a fair and just one.

This provision virtually means that in a calm sea and on a quiet day in the presence of the naval officers there shall be a test made, and any ship that can then and there make 16 knots per hour for four hours will be entitled to a share of this appropriation. One must be silly indeed not to see the fallacy of this provision. If the friends of this measure were dealing honestly with the American public they would provide a system of deduction for every ship that did not make passage from point to point as required at the rate of 16 knots per hour. The railway mail service is required to make the scheduled time or they suffer a deduction from their pay, and why should not mail ships be controlled by the same rule? It does seem that if the necessity for the transmission of mails between this country and the point mentioned in the bill were so eminent and urgent as to necessitate this rape upon the Treasury that it would be a far better policy for the Government to press into service some of our fast-going cruisers that are now rusting, in the time of peace, at the various naval stations of the country.

Mr. Chairman, all the wealth of the Treasury voted into the pockets of the millionaire shipbuilders of America would never replace our lost merchant marine. Ships are built to carry commerce, and without it there can be no merchant marine. Commerce between nations, as between individuals, is created by reciprocal trade benefits. As long as England and Germany make concessions for the South American trade not made by the United States they will dominate and control that trade. In other words, so long as their markets are thrown practically open for all the products of the South American republics, while our doors are locked and barred by protection, they will continue to be masters of that fruitful field of commerce. Nor will the multiplied millions to be spent on the Panama Canal or in fostering this infamous subsidy policy ever change our humiliating commercial exclusion from the markets of our sister republics.

At the close of the Boxer trouble in China, when Russia, Germany, and other nations of Europe wanted to dismember that Empire, President McKinley boldly championed the cause of maintaining the integrity of China and equal trade privileges to all nations. He not only saved the tottering throne of China, but saved us our richest foreign market. Since that remarkable event our cotton-goods trade alone has grown from practically nothing to many millions of dollars, as is shown by the following from the Department of Commerce and Labor:

In manufactured cottons China is by far our largest customer. The total value of all cotton manufactures exported in the fiscal year 1906 was, as above indicated, \$53,000,000. In round terms, of which about thirty millions went to China. Practically all of the cotton goods sent to China were in the form of cloth, the total value of cotton cloths exported to China in the year being \$29,641,188, and of other cotton goods \$172,887. The exports of cotton cloths to China in the fiscal year 1906 exceeded, both in quantity and value, that of any other earlier year, the value in 1906 being about \$2,000,000 greater than in 1905, and the number of yards about 24,000,000 greater than in 1905. China's rank as a purchaser of American cottons is indicated by the fact that of the 711,000,000 yards of cotton cloths exported in 1906, 498,000,000 went to China, while about 133,000,000 yards went to the American countries south of the United States and 25,000,000 to Asia other than China and Oceania.

Would that a few rays of McKinley's wisdom could pierce the brains of the latter-day rulers of his party.

We admire the dashing, wild courage of the powerful man in the White House. We believe that in many respects he is a great President, but we must be permitted to question his wisdom or sincerity in his advocacy of this ship-subsidy measure as well as in his attempted prosecution of the trusts. It does seem that instead of throwing the power of the Executive behind this measure under the guise and pretense of replacing our foreign commerce that he would come to the front and advocate a policy that would open the doors of this country to the markets of South America and the Orient. Such an act on his part would do far more to replace our merchant marine and to reinstate our lost commerce than the expenditure of a hundred millions for ship subsidies.

What assurance does he give this House or the country that our trade will be increased a single dollar when he shall have secured the passage of this, his pet measure, and shall have placed his subsidized mail steamers on the bosom of the ocean? How can he expect to drive England and Germany, the masters of the South American commerce, from that field so long as those people are not permitted to bring their products into our country without paying at least 25 per cent of their value for the privilege of entering, while at the same time they can send them elsewhere free of cost? The President may in some respects be a great man, but he is twenty years behind the masters of his own party. Blaine and others thirty years ago looked across the coming years and prophesied the present conditions in our foreign commerce. Only a few days ago our great Mr. Root waked up from his Rip Van Winkle nap and uttered sentiments in reference to the importance of our commerce with South America which are precisely the same as those given to the world by Blaine thirty-odd years ago.

Why have they slept all these years? Why is it that they now not only want to pass this infamous measure, but they dare to go so far as to favor a maximum and minimum tariff, which we prefer to the system of taxation now in vogue? But this is only another attempt to blind the public. This advanced step has been taken for no other purpose than to appease the wrath of the outraged millions whose products are rotting in the fields and factories for the want of the rich markets of the world long since closed to them by protection.

Mr. Chairman, wherein arises the necessity for this useless expenditure of the people's money? Our foreign commerce has never suffered a day for the want of transportation facilities. Other nations with their ships are ready to handle the small amount of trade we have with the countries mentioned in this bill at much less cost than is proposed by this measure. We propose to donate money enough to build the ships of private citizens and then send them upon the high seas to charge the

same freight rates as are now charged by foreign competitors. In other words, this is another tax placed upon the foreign commerce of the nation—on the cotton, the wheat, and other products shipped abroad.

At the last session the Republicans vied with the Democrats in their efforts for railroad rate legislation, and when the Hepburn bill passed they loudly blew their trumpets in the willing ears of the farmer and other shippers who are being robbed by unjust railroad rates, yet in less than one year from that time they come forth with this measure and propose to make the same classes pay an extra tax of several millions per annum for the privilege of shipping their products abroad. What manner of statesmen compose this party? Has consistency ceased to live within its ranks? Just here let me say that if the party in power desires to really free the people from the burdens resulting from the want of adequate transportation facilities, why does it not do something to relieve the situation on land instead of embarking upon the high seas? Almost every industry is suffering for the want of interstate transportation, the farmers' cotton as well as the manufacturers of lumber, and a great many other industrial enterprises are suffering serious losses for the want of additional cars and railroad trackage. The wheels of commerce are being clogged by the inability of the railroads to handle our increasing freight. New roads should be constructed. Those now built should be double tracked and the rolling stock should be largely increased. Along this line some real good can be done for the people. Why not pass a law compelling the railroads to provide adequate transportation facilities for the commerce of the country? Why not make it possible for them to construct and equip their lines at much less than the present cost by destroying the steel trust, by removing the duty on iron and steel? Next to labor, steel and iron enter more largely into railroad construction and equipment than any other item of cost. Railroads are the largest consumers of iron and steel. The construction of a mile of single-track railway requires 141 tons of rails, weighing 80 pounds to the yard.

Ten years ago these could have been bought for \$17.40 per ton, or \$2,491.75 per mile. The present price is from \$28 to \$30 per ton, or from \$3,948 to \$4,230 per mile. Prices of joints, bolts, spikes, and all other steel used in track construction have gone up in proportion. There is on an average one locomotive for each 4.5 miles of railway line. Ten years ago the average locomotive cost about \$12,000. To-day the average cost is from \$16,000 to \$20,000. Making an allowance for the increase in size, there is an advance of from \$4,000 to \$5,000 on each locomotive, due entirely to the advance in the price of steel made by the steel trust behind the sheltering wall of the Dingley tariff. This amounts to an increase of about \$1,000 per mile in the cost of equipping a railroad. There is one passenger coach for each 5.3 miles of line. The cost per coach has increased about \$3,000, or \$566 per mile, due to the advance in prices of steel and lumber. There are 8.3 freight and company cars, built of steel and wood, per mile of line, costing an average of fully \$450 more per car, or \$3,735 per mile, than ten years ago, making due allowance for the increase in the size of cars.

This marvelous increase in the price of steel is due to the steel trust that is barricaded behind the Dingley tariff law, and it is doing more to retard the industrial development of the country than any other cause. It is an additional tax upon the shippers, not only those of the present time, but those yet to be born. The railroads are constructed by interest-bearing bonds sold upon the markets of the country and which are never paid. The interest thereon becomes a perpetual charge upon the products to be transported. You should not believe for one moment that any part of this extra burden is assumed by the railroads. It is always shifted by them on the people.

But, before returning to my subject, let me conjure my Republican friends to free the people from the clutches of the trusts and railroads before thrusting upon them this ship-subsidy burden.

But it is contended that other nations subsidize their merchant marine and that thereby they have become the commercial mistresses of the world; that means they have appropriated unto themselves the commerce of the world. England, the greatest commercial power on the face of the globe, has acquired her wonderful domination of the world by her open-door policy, and Germany, while a protective nation, has appropriated unto herself the commerce of many of the richest countries of the world by suspending and modifying her tariff policy whenever it interferes with her commercial power.

It takes more than a subsidized merchant marine to make commerce. We annually pay for carrying our ocean mail about \$3,000,000, and no one can say that it has increased our foreign trade. We have paid hundreds of thousands of dollars

annually for sending the mail from San Francisco to Australia, yet our commerce with that country is frightfully insignificant. Germany pays scarcely more than the United States for her ocean mail service, though her commerce is expanding tenfold more rapidly than ours. The same is true with England; while there is France, with her heavily subsidized merchant marine, making less progress in this regard than any other first-class nation. Let me here read an interesting article from the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin about foreign subsidies and their effect upon commerce, since we have heard so much in this debate about the liberal ship-subsidy policy of England, Germany, and France:

The letter from Hamburg which we published yesterday showed conclusively what has been shown many times before, that German shipping owes absolutely nothing to Government subsidies. The only subsidies paid are moderate ones for a mail service to China, Japan, Australia, and the German colonies of Africa, and those have produced little, if any, effect upon trade with those countries and none whatever upon the development of German shipping. Those particular lines of service are not profitable, and the Hamburg-American, the most successful of all German companies, gave it up after a brief trial. We know very well what has not built up German shipping, and now it is more important to know what has done it.

The most important influence is its freedom. German shipowners are free to buy their vessels where they can get them to the best advantage, and German shipbuilders get their materials free of duty. For some years after this policy was adopted the vessels were mostly built in British shipyards, but German capitalists had the enterprise to enter into competition with them, and beginning with repairs and the less important vessels they have built up an industry that vies with that of Great Britain, and first-class steamers are now built in German yards. It is the fruit of energy, skill, and free competition. It is sometimes said that German shipping is favored by lower rates on the Government railroads for commodities intended for export than upon those for domestic markets. The trade upon which it thrives may be favored in that way, but the same discrimination in favor of both exports and imports is shown by railroads in this country. That explains nothing as to the development of shipping.

The most potent influence has been a scientific study of the subject and an unremitting application of enterprise, skill, and managing ability in the shipping trade and in shipbuilding. But a fundamental difference between the conditions in both Germany and Great Britain and those in this country is to be considered as the decisive factor. Owing to the natural resources and relatively undeveloped industrial condition of this country both capital and labor find more profitable fields in internal development and activity. It is that condition that explains the higher wages of labor and the larger profits of capital. In Germany, with a smaller area than Texas and a population equal to more than two-thirds of that of the United States, there is a competition which makes wages, prices, and profits lower, and energy and capital feel the need of extending their energies outside of the borders of the country. There they must compete with others, and this they are able to do by their capacity for the necessary effort and not by the help of the Government at the expense of the people whose work is on shore. In prosecuting their industry on the seas they are ready to do carrying for all nations and to and from all ports at a less cost than that at which it could be done by American capital and labor. That is why they do it and why we let them do it; why, in fact, it is to our advantage to have them do it. There is no need of subsidies to explain the building up of either German or British shipping.

On a former occasion I stated on this floor that the greatest evil following in the wake of protection is the fact that it closed to our increasing products the fruitful markets of the world, and that if we were only permitted to feed and clothe the hungry and naked of the earth we would never be otherwise than prosperous, and since hearing the great debate on this subsidy measure I am more thoroughly convinced of the correctness of my position. It has been conclusively demonstrated that the cotton, corn, and wheat products of the South and West, as well as the manufactures of every section, have so far outstripped home consumption as to produce an alarming condition. These products are in the warehouses decaying for the want of markets. This is a dreadful state of affairs, indeed, and will ultimately result in closing our factories, driving the plowshare from the fields, and turning upon the country an army of begging laborers who now live upon the earnings of their daily toil. It will soon sweep away the wealth of the rich in a panic and bring untold misery to the poor. [Applause.]

In the face of this impending calamity, why not unlock our barred doors to the world, in order to induce the world to consume our great surplus, and thereby make our prosperity as enduring as time itself. Our crops never fail; we can feed and clothe the world and can furnish the machinery for her every industrial enterprise. Yet, in the face of all this, we are "standing pat" by a policy that is intended for no other purpose than to enrich the already rich. The rights of 80,000,000 people, as well as the commercial destiny of the nation, is being sacrificed at the throne of avarice. Can it be that this policy will never change? Will the people never be aroused to the full appreciation of the iniquities of Dingleyism? Will they always be blinded by such paltry subterfuges as this ship-subsidy fraud. May God forbid!

Much success hath made our Republican friends mad, or they would not have attempted this rape upon the rights of the people. Long-continued success has sharpened their avarice to such an extent that they will dare the most grievous political

crime with the apparent innocence of an unsuspecting child. Like the wild Indian hunter of the Andes, who scales the dangerous cliffs and walks upon the brink of the gaping abyss, unconscious of the impending danger, they are boldly rifling the pockets of the masses to swell the coffers of the classes, little realizing how dangerously near they are approaching the pit-fall of political destruction.

Sir, your party has committed many political crimes—you have given the public domain to the railroad corporations; you have subsidized the coal trust with all the coal fields of the people; your vassals have robbed the Treasury of the nation; you have debauched the electorate to acquire the Chief Magistracy of the nation—all of which the people have borne with patriotic patience; but on to-morrow, when your votes are registered in favor of this infamous ship-subsidy steal, you will have sinned against the Holy Ghost and there will be naught left for you to do but to "fold your tents and steal silently away." [Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] wants to offer an amendment in the line of his argument he would offer an amendment not in keeping with that offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER], but an amendment that "nothing in this bill should affect any contract now existing between the United States Government and any line of steamships." The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is to pay this contracting line \$200,000 more than the present contract calls for. If this attempt be based upon the ground that these vessels of this line are 16-knot ships and up-to-date, the reply is that the *Siberia* and the *Manchuria* and the *Korea* in another line are better ships—indefinitely better and faster. If the object be to exempt ships on account of their merits as transportation agencies, those latter ships would be the ones to be excepted; but the object of this amendment is neither what was stated by the gentleman from New York nor what was stated by the gentleman from Ohio.

Whatever its object may be, its effect will be, if adopted, simply to prevent any other line offering to do the work cheaper from getting the work to be done and to forestall in advance the chances of other would-be contracting parties, and to fix it so that the only existing ships upon the Pacific coast that can receive the benefit of the payments under this bill are these three ships mentioned in the amendment. Now, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] really wants to exempt these ships because they now have a contract with the Government and want to be able to carry out that contract, the proper form of the amendment is, as I say, to provide that nothing in this bill shall affect that contract, referring to it specifically in sufficiently specific terms.

Mr. Chairman, one other word. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has just sent a sharp dagger to the very heart of the iniquity and the pretense of this legislation. The pretense of this legislation is to take the money out of the Treasury for the purpose of making up the difference between American sailors' and ship employees' wages and salaries and those paid to foreigners, and the gentleman from Michigan has demonstrated that in the case of this particular line the subsidy already granted absolutely exceeds not only the difference between the wages on these and other ships, if any difference exists, but the entire wage and salary bill of the line.

The gentleman from Michigan produced figures—

Mr. KAHN rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from California can not shake his gory locks at me with the result of putting Banquo down. He must first down the figures furnished by the gentleman from Michigan, and such is my confidence in the gentleman from Michigan that I know he can not do it.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Michigan, as I understood it, simply referred to the wages paid on the ships. Is that the total expense of running a line of steamers?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor did I state it was. I stated that it was greater than the wages, not greater than all the expenses. The gentleman from California seems to want a subsidy equal to all the expenses of owning and operating a ship line.

Mr. KAHN. You said the wages; that is not nearly all. Now, a word as to the two steamers the gentleman from Michigan spoke of. They are the *Mariposa* and *Alameda*. They are 3,000-ton ships. They could not begin to enter this particular service, because they could not make the time. They have not the coal capacity. They can not carry the coal that is required to make the time, and they never have been able to make 16 knots heretofore, and they could not be used for this purpose.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is it true the very ships you have men-

tioned were running from Australia to San Francisco before this contract?

Mr. KAHN. Yes; they made 13 trips a year, and the present ships make 17 trips.

Mr. FORDNEY. That cuts no figure.

Mr. KAHN. It does cut a figure, because the *Mariposa* and the *Alameda* could not make 17 trips per year.

Mr. FORDNEY. They were good enough to run there—

Mr. KAHN. And they made money while they were running. The Oceanic Steamship Company then took this contract, and it has not been able to make a dollar since. In fact, it has lost money constantly ever since then. Now, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that Congress repeatedly has come to the assistance of contractors with the Government where under unforeseen conditions the amount allowed under the contract was found insufficient. Take the case of the Baltimore fire. There was a contractor there who, by reason of that fire, could not meet the conditions of his contract, and then the Government came to his aid and allowed him considerably more than his original contract price in order that he might be able to complete the contract. I merely cite that as an instance.

The gentleman from Michigan has stated that possibly there was some juggling in the management of this company's affairs, so as to make it appear it was insolvent. I resent the imputation. Any man in the State of California who owns a single share in that company—and the stock is worth only \$2 a share—can demand a full investigation of the entire management of the Oceanic Line. They can easily determine whether there is crookedness or manipulation or juggling. On the contrary, I believe that the line has been well managed. It has given a good service to the country, but it has been constantly running behind. It has lost money hand over fist. It owes \$2,000,000 over and above its bond issue and its stock issue—

Mr. WILSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I only have a moment or two, but I will yield.

Mr. WILSON. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question. Is this same line now receiving a subsidy from any other foreign country?

Mr. KAHN. Yes, sir; it is receiving \$75,000 from New Zealand, where prior to the time it built these ships it was receiving \$118,025 a year from the same country for thirteen voyages a year. If it had been paid in the same proportion for seventeen voyages, the company would have received \$154,333 a year as a subsidy; instead of that the New Zealand Government, the moment the company put on these American ships, cut the subsidy down to \$75,000. In brief, the company is now being paid less subsidy for a greatly improved service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 97, noes 108.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KAHN. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 112, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 21, after the word "steamships," insert the words "of the highest American rating known to maritime commerce."

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, in advocacy of the amendment I desire to say, first, that the highest rating known to maritime commerce, as provided in section 4 of the ocean-mail act of March 3, 1891, does not carry out the intention of the proposed amendment in its benefits to American shipping unless the words "American rating" are added, to exclude foreign ratings, especially in the case of Lloyds, which is largely interested in the merchant marine of Great Britain; second, the last paragraph of section 10 of the proposed amendment, providing that "all ordinary repairs or overhauling, etc., shall be made in the United States," would imply American inspection and rating, which condition should also apply to new vessels by the words "American rating;" third, the conversion of vessels into auxiliary cruisers—as mentioned in section 4 of the mail

act of March 3, 1891—according to plans to be agreed upon by owners and the Secretary of the Navy, if rated by a foreign society would give that society the privilege of inspection of such conversion.

I therefore trust that the amendment may be adopted, as I believe it to be necessary to perfect that section and give a proper and efficient rating.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is simply to add the words "of the highest American rating known to maritime commerce." It makes it so that our vessels shall be inspected by our own inspectors and not by foreigners. I believe that the amendment is a good one and I hope the gentleman on the other side will accept it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not rise to oppose the amendment, but I would like to have the gentleman tell the committee what the difference is in the highest rating of the Lloyds standard and that which the gentleman now proposes to put into this bill.

Mr. GOULDEN. I will simply give the third reason that I gave a few moments ago when the gentleman was otherwise engaged.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I was not otherwise engaged.

Mr. GOULDEN. To repeat, the arguments for this are in brief as follows:

First. The highest rating known to maritime commerce, as provided in section 4 of the ocean-mail act of March 3, 1891, does not carry out the intention of the proposed amendment in its benefits to American shipping unless the words "American rating" are added, to exclude foreign ratings, especially in the case of Lloyds, which is largely interested in the merchant marine of Great Britain.

Second. The last paragraph of section 10 of the proposed amendment providing that "All ordinary repairs or overhauling, etc., shall be made in the United States," would imply American inspection and rating, which condition should also apply to new vessels by the words "American rating."

Third. The conversion of vessels into auxiliary cruisers (as amended in section 4 of the mail act of March 3, 1891), according to plans to be agreed upon by owners and the Secretary of the Navy, if rated with a foreign society would give that society the privilege of inspection of such conversion.

Mr. LITTAUER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GOULDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman stated certain matters in relation to the rating. On what authority does he state those as facts?

Mr. GOULDEN. Under the mail act of March 3, 1891, you will find that that is provided for in that act.

Mr. LITTAUER. I appreciate that; but you said that there are certain changes following that. Has not that act worked well in connection with such ships as have taken advantage of it?

Mr. GOULDEN. Not satisfactory; and I think we ought to guard against foreign societies and inspectors who have the privilege of inspecting anything we might convert.

Mr. LITTAUER. Was there any such experience during the Spanish war?

Mr. GOULDEN. I think there was. I can see no harm to the amendment.

Mr. LITTAUER. I do not know that there is any harm in it.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is a good American amendment, and every American should approve of it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You would have two standards of insurance. If you wanted to insure in a British company you would have no standard except the Lloyds standard. If you wanted to insure in an American company, you could not insure under the Lloyds standard. What is the use, unless the gentleman can state that our standard, if we have one—and I do not know that we have—is better than the old standard or is higher or lower or cheaper—some reason besides the mere name?

Mr. GOULDEN. I think our standard is higher, or should be, than the Lloyds standard.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then it would defeat insurance in any of these companies of any other country in the world.

Mr. GOULDEN. No; not necessarily, and aside from that I think we have enough American companies to attend to the business. I would always favor American institutions; and believing this amendment to be along that line, I have introduced it. It is of no personal interest to me, and the committee can do as they see fit with the proposition.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This seems to be in the interest of American ship insurance companies.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is in the interest of American institutions

and in behalf of the American flag, that we are talking about so much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee proceeded to divide.

Mr. GOULDEN. It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that I strike out the word "American."

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. You can not take it out while the vote is being taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York can not do that. If he withdraws the call for the division—

Mr. GOULDEN. I insist on the call for the division.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count, then.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 61, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 4, after the word "prescribe," add "Provided, That no money shall be paid under the provisions of this act to, for, or on account of any vessel operated or owned in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, by or for or in connection with any railroad, railroad corporation, company, or system."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, we could not hear that amendment, and I ask that it be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise for the purpose of considering a conference report.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker 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 S. 529 and had come to no resolution thereon.

RETURN OF BILL TO THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request of the Senate; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 28, 1907.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 8556) to authorize the Pensacola and Northwestern Railroad Company, a corporation existing under the laws of Florida, to construct a bridge over the Escambia River between the counties of Santa Rosa and Escambia, in the State of Florida.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following conference report, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa presents the conference report on the Army appropriation bill, and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 23551) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: On amendment numbered 25 the committee of conference has been unable to agree.

J. A. T. HULL,
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,
JAMES HAY,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
J. B. FORAKER,
JO. C. S. BLACKBURN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read as follows:

STATEMENT.

Conferees report a disagreement on amendment No. 25, which provides for promoting paymasters' clerks to first lieutenantcies in the Army and placing them on the retired list after thirty-five years of service.

J. A. T. HULL,
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I will say that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY], temporarily absent from the Chamber for some reason, I know not what, also agrees with us in this statement, and I want to state to the House that we have had conference after conference in this matter, and we are met with the proposition that the Senate will not recede from its amendment unless the House will agree with an amendment. The provision in the Senate amendment is that any paymaster's clerk who had served thirty-five years in that position should, on reaching that length of service, be commissioned as first lieutenant in the Regular Army and placed upon the retired list with the rank, pay, and allowances of that grade. The House conferees did not believe that upon an Army appropriation bill, or any appropriation bill, civilian employees of the Government should be taken and commissioned in the Army and placed upon the retired list. The House conferees believe that if this Congress or any future Congress desired to deal with the question of a civilian retired list, it ought to be independent of the Army and where all the clerks of all the Departments would be upon an exact equality; so they could not agree to the Senate provision. The Senate conferees did finally agree that if we were willing to adopt this amendment, which I will read to the House, they would agree to this as a change of the language of their amendment:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint E. Russell Mears, now a paymaster's clerk in the Army, who has rendered thirty-eight years' faithful service as such, a first lieutenant, mounted, United States Army, and to place him on the retired list thereof as of that rank.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that to me this would be a vast improvement on the other provision; but on that subject my judgment is the same as that of the other House conferees—that it is not right to take a civilian employee of the Government who had not had Army service and place him, as an officer of the Army, on retired pay for life when he reaches the age of 64 years or after thirty-eight years of service as a civilian employee. Unless some one desires to make a motion or to be heard on the subject—

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand this last proposition is to take a certain civilian clerk, by name, and make him a lieutenant, for the purpose of putting him on the retired list, or, in other words, giving him a pension.

Mr. HULL. No; it is not a pension.

Mr. PAYNE. It amounts to that.

Mr. HULL. It will be more than that.

Mr. PAYNE. It amounts to a large pension, does it not?

Mr. HULL. To an annuity, in the form of retired pay of an officer of the Army.

Mr. PAYNE. An annuity. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed—

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I am not willing for one to yield to any such proposition. It can not be that any legislative branch in this country will hold up a great appropriation bill in an attempt to compel the coordinate legislative branch of the Government to surrender and agree to an annuity to a certain individual, I do not care who that individual may be. For one, I do not propose to be coerced into any such position as that. [Applause.]

If it is in order, I should like to move that the House adhere to its disagreement to this amendment.

Mr. HULL. I propose to make that motion myself in the event of no one presenting any other motion of higher privilege.

Mr. PAYNE. And not ask for a conference.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman's committee has recently reported adversely a bill to place one Daniel Robertson, practically as a second lieutenant in the Army, upon the retired list, after fifty years of service as a hospital steward, or something of that sort.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman right there that personally I believe he ought to be placed on the retired list with the grade of second lieutenant, but the Committee on Military Affairs thought otherwise. Robertson goes on the retired list under law now.

Mr. MANN. The policy of the committee in that case will undoubtedly be adhered to by the House, and that policy is to refuse to place this man, who has been in active service, upon the retired list. So I hope the gentleman will see that a civilian employee is not given any better treatment than this man, who has served for fifty years.

Mr. HULL. I want to say to the gentleman that as far as the conferees are concerned the House must take it out of our hands in order to place clerks on the retired list of the Army.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HAY. I do not want five minutes. I simply want to say that I thoroughly agree with the position of the gentleman from Iowa and that I am unalterably opposed, and I believe this side of the House is unalterably opposed, to beginning a system which means a civil-pension list. [Applause.] That is what this means, and that is all I want to say.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, if no other gentleman desires to speak, I move that the House adhere to its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 25. There is nothing to adopt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the House do adhere to its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 25.

Mr. HULL. And I call for a division, so that we may have a rising vote.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 241, noes none.

The result of the vote was received with applause.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that when the House adheres to its disagreement to an amendment there is no necessity for any further conference?

The SPEAKER. Not at all.

Mr. HULL. I do not ask any.

The SPEAKER. The action of the House would seem to exclude a conference.

HOMER QUICK.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 22210) to correct the military record of Homer Quick, with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. CAPRON. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MONROE STREET NE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 10703) authorizing the extension of Monroe street NE., with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

METROPOLITAN POLICE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 25630) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1901," approved June 8, 1906, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of J. R. Harris, Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

MERCHANT MARINE BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will resume its session.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the merchant marine bill, with Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish briefly to explain the object of this amendment. It has been frequently charged on the floor of the House that the object of this bill was largely to grant a subsidy to Mr. Hill and Mr. Harriman. We have already adopted an amendment that excludes any but American ships hereafter built, and I want now to have this amendment made so that it will be impossible not only to use the ships that Hill and Harriman and other railway corporations now have, but such as may hereafter be built to run in connection with railroads.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in what he said a while ago, that it did not make any difference what ships carried our mail so long as they performed the

service. But there seems to be in this House, among certain Members, an idea that if this bill is passed it will inure to certain corporations, and what I desire to do is to make it impossible for that thing to happen, in order that when we come to the Pacific lines we may be able to keep a few ships on that ocean, at least, to run to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington if he does not think his amendment goes farther than that? Does he not think that it would preclude railroad corporations and shipping corporations from making a contract for freight—say from Chicago to Yokohama—over the two lines when he cuts off all connection and business relations between railroad corporations and shipowners?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not think the amendment goes that far. If the railways shipped freight to San Francisco and an independent ship, owned by an independent company, received it, I do not believe that such ship would be a ship operating for the railroad within the meaning of the proposed amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. No; but they make a freight rate from Chicago through to Yokohama, and any amendment that would cut that off ought to be avoided. It is for the interest of commerce, the interest of the country that that thing should be continued. I think the gentleman's amendment cuts it off. It goes too far. I think enough has been done already to cut off these companies and all fear and apprehension on the part of any Member of the House; and I think that there can be no question about the construction of the bill under the amendments that have been made. I am afraid that the amendment of the gentleman from Washington goes so far as to cut off that class of contracts which ought to be encouraged.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I had no desire to do that. I gave the most careful consideration to this amendment. I don't think it is open to the objection that the gentleman from New York makes. I did not intend to restrict through freight rates or work any hardship on commerce.

Mr. PAYNE. I remember in the gentleman's amendment the words "in connection with any railroad."

Mr. MINOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Washington and to this House that more than twenty times, on different occasions and at different places, the vice-president of the Pacific Mail Line and general manager, one and the same, told me that under no circumstances would his company consider a mail subsidy for that line unless it provided for twelve hundred thousand dollars, and I told him he couldn't have it, and that ended it.

Mr. POLLARD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. POLLARD. I would like to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise to oppose the amendment?

Mr. POLLARD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, in my time I would like to have the pending amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection; and the Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. POLLARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, the wording of that amendment is such that it certainly will make it utterly impossible to bill goods through from Chicago or any other port of origin in the United States to a point in Australia, Hawaii, or any other port in the Pacific Ocean. It seems to me the committee does not desire to amend the bill in that way. All we want to do is to so amend the bill that these great railroad magnates can not own and operate these mail lines. I have an amendment here that is very simple that does that and has nothing whatever to do or no connection whatever with through billing, and that certainly ought not to be interfered with. I will read the amendment, which I shall offer if this amendment is voted down. It is as follows:

Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be made available for any person or any corporation, joint stock company, or association that has among its stockholders, directors, or officers any person that is now or may become at any future time an officer or director in a railroad company.

That, Mr. Chairman, meets the same objection, and it does not prevent through contracts.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to the amendment. Let me say to the House that at the present time the Great Northern Steamship Company, which company owns the *Minnesota* and the *Dakota*, known as the Hill Line, running from Puget Sound to the Orient, and the

Pacific Mail Steamship Company, now operating a line from San Francisco to the Orient, have the best ships sailing on the Pacific Ocean, and if this amendment prevails and this bill becomes a law those ships will be excluded from any benefit under this measure. Those ships are running to-day and running without a subsidy, carrying United States mails to the Orient.

Mr. WATSON. Will my friend point out to me how they could take advantage of it anyway? We have already excluded all existing ships.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I know so far as that amendment is concerned that it will amount to a fly speck on the map of the world. It will be wiped out when we go into the House and get the yeas and nays. There is no doubt of that. Those lines would be excluded from any benefits under this measure. Those lines are running to-day and carrying United States mails, and last year carried 140 shipments of mails from the Pacific Coast to the Orient. There is no reason why the Great Northern Steamship Company, owned directly or indirectly by the Great Northern Railroad, or the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, owned or controlled by the Southern Pacific, should not carry United States mails if they would do it as cheaply as any other company; no reason in the world why a wealthy corporation or a wealthy man should not receive consideration at our hands just the same as any other party.

A few minutes ago the gentleman disputed the correctness of my statement about certain fast ships of certain speed. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company—and I have the record here—has five fast ships. There are thirty-eight American ships in existence on salt water to-day that have a speed of 16 knots or more. I have the names of the company and the number of ships owned by each company.

Mr. LITTAUER. Thirty-eight ships on salt water?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; of 16 knots or more. I will give you the names of the companies and the number of ships. The International Mercantile and Marine Company has six. The New England Navigation Company has four. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company has five. The New York and Cuban Mail Steamship Company has five. The Hudson Navigation Company has two. The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, one. The Oceanic Steamship Company, five. The Metropolitan Steamship Company, one. The New York and Texas Steamship Company, one. The Merchant and Marine Transportation Company, four. C. H. Mallory & Co., one. The Maine Steamship Company, two. There may be a few of those ships that are not on salt water, but the records of Lloyds gives them there. I took the last and most official statement of it, the insurance company's statement, giving the home office of the company and the name of the ship and the owners, and I say that they would be excluded under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. POLLARD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. TOWNSEND. To offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. POLLARD. To offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the members of the committee to offer an amendment first.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "that," in line 13, page 15, and insert the following:

"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 fisheries of the United States, including the coastwise trade of the Atlantic and Pacific and the Great Lakes, such officers, petty officers, and men as may be capable of rendering services as members of a naval reserve, 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. They shall also possess such qualifications, receive such instructions, and be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon proper audit by the Auditor for the Navy Department, 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, petty officer, or man thus enrolled and employed in the merchant marine or fisheries, including the coastwise trade of the Atlantic and Pacific and the Great Lakes 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; for each seaman, first class, \$36; for each seaman, second class, \$30; for each seaman, third class, \$24. Such retainer shall be paid at the end of each year of service on certificate, by the Secretary of the Navy, that the member of the Naval Reserve has satisfactorily complied with the regulations, and on certificate by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor 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. The total number of officers, petty officers, and men enrolled in the Naval Reserve shall not at any time exceed 10,000.

"Sec. 2. That in the interest of the national defense and for the performance of the public services hereinafter specified, after July 1, 1907, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, subject to the provisions of this act, out of any money in the Treasury, to be annually appropriated therefor, upon estimates to be annually submitted to Congress in the Book of Estimates, to the owner or owners of any steam vessel of over 1,000 gross tons, and of any sail vessel of over 200 gross tons, hereafter built and registered in the United States or now duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens any corporation created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof, engaged exclusively as a common carrier for the service of the public, subventions as hereinafter provided—that is to say, (a) the sum of \$5 per gross registered ton for each vessel which has been engaged in the foreign trade by sea or the deep-sea fisheries for a period of twelve months, including time necessarily consumed in receiving or discharging cargo, or not to exceed two months in making annual or extraordinary repairs; (b) the sum of \$4 per gross registered ton for each vessel which, during any twelve consecutive months has been engaged in the foreign trade, by sea or the deep-sea fisheries for a period of nine months or over, but less than twelve months, including time necessarily consumed in receiving or discharging cargo, or not to exceed one month in making extraordinary repairs; (c) the sum of \$2.50 per gross registered ton for each vessel which during any twelve consecutive months has been engaged in the foreign trade by sea or the deep-sea fisheries for a period of six months or over, but less than nine months, including time necessarily consumed in receiving or discharging cargo, or not to exceed one month in making extraordinary repairs.

"A vessel receiving a subvention under this section shall not receive any other subvention, subsidy, or bounty from the Treasury of the United States.

"Sec. 3. That before receiving any subvention under the provisions of section 2 of this act the owner or owners of any vessel shall contract, in writing, with sufficient sureties, with the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to fulfill each and all of the following obligations:

"First. 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. And if there shall be a disagreement as to such fair actual value or fair rate of hire between the United States and the owner or owners of such vessel, 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 by two impartial appraisers, one to be appointed by each of said parties, they to select a third, who shall act in such appraisal in case the two shall fail to agree, and the provisions of this subdivision shall be embodied in every contract between the vessel owner or owners and the United States.

"Second. That said vessel shall carry free of charge the mails of the United States, when the Postmaster-General shall so require, for the whole or any part of a voyage for which subvention shall be claimed.

"Third. That a vessel employed in the foreign trade shall maintain during the period so employed at least class A1 if a steam vessel, and class A1½ if a sail vessel, as such classes are now established by either the Record of American and Foreign Shipping or the United States Standard Owners, Builders, and Underwriters' Association, or equivalent classification in any other register of shipping of at least equal merit.

"Fourth. That all ordinary repair or overhauling of said vessel shall be made in the United States, except in cases where dry docking is necessary and no American dry dock of sufficient capacity shall be within a distance of 500 miles of the location of the ship when the repairs shall be needed.

"Sec. 4. That the contracts provided for in section 3 shall be for a period of one year and shall be renewed from time to time. At the expiration of each annual contract the owner of the vessel shall be required to prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, in such manner as the said Secretary shall prescribe, that its obligations, each and all, have been satisfactorily complied with. The Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of subvention to which said owner shall be entitled in fulfillment of said contract and of the provisions of this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury upon proper audit shall thereupon pay the subvention due.

"Sec. 5. The subventions provided for in this act shall apply exclusively and be paid to the owner or owners of vessels engaged in foreign trade between ports in the United States and ports in South America.

"Sec. 6. That this act shall take effect on July 1, 1907.

"Sec. 7. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, in whole or in part, whenever in its judgment the public interests shall so require, without, however, impairing in any wise the obligation of any specific contract then in force which shall have been entered into under the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this act."

During the reading of the amendment the following occurred:

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand the Clerk is reading section 3 of the bill. We have not yet reached section 2 nor finished with section 1. Do I understand it is in order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reading an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan

Mr. SHERLEY. But, as I understand, the amendment relates to section 3 of the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands, if the gentleman from Kentucky will permit, that this proposition covers all propositions in this bill, and that the gentleman from Michigan offers this as an amendment to the first section, giving notice as he will, that if it is adopted he will move to strike out the other sections of the bill as they are reached.

Mr. SHERLEY. I asked in order to understand this did not preclude further amendments to the first section.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this amendment that it is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that if the amendment is germane either to the substitute amendment or to the Senate bill it is in order, and the Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in support of the amendment a few minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan. The Chair states, however, that this amendment will be held pending, and the question will not be put to it until all amendments have been passed upon which are offered to perfect the proposition.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, then, will be in order to be discussed after all other amendments have been passed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, at the end of line 8, insert:

"Provided, That subject to the foregoing provision every contract hereunder shall be awarded to that responsible bidder who will contract, under penalties prescribed by the Postmaster-General, for the highest running speed between the points named in this contract."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested upon the floor yesterday that although this bill provides for 16 and 14 knot ships, there is no provision in the bill binding the companies taking these contracts to operate these ships at the speed they are capable of. The object of this amendment is twofold. It is to get the highest possible speed, even if the contract be let for 16 or 14 knot ships, as provided in the bill, and, if possible, to secure bids for even more speedy vessels than those at the same price. It simply applies a rule now in use with reference to the railway mail. Between the city of Chicago and the Missouri River, where I live, there are six trunk lines of railroads. The Government does not offer any price above the regular one for fast mail service over those roads, but it lets the contract for the through mail to that road that will contract to carry it in the shortest time, and this amendment simply provides that, subject to all the foregoing provisions, the contract shall be let to that responsible bidder who will bind himself to give to the Government the highest speed between the points named in the contract.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will say to the gentleman I am decidedly in favor of this amendment, unless there is a defect about it, which I know the gentleman will understand. Is it so guarded in its language that a contract might be given to a bid that was not the highest rate of speed? May there not be other conditions that would be indispensable to the safe carrying of mail that might be overlooked for the mere question of speed?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think not; because it provides that it must be subject to all of the foregoing provisions. I feel confident the committee has safeguarded the matter in that respect.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman thinks that would protect it from the mere question of speed alone?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I inserted it deliberately with that purpose in mind.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have not any objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to recognize a gentleman to speak in opposition to it.

Mr. GILL. No; I desire to speak in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize some one who

desires to speak in opposition to the amendment, if there be such a Member.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to furnish the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 1462) to establish one more fish-cultural station on Puget Sound, State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 91. Joint resolution adjusting the status of certain officers of the Army as to their period of service, required by the act of Congress approved June 30, 1882, to entitle an Army officer to retirement on his own application;

S. 8583. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Calboun Falls;

S. 8584. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Hattons Ford;

S. 8581. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Trotters shoals;

S. 8580. An act granting land to Anna Johnson;

S. 8572. An act permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Andersonville shoals; and

S. 7382. An act to encourage the holding of an Alaska-Yukon-Pacific exposition at the city of Seattle, State of Washington, in the year 1909.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 25 to the bill (H. R. 23551) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

Also:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return the bill (S. 6078) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah B. Hudson."

SUBSIDY BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire, as a part of my remarks and in my time, to have read an amendment which I had prepared and proposed to offer to this section of the bill, covering in part the proposition contained in the amendment now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read for the information of the committee:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all after the figure "10," in line 18, page 15, of the bill, up to and including the word "prescribe," in line 4, page 16, and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to advertise for proposals by any citizen or citizens of the United States for the carrying of mails on steamships hereafter built in the United States and registered in the United States, and the Postmaster-General shall contract for the carrying of mails, as hereinafter provided, with the citizen or citizens of the United States who shall offer in his or their bid the most expeditious service at the lowest cost to the Government for the carrying of mails to such ports in foreign countries as are hereinafter set forth; and said contract shall not be made to cover a longer period than five years.

Mr. GILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in this bill as it has been presented to this House by the committee it is absolutely in the hands of the Attorney-General to award the respective contracts provided for in this bill to any citizen or citizens or corporation or corporations that the Postmaster-General may prefer.

Now, I do not desire to say that the Postmaster-General in dealing with this matter will bestow these contracts unfairly, but I do say that the opportunity is open to the Postmaster-General. And I do say—and I am sure it is known to every Member of this House—that importunity will be made to the Postmaster-General to give these contracts to certain existing corporations controlling, at least on the Atlantic coast, all the vessels that we now have engaged in foreign trade, and owning, I may say, almost all the steam vessels engaged in our home trade.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I say, this bill leaves this matter open

to the Postmaster-General to prefer an individual or to prefer a corporation

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. BURTON of Ohio and Mr. SULZER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask my friend whether or not he proposes to talk on the general subject or to confine himself to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I desire to speak upon the general subject of subsidy, a question immediately raised by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
Mr. WATSON. I shall not object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the request, Mr. Chairman?
The CHAIRMAN. The request is that the gentleman from Ohio have fifteen minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for fifteen minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the idea of subsidy or any bounty or subvention for the support of private enterprise is repugnant to the great majority of our citizens. We are becoming the industrial sovereigns of the earth, and this position is due to our unparalleled advantages and to the force of individual initiative and energy. On the subject of subsidy that great Republican leader, President Garfield, said in some remarks in this House in 1870:

There is one feature of this bill, the subsidy provision, which is odious to the American people. It is a feature, I think, which no man in the House—certainly no Representative of an inland district—can support and sustain himself before his constituents.

The argument is made to Republicans that such a measure as this is in line with a protective tariff. I deny it. In the first place, there is the essential distinction that while a tariff brings money into the Public Treasury a subsidy pays it out. [Applause.] Then there is a stronger distinction in the very nature of the case. You can build a wall around a country; you can enforce any kind of a domestic policy; you may levy a tariff in figures so great as to be prohibitive, but you can not exercise any such control over all the seas. There competition is unlimited and fitness and cheapness must prevail. We may cite Byron's apostrophe to the ocean:

Man's control
Stops with the shore.

So there is no reason why one who favors a protective tariff should favor such a bill as this. Let us note another essential distinction.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. Is it not a fundamental principle of the protective-tariff system of the United States that our nation should make everything, produce everything that its climate, its soil, its genius, its natural resources, and its capital will enable it to make?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. No; and I will go right on with that now.

It is conceded that this measure is for the purpose of making up a difference in the cost of construction and operation of ships, which will continue for all time. It may be remarked incidentally that it will not make transportation cheaper. You can not ship a bushel of wheat or a ton of iron for any less under this subsidy bill than you can now. You simply make a new class of ships, manned and owned by Americans, and bring them into the field of competition.

Now, my theory of the American protective tariff is not that it causes us to enter into competition for all time where we will be at a disadvantage. A nation would be, if not bankrupted, greatly hampered by such a policy. What has been the result of our protective tariff? It has created two sources of supply where only one existed before. It has enabled us to develop the capabilities of our people and to enjoy the wealth of all our latent resources. What has followed? In the majority of the items included in our tariff schedules the prices have lowered and employment has been increased. Particularly is this true in the cases of iron and steel. How is it with your

shipping? Can American ingenuity make it any easier to climb a rope; can American invention diminish the cost of handling and repairing ships? There is no analogy between these items in a protective tariff and shipping. I want to say that I should not be in favor, and I do not believe this House would be in favor, of continuing a tariff for all time on articles where there is to be a perpetual disadvantage in competition with other countries. True, in our tariff schedules there are items which have been included as a matter of compromise and some a matter of experiment, where the prices are made higher and continue higher than they were before, but not as in the case of shipping.

I desire to say a word just here about a misapprehension that has gone abroad. That is that foreign shipping is built by subventions and subsidies. That is absolutely not correct. What does England pay for? For fast service for mail and for a naval auxiliary. The great body of her commerce is carried by her tramp steamships, and, in the language of one of their owners, these steamships receive no more subsidy or help from the national treasury than the outcast human beings from whom they are named. How about the German shipping? In Germany there are two great lines—the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg-American Line. The North German Lloyd receives a subsidy, the Hamburg-American Line does not; and yet it is the more prosperous and pays the larger dividends of the two. How, in the face of that, can you say that the merchant marine of Germany has been built up by subsidies? And you will find the world over that gain in merchant marine and the ownership of ships is not due to subsidies, but to some collateral fact, such as an increase in wealth or products for sale or in the interest or preferences of the people. One of the witnesses before the British commission said, in respect to the German merchant marine: "I think the interest taken in shipping in Germany, from the Emperor down, has done more to stimulate it to action and success than subsidies. This help is moral rather than material." And so elsewhere success has not been dependent upon subventions.

These do not cause a healthy plant to grow. Our own experience in this country in the matter of subsidies has not been free from failure on the part of those who have taken advantage of them, or free from corruption in the relations between the Government and those who desired them. In dwelling upon reasons why we have not more vessels in the merchant marine of this country, if I had more time I would like to go more into the detail. Some say it is due to our protective tariff because our vessels have no return cargoes. But whatever may be the importance of this cause, it is very small in comparison with certain other disadvantages which exist in the very nature of the case. In the first place, the products of our country are largely raw material, and the outgoing cargoes are much heavier than the incoming. I have prepared some figures on this, and I find that even in the port of New York, the great import harbor of our country, the weight of the outgoing cargoes exceeds by a million tons those which come in.

When we come to Galveston, the weight of the exports is twenty-four times that of the imports. From Savannah, the value of the exports is thirty-five times that of the imports.

I will insert a table comparing tonnage or values at leading ports.

Tonnage or value of freight entering and clearing at leading ports.

	Imports.	Exports.
New York, year ending June 30, 1906.....tons..	4,160,000	5,206,000
Boston, calendar year 1905.....do....	974,712	1,294,815
Philadelphia, calendar year 1905.....do....	1,365,245	3,267,439
New Orleans, calendar year 1905.....do....	633,131	2,155,143
Baltimore, year ending June 30, 1906.....value..	\$30,655,000	\$109,801,000
Galveston, year ending June 30, 1906.....tons..	57,966	1,433,641
Savannah, calendar year 1905.....value..	\$1,706,000	\$62,546,000

Now, it is desirable in all kinds of transportation that the freight carried both ways should be as nearly as possible equal; but just so long as conditions are as they now are we shall labor under this disadvantage of inequality in shipments. What would be the result of a subsidy the purpose of which is that some may go under the American flag? Those American ships that did not receive the subsidy would be placed at a disadvantage. The foreign tramp steamer would turn aside in many of its trips from our country and go from England, France, or Germany, not to the United States, but to the Argentine Republic or some other place where it could obtain charters more advantageously.

Then there is another disadvantage of the American merchant

marine. The cargoes are not so varied. The demand is not so great as in western and northwestern Europe, where there is a constant demand, where there are all the routes to the Mediterranean, to the Black Sea, to the Orient, to South America, and to the Cape, as against the more limited routes of commerce in this country. This advantage makes it possible for boats to receive quicker employment.

I desire to say, in regard to a subsidy or any treatment of the American merchant marine, that the question is so complicated with other problems—railroad rates on products to the seaboard for export, port dues, tariff regulations of the different nations, banking facilities, the existence of agencies abroad for the selling of goods, and you may add, as a general term, the preferences and affiliations of the people with whom we are to deal, so that a subsidy alone is not going to restore or build up trade. There must be intelligent and effective treatment of all these other questions. And we should bear in mind the general principle, the possession of commodities for sale precedes shipping, not shipping the possession of commodities for sale. When there is anything to sell, boats can be found to carry it. Why, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] called attention forcibly yesterday to the place where there is trouble in the carrying of freight. It is on land. Is there anyone who has to wait long for a boat to carry his product over the sea? That is not where American commerce is handicapped. It is by the patent insufficiency of our facilities for the carrying of the freight on land between the different portions of our country.

Now, I must in the brief time allotted to me pass by quite a number of things that I should like to mention. What is the real reason for the decadence of our merchant marine? In the first place, the tastes of our people are not in that direction. In Norway, in England, in Germany, generation after generation follow the sea. In this country the son of a sailor wants to study law or go into some profession. The life of a sailor is to most of our people an employment of drudgery and danger. Why is it that investments are not in that direction? Because there is such an infinite variety of opportunities for enterprise on the land which are more attractive and profitable than investments in shipping. We have here this great empire lying before us. When the pioneer shall have spread over all these millions of acres, when every valley shall have been exploited, and factories shall have crowned every hill, American enterprise will turn toward the sea. And it will not wait until then. It will look in that direction long before; but just at present, with higher profits and that which is more congenial and to which our people are more accustomed, there is an absorbing interest in investments upon the land.

The substantial rehabilitation of our merchant marine will come when our investors desire to invest in ships and when our people desire to man them. Some say that is waiting a long time. But must we pay from the Public Treasury an amount to make that business profitable toward which the enterprises of the people and their preferences do not tend? Why, in the old days in Maine and in the coast towns of New England the sea kings sailed all over the globe. Our shipping was upon every sea; but that was before the day of the great inland development of the country, and we are now engaged in that development, a development which is the marvel of the world and will continue to be the marvel of the world more and more in the future.

Let us notice that under all these so-called "subsidy bills" the sailors must, the majority of them, be natives or citizens of the United States. How would we get along in our steel mills if it was provided that the employees should all be natives or citizens of the United States? I have forgotten the exact phraseology of the bill in its requirements.

Mr. MANN. Natives or naturalized.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Natives or naturalized. You are nationalizing this industry by this bill. You are putting it under a handicap that other lines of industry would not endure for a year.

There is an argument in favor of the desirability of having a reserve for time of war, but I call your attention to one or two things—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I thank the House for its courtesy. [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] may have fifteen minutes in which to reply to his colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, it is no serious charge against a public man that he has changed front and gone over from the position he has heretofore advocated and become a zealous devotee and promoter of the very sentiments which he fought in years gone by. Mr. Gladstone did that and Calhoun was a protectionist when Webster was a free trader, and Webster was a protectionist when Calhoun became a free trader.

I want to call the attention of the committee now to a condition that happened in the House of Representatives in the Fifty-first Congress. We had on that occasion a postal subsidy bill. I have a copy of it in my hand, and I will put it in my speech. It is identical in principle and nearly identical in every respect with the bill now under consideration.

That postage bill would have worked out precisely the results of this bill, except that this bill is highly conservative in its character, in that this bill limits the Postmaster-General to certain specified postal lines which we put into the bill itself, thereby retaining in Congress the control of the expenditure of the money. That bill was a broad, sweeping authority to the Postmaster-General to make any number of contracts to carry the mail anywhere on earth.

The bill, after its passage in the Senate of the United States, came into the House of Representatives on the 27th of February, in the year 1891. The bill was very bitterly fought on the floor of the House. Party lines were not adhered to in their entirety, and there was a decided division between the radical supporters of the bill and gentlemen who were seeking a modification of its terms and ultimately to cripple and possibly to destroy the bill.

One of the gentlemen who was prominent in opposition to that bill was the now distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives. He sought to bring about certain changes in the bill, which were at last adopted, and then the present Speaker of the House voted for the bill.

I have not time in fifteen minutes to do more than to state how my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and myself stood on that important question at that very important epoch in his career.

I will cite gentlemen of the House who wish to verify my statements to page 3501 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February, 1891. I have this to say, that attack after attack was made on the bill in the form, first, of amendments of the bill—amendments that were in their nature calculated to impair the efficiency and make a very radical bill less effective and more conservative. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and myself had great pleasure, as we have now, to be colleagues, and with about the same amount of Congressional experience. We voted side by side with the radical element in favor of the Senate bill without amendment, a complete subsidy bill, as I have stated. We voted for the bill every step of the way, and I cite page after page showing that the yeas and nays were called over and over again, and among the supporters of the bill you will find the name of Mr. GROSVENOR every time except one, which I will directly refer to.

The bill was finally amended on an arrangement—I should say conspiracy—formed by the now Speaker of the House, which, in my judgment, impaired its efficiency, but it did not deteriorate one particle the zeal of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] for the support of it, and when, upon the last issue, a final vote was taken upon the passage of the bill, I refused to vote for it, because of what I believed was damage done to the bill by amendment, but my friend from Ohio, so intent was he in favor of subsidy of mail lines all over this country, everywhere, without restriction in price or anything else, except the price in mileage, that he even voted for the bill and aided in its passage when I couldn't stand it. [Laughter and applause.]

I shall put the bill itself in the RECORD, and the gentleman will find when he puts in a double column for comparison the Senate bill that we had under consideration and the bill which we now have under consideration that this is a bill of marked conservatism as compared with the radicalism of that bill.

The bill finally went to the committee of conference, and then the question, of course, of opposition on concurrence was lost sight of, so far as the RECORD discloses.

Now, I do not do this at all to militate against the distinguished ability and statesmanship of my distinguished colleague. He is a man who when he studies a thing gets to the bottom of it pretty successfully. Certainly no man has ever conquered the troubles of the river and harbor bill as he has since I have been in Congress. [Applause.] But the trouble about it is that somewhere, some place along the line he did not change his position upon details, but seems to have changed his position upon the principles that underlie the whole proposition. And certainly I think he ought to be able to explain to us where it

was, when it was, and how it was. The law of 1891 went into effect. It was a law that had been advocated by Democrats as well as by Republicans. It was a law voted for by Democrats as well as Republicans. It was a law that was administered by Democrats as well as Republicans. It was a law that was not attacked in the Cleveland Administration. In eight years of the service of that distinguished President of the United States no attack was made upon this law, and now what have we here? Every principle of that law is maintained in the bill at bar. Every underlying principle is here, and the only question is—and not anything else involved—shall we extend to certain places the operation of the law now on the statute books, and I wish the gentleman would tell me how it was that he could vote for the radical bill of 1891, but can not support the bill of 1907? [Applause.]

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. May I speak now, Mr. Chairman, for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. For how long a time?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. For five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that his colleague may be permitted to speak for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my colleague has overlooked the fact that my remarks were addressed to the general principle of subsidy, and were immediately called out and were pertinent here because of the offering of an amendment by the gentleman from Michigan, which provided for a tonnage subsidy. In the next place, it is true that I did vote some sixteen years ago with my colleague for this bill allowing compensation to the mail lines under which mail lines had been created. That law is in force now. But to turn aside from subsidy tonnage provision to the mail provision, which immediately called out my remarks, I would point out the difference between that bill and this. We have a contract here with one of the lines, and it is proposed to cancel that contract—a contract in force until 1912—just as valid a contract as the Government of the United States or any individual could make. What are you proposing to do in this bill? To let the contractees get out of that contract because, forsooth, it is said here that they can not make money on it. [Applause.] That is your bill.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I have not the greatest respect for that continuity which would make a man vote, act, and think in 1907 as in 1891. [Applause and laughter.] I sincerely hope, however much I may be in error, that I have learned something since then. Consistency is a jewel valuable rather because of its rarity than by reason of its intrinsic value. I have little respect for the man who would vote in some way in 1907 because he voted so in 1891, sixteen years ago. His motto would be, "I think that I thought in 1891," or, "In 1891 I thought that I was thinking." [Laughter and applause.] Well, if you think you were thinking in 1891, why should you not put that same thinking cap on in 1907 and endeavor to arrive at correct conclusions? If the world stands by the men that are consistent alone, I am afraid it will stand by many wrong and unprogressive things. It had better stand by those who look onward, who are progressive, who have no pride of opinion, who, when they realize that they were wrong yesterday or ten or twenty years ago, will to-day change their minds and do something else. [Applause.] To those who have the opposite opinion there should be a monument reared, even while they live, and on it should be carved these words:

"Sacred to the men who were consistent. They always lived lives in which they were consistent.

"They were long on consistency, but short on wisdom." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, in order to ascertain the gentleman's position—and I am entirely sincere about it, because I would really like to know where the gentleman stands on this bill—I will ask him a question, and perhaps involved in that may be two other questions. The gentleman has stated that he had addressed his former remarks to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], which was a tonnage subsidy proposition. In answer to the question that he did not like the pending measure, he was stating that we were seeking to cancel an existing contract now in operation under its provision. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not if the oriental lines were stricken out he would be in favor of the South American propositions in this bill?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I do not wish to answer those questions until those paragraphs are reached. I regard them as far less objectionable than a tonnage subsidy, and if from the

wreck of this bill something can be retained which would do good to the country I would certainly join in voting for it. I would not want to be understood as bringing forward any such proposition, but if it is not a subsidy in disguise, if it is not an entering wedge for subsidy, if it is not virtually to benefit the shipbuilders, if it is intended for legitimate mail service and for improving such communications as are incidental to the mail service, I shall not oppose it. That I will say to the gentleman right now. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNSEND rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on pages 17 and 18 of the bill, the paragraphs marked fifth and sixth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pages 17 and 18, strike out paragraphs fifth and sixth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet addressing the Chair. I desire to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is not much that I can say more than has been said, but I desire to call attention—

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that we have just voted upon this motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan was on his feet desiring recognition, and the Chair will hear him.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this amendment proposes to strike out of the bill the two provisions for the oriental lines. I believe it has already been demonstrated to the committee that these two provisions are the most objectionable ones in the bill. The trouble which gentlemen have had in trying to amend the first paragraph of the bill indicates some of the difficulties that they themselves encounter. The reason why I do not object so much to the provision as to the South American lines, as amended by the gentleman from Iowa, is because we have had recently called to our attention by the Secretary of State reasons why such a provision might bring some benefit to the country. But there are others. I realize that our policy known as the "Monroe doctrine," which imposes upon us the practical duty of preserving the integrity, so far as foreign interposition is concerned, of the states of South America perhaps will be somewhat aided by a closer communication if it can be brought about in this way between the United States and South American countries. We are building the Panama Canal. We are close to South America at the present time. Furthermore, I believe that it is well now for us to go slowly in this matter of subsidies, because calling them by any other name does not change the situation, and the gentlemen of this House while arguing for a purely mail subsidy are insisting that the principal object is that of trade and that is to be accomplished through this method called a mail subsidy or subvention.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that by bringing this amendment up at this time we can get directly at the very meat of the matter and determine whether those who favor any kind of a subsidy are of a sufficient number to pass any bill at all. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have brought this amendment up at this time, thinking that we can possibly adopt the provisions relative to the Pacific and Atlantic lines in connection with South America and eliminate the question which prevents so many of us from supporting the bill as a whole.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, personally I favor the striking out of the fifth paragraph and oppose the striking out of the sixth. I therefore demand a division of the question and a submission of the motion to strike out separately as to the two paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will be divided.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent to include in my amendment paragraph 7 also? I had intended to strike out all of the oriental lines, and supposed that I had done so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment so as to include paragraph 7.

Mr. KAHN. I object.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope that will not be objected to, because we can have a vote on each one—

Mr. KAHN. But we want to discuss them separately.

Mr. PARKER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKER. I desire to know if the gentleman desires to strike out all of paragraph 7 down to the end of the section, or only that part down to the proviso?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair can not answer that.

Mr. PARKER. Then I will ask the gentleman.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I desire to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman to oppose the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think this committee ought to realize what is or ought to be the condition if the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan should prevail. If this bill should pass with that amendment striking out the trans-Pacific lines, there will yet be left in the bill two lines from the Atlantic to the eastern coast of South America and two lines from the Gulf to the north and east coast of South America and one line along the western coast of South America. I know that it is the purpose of the amendment and of many Members upon this floor to provide two lines to South America alone, but in so doing we ought to realize exactly what will be accomplished. The reason for the passage of any bill upon this subject would be, as has been often said on this floor, to extend our lines of foreign communications under our own flag, to extend our own foreign trade, to extend our political influence, and to provide for the national defense by sea.

With these important propositions in mind I think this committee and the House ought to compare conditions as to these matters which would prevail under such a bill confined alone to South America with conditions prevailing upon the Pacific Ocean. First, as to the means of communication between the Atlantic ports and the east coast of South America. I hold here in my hand a list of vessels plying during the last year between the port of New York alone and the east coast of South America. There were more than 170 trips made in eleven months of last year. They are clipped from the issue of Thursday, December 6, 1906, of the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin:

NO LACK OF VESSELS FOR SOUTH AMERICA—RECORD SHOWS SAILINGS OF MORE THAN FOUR PER WEEK—THESE FIGURES ARE FOR THE EAST COAST OF SOUTH AMERICA ONLY—THE TONNAGE OF VESSELS EMPLOYED AVERAGES ABOUT 4,500 TONS AND RUNS AS HIGH AS 10,000 TONS—ABOUT 170 SAILINGS SHOWN IN ELEVEN MONTHS.

Since the revival of the subsidy agitation at Washington one of the favorite arguments in its support has been that of insufficient sailing opportunities. To show the facts of the case, a complete list of sailings from the port of New York to Brazilian and River Plate ports has been prepared by the Maritime Association of this city. The list is appended below and suggests no lack of tonnage. It gives the date of sailing, the name of the vessel, the destination, and the agent of each vessel sailing between January 1 and November 30, 1906. It also shows that during the eleven months there have been 170 sailings between the ports in question, or at the rate of about four per week. The tonnage of these ships averages 4,500 tons, and in some instances is as high as 10,000 tons.

This list of sailings covers the bulk of our traffic with ports on the east coast of South America. It does not, however, include the whole trade, but only, as above said, the Brazilian and River Plate ports. There are also a number of additional sailings to the east coast of South America from the Gulf ports, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Boston not given in this list. The following is the list in detail:

JANUARY.

3. *Sierra Blanca* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
4. *Soldier Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Seager.
4. *Byron* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
6. *Wotan* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Santos, etc.—Funch, Edye & Co.
8. *Fortuna* (Nor.), Pernambuco, Santos, etc.—Funch, Edye & Co.
9. *Whitgift* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—H. Houlder & Rowat.
9. *Silvia* (Br.), Buenos Ayres, Rosario, etc.—Barber.
10. *Amazonense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth.
23. *Homer* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
24. *Hostilius* (Br.), Montevideo and Buenos Ayres—R. P. Houston.
26. *Cearense* (Br.), Para, etc.—Booth & Co.
27. *Merchant Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Seager.
30. *Hempstead* (Br.), Buenos Ayres, Rosario, etc.—Barber.
30. *Etona* (Br.), Montevideo and Buenos Ayres—H. F. Norton.

FEBRUARY.

2. *Phoenix* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
2. *Skuld* (Nor.), Pernambuco, Santos, etc.—Tweedie Trading Company.
3. *Tennyson* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
4. *Grangense* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.
7. *Symeric* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—H. Houlder & Rowat.
8. *Sycracusa* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Santos, etc.—Funch, Edye & Co.
14. *Ripley* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Norton & Son.
14. *Moorish Prince* (Br.), Rio Janeiro—Seager.
16. *Honorius* (Br.), Buenos Ayres and Rosario—Niebrugge & Day.
21. *Pilar de Larrinaga* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.

23. *Grecian Prince* (Br.), Macelo and Santos—Seager.
24. *Maranhense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
26. *Queen Olga* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—H. Houlder & Rowat.
27. *Seigmund* (Sw.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Funch Edye.
28. *Milton* (Br.), Montevideo and Rosario—Busk & Jevons.
28. *Melderskin* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Tweedie Trading Company.

MARCH.

2. *Italian Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Seager.
3. *Byron* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
5. *Cametense* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.
8. *St. Quentin* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
10. *Kyoga* (Nor.), Rio Janeiro via Norfolk—Tweedie Trading Co.
12. *Hellenes* (Br.), Buenos Ayres and Rosario—Houston.
13. *Taurus* (Nor.), Buenos Ayres—Bowring & Co.
14. *Castilian Prince* (Br.), Rio Janeiro, Santos, etc.—Seager.
16. *Polycarp* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
17. *Domingo de Larrinaga* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
23. *Eastern Prince* (Br.), Pernambuco, Santos, etc.—Seager.
27. *Sark* (Nor.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
28. *Fluminense* (Br.), Para, Manaos, etc.—Booth & Co.
28. *Sieglinde* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Funch Edye.
31. *Yoruba* (Br.), Rio Janeiro via Savannah—Seager.

APRIL.

4. *Tennyson* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
6. *Carondal* (Br.), Buenos Ayres, Rosario, etc.—Norton.
10. *Dunstan* (Br.), Para, etc.—Booth & Co.
13. *Casilda* (Br.), Buenos Ayres—Norton & Son.
17. *Jacob Bright* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio de Janeiro, etc.—Funch Edye.
21. *Mercedes de Larrinaga* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
25. *Woodford* (Br.), Pernambuco, Macelo, etc.—Tweedie Trading Company.
25. *Maranhense* (Br.), Barbados, Para, etc.—Booth & Co.
26. *Crown Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Seager.
26. *Hilarius* (Br.), Buenos Ayres and Rosario—Houston.
30. *Moorish Prince* (Br.), Rio de Janeiro and Santos—Seager.

MAY.

2. *Byron* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Booth & Co.
4. *Hornby Castle* (Br.), Montevideo, La Plata, etc.—Barber.
5. *Equita* (Ital.), Buenos Ayres and Rosario—Corner Brothers.
7. *Gregory* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.
9. *Grecian Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Seager.
11. *Beatrice* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Norton.
14. *Norman Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
15. *Canova* (Belg.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
15. *Dominic* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
15. *Avonmore* (Br.), La Plata and Rosario via Newport News—Barber.
16. *Gutrune* (Ger.), Pernambuco via Fernandino—Funch Edye.
17. *Otto Sverdrup* (Nor.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Tweedie Trading Company.
18. *Linda* (Br.), Montevideo, Rosario, etc.—J. H. Winchester.
21. *St. Hugo* (Br.), Buenos Ayres and Rosario—Barber.
26. *Cearense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
26. *Siegmund* (Ger.), Rio de Janeiro, etc.—Funch Edye.

JUNE.

2. *Soldier Prince* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio de Janeiro, etc.—Seager.
4. *Arabistan* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Norton.
4. *Tennyson* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
5. *Horace* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
5. *Hubert* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.
9. *Hortensius* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Houston.
9. *Croydon* (Br.), Montevideo, etc.—H. Houlder & Rowat.
11. *Miguel de Larrinaga* (Br.), Buenos Ayres—Barber.
12. *Etona* (Br.), Montevideo—Norton & Son.
15. *Bernard* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
15. *Eastern Prince* (Br.), Rio de Janeiro and Santos—Seager.
19. *Gunther* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Santos, etc.—Funch Edye.
21. *Hostilius* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—R. P. Houston.
21. *Pilar de Larrinaga* (Br.), Montevideo, etc.—Barber.
23. *Merchant Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, etc.—Seager.
25. *Minerva* (Nor.), Pernambuco, Bolivia, etc., via Savannah—Tweedie Trading Company.
25. *Maranhense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
30. *Byron* (Br.), Pernambuco and Bahia—Busk & Jevons.

JULY.

2. *Whitgift* (Br.), Montevideo, Rosario, etc.—H. Houlder & Rowat.
3. *Castilian Prince* (Br.), Rio Janeiro, etc., via Savannah—Seager.
5. *Grangense* (Br.), Barbados, Para, etc.—Booth & Co.
10. *Sallust* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
10. *Asuncion de Larrinaga* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
10. *Italian Prince* (Br.), Buenos Ayres and Montevideo, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
11. *Sieglinde* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Funch Edye.
14. *Horatio* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
18. *Spartan Prince* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
19. *St. Irene* (Br.), La Plata, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
20. *Ripley* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
21. *Horatius* (Br.), Buenos Ayres—R. P. Houston.
25. *Cearense* (Br.), Para, Manaos, etc.—Booth & Co.

AUGUST.

1. *Tennyson* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
2. *Queen Eleanor* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc., via Savannah—Tweedie Trading Company.
3. *Coniston* (Br.), La Plata and Rosario—Barber.
3. *Coronda* (Br.), Montevideo, Rosario, etc.—Norton.
4. *Siegmunde* (Br.), Pernambuco, etc.—Funch Edye.

4. *Cametense* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.
10. *Cavour* (Br.), Montevideo and Buenos Ayres—Busk & Jevons.
11. *Grecian Prince* (Br.), Macelo and Santos—Busk & Jevons.
13. *Mercedes de Larrinaga* (Br.), La Plata via Norfolk—Barber.
14. *Benedict* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
17. *Tronto* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc., via Norfolk—Norton.
17. *Soldier Prince* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc., via Savannah—Busk & Jevons.
18. *Gutrune* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Funch Edye.
20. *St. Quentin* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
24. *Maranhense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
24. *Welsh Prince* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
27. *Sandhurst* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Tweedie Trading Company.

SEPTEMBER.

4. *Byron* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
5. *Fluminense* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.
7. *Hilarius* (Br.), Buenos Ayres—R. P. Houston.
7. *Taurus* (Nor.), Montevideo, La Plata, etc.—Bowring & Co.
10. *Gunther* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Funch, Edye & Co.
12. *Raume* (Nor.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
14. *Amazonense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
14. *Eastern Prince* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
18. *Christian Bors* (Nor.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Barber.
18. *Casilda* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Norton.
19. *Strathairly* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
25. *Cearense* (Br.), Para, etc.—Booth & Co.
26. *Otto Scudrup* (Nor.), Montevideo, La Plata, etc.—Tweedie Trading Company.
27. *Spartan Prince* (Br.), Bahia, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
29. *Hornby Castle* (Br.), Montevideo, La Plata, etc.—Barber.

OCTOBER.

1. *Queen Louise* (Br.), Montevideo and Buenos Ayres—H. Houlder & Rowat.
2. *Goyas* (Braz.), Para, Maranham, etc.—J. C. Seager.
3. *Tennyson* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
4. *Etona* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, and Rosario—Norton.
5. *African Prince* (Br.), Montevideo and Buenos Ayres—Busk & Jevons.
5. *Hildebrand* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.

6. *Croydon* (Br.), Montevideo, etc.—H. Houlder & Rowat.
10. *Sieglinde* (Ger.), Pernambuco and Bahia—Funch, Edye & Co.
10. *Castillian Prince* (Br.), Rio Janeiro and Santos—Busk & Jevons.
12. *Balaclava* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
15. *Basil* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
16. *Woodfield* (Br.), Montevideo and La Plata—Tweedie Trading Company.
17. *Canova* (Belg.), Montevideo, Rosario, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
20. *Indiana* (Br.), Pernambuco, etc., via Norfolk—Tweedie Trading Company.
24. *Inchmaree* (Br.), Montevideo, La Plata, etc.—Barber.
24. *Pecine* (Aus.), Montevideo and Rosario via Norfolk—Barber.
25. *Maranhense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
29. *Vimeira* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, Santos, etc.—Seager.
29. *Phidias* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
30. *Seigmund* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Funch, Edye & Co.
31. *Volga* (Br.), Montevideo, La Plata, etc.—J. H. Winchester.

NOVEMBER.

3. *Hortensius* (Br.), Buenos Ayres, Rosario, etc.—R. P. Houston & Co.
3. *Whitgift* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—H. Houlder & Rowat.
3. *Byron* (Br.), Pernambuco, Bahia, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
5. *Hubert* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Booth & Co.
12. *Grecian Prince* (Br.), Pernambuco, Rio Grande do Sul, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
14. *Dominic* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
15. *Homor* (Br.), Rio Janeiro and Santos—Busk & Jevons.
17. *Sergipe* (Br.), Para, Maranham, etc.—Seager.
19. *Gutrune* (Ger.), Pernambuco, Rio Janeiro, etc., via Boston—Funch, Edye & Co.
22. *Cavour* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Busk & Jevons.
22. *Myrtledene* (Br.), Bahia, Rio Janeiro, etc.—Seager.
23. *Athalie* (Nor.), Buenos Ayres and Rosario—Barber.
24. *Arabistan* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—Norton.
24. *Cearense* (Br.), Para and Manaos—Booth & Co.
30. *Honorius* (Br.), Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, etc.—R. P. Houston & Co.

I hold here a sheet which I received this morning from the Post-Office Department, giving an official list of the sailings of steamers carrying United States mail during this month of March, 1907, from New York to the east coast of South America, and I insert the portion containing this information in the RECORD.

Date of sailing.	Sailing days.	Name of steamer.	Name of line.	Ports of destination and intermediate ports of call.	Hour of closing mails at post-office at port of departure.		Mails to be conveyed.
					a. m.	p. m.	
1907.							
Mar. 2	Saturday	Etona	Norton	Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, and Rosario.	9.00		Mails for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay.
Mar. 5	Tuesday	Tennyson	Lamport & Holt.	Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, and Santos.	8.30		Mails for Brazil direct, and for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay, via Brazil.
Mar. 5	Tuesday	Fluminense	Booth	Barbados, Para, Maranham, and Ceara.	Noon		Mails for Barbados direct, and for the northern ports of Brazil.
Mar. 9	Saturday		Barber	Montevideo and Buenos Ayres.	Noon		Mails for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay.
Mar. 12	Tuesday	Talisman	Demerara	Guadeloupe, Martinique, Barbados, and Georgetown.	Noon		Mails for Guadeloupe, Martinique, and Barbados; and for British, Dutch, and French Guiana, via Georgetown.
Mar. 15	Friday	Cuthbert	Booth	Barbados, Para, and Manaos.	Noon		Mails for Barbados direct; and for the northern ports of Brazil.
Mar. 19	Tuesday	Spartan Prince	Prince	Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, and Santos.	Noon		Mails for Brazil direct; and for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay, via Brazil.
Mar. 23	Saturday		Barber	Montevideo, and Buenos Ayres.	Noon		Mails for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay.
Mar. 25	Monday	Maranhense	Booth	Barbados, Para, and Manaos.	Noon		Mails for Barbados direct; and for the northern ports of Brazil.
Mar. 26	Tuesday	Gunther	Sloman	Pernambuco, Rio de Janeiro, and Santos.	Noon		Mails for Brazil direct; and for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay, via Brazil.
Mar. 26	Tuesday	Uller	Demerara	St. Kitts and Georgetown	Noon		Mails for St. Kitts; for Nevis, St. Eustatius, and St. Martins, via St. Kitts; and for British, Dutch, and French Guiana, via Georgetown.

According to this statement, for the month of March there will be seven regular mails from New York to Brazil and Buenos Ayres, while the pending bill provides for only four during a similar period. There will be seven regular mails from New York—three to Rio Janeiro, four to Buenos Ayres and Montevideo—and the three to Brazil also carry mail to Argentina.

So that there is right now under the present law, paid for out of the postal revenues, seven sailings in March—nearly twice as many lines as provided by this bill, carrying mail to the identical places to be provided for by this bill.

Mr. POLLARD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. POLLARD. I understood the gentleman to say that there are seven lines of vessels running to South America?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. The gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say any such thing. I said that the sheet from the Post-Office Department shows that there will be seven sailings for the month of March, carrying mails by recognized lines to the various ports of South America provided by the paragraphs of this bill. That is what I said.

Mr. McCALL. May I ask the gentleman what time a letter would take in reaching Rio Janeiro in one of those ships?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. It will be probably two to three weeks.

Mr. McCALL. I have a letter from the Assistant Postmaster-General in which he states that the average time at present is about twenty-five days from New York to Rio Janeiro. It would require about nine or ten days by the ships provided in this bill.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Chairman, this may interest the gentlemen. Here is the schedule of the Royal Mail Steamship Company, of Great Britain, receiving the postal subsidies of Great Britain, for mail service to Brazil and Argentina, and, if I remember correctly, receiving about the same amount which is proposed by this bill to pay for the schedule to Argentina or the schedule to Brazil, while the British line provides both services. That schedule will be inserted in the RECORD, and shows a sailing about every five days from Southampton to the east coast of South America. There are eight or ten steamships of 5,000 to 10,000 tons, so that they will be about the same size, and their schedule time is twenty-two days from Southampton to Buenos Ayres.

The Royal Mail Steam Packet Company time-table, Brazil and River Plata route, Southampton to Buenos Ayres.

	Nile.	Aragon.	Ara- guaya.	Danube.	Amazon.	Thames.	Clyde.	Nile.	Aragon.	Ara- guaya.	Danube.	Amazon.
Southampton and Cherbourg	Jan. 25	Feb. 8	Feb. 22	Mar. 1	Mar. 8	Mar. 15	Mar. 22	Mar. 29	Apr. 5	Apr. 19	Apr. 26	May 3
Cortunna				Mar. 3		Mar. 17		Mar. 31			Apr. 28	
Vigo	Jan. 27	Feb. 10	Feb. 24	do	Mar. 10	do	Mar. 24	do	Apr. 7	Apr. 21	do	May 5
Leixoes				Mar. 4		Mar. 18		Apr. 1			Apr. 29	
Lisbon	Jan. 28	Feb. 11	Feb. 25	Mar. 5	Mar. 11	Mar. 19	Mar. 25	Apr. 2	Apr. 8	Apr. 22	Apr. 30	May 6
Madeira	Jan. 30	Feb. 13	Feb. 27		Mar. 13		Mar. 27		Apr. 10	Apr. 24		May 8
St. Vincent	Feb. 2			Mar. 10		Mar. 24	Mar. 30	Apr. 7			May 5	
Pernambuco	Feb. 7	Feb. 21	Mar. 7	Mar. 15	Mar. 21	Mar. 29	Apr. 4	Apr. 12	Apr. 18	May 2	May 10	May 16
Bahia	Feb. 8	Feb. 22	Mar. 8	Mar. 16	Mar. 22	Mar. 30	Apr. 5	Apr. 13	Apr. 19	May 3	May 11	May 17
Rio de Janeiro	Feb. 11	Feb. 25	Mar. 11	Mar. 19	Mar. 25	Apr. 2	Apr. 8	Apr. 16	Apr. 22	May 6	May 14	May 20
Santos	Feb. 12	Feb. 26	Mar. 12	Mar. 20	Mar. 26	Apr. 3	Apr. 9	Apr. 17	Apr. 23	May 7	May 15	May 21
Montevideo	Feb. 15	Mar. 1	Mar. 15	Mar. 23	Mar. 29	Apr. 6	Apr. 12	Apr. 20	Apr. 26	May 10	May 18	May 24
Buenos Aires	Feb. 16	Mar. 2	Mar. 16	Mar. 24	Mar. 30	Apr. 7	Apr. 13	Apr. 21	Apr. 27	May 11	May 19	May 25

I have a statement here of the Hamburg-American Line, showing four different routes from Hamburg to Brazil and Argentina for about the same price that we pay by this bill for two to the east coast of South America. It is important right here to remember what this bill really will accomplish.

There will start from New York two steamers running over the identical route for nearly 5,000 miles to Rio de Janeiro, both getting mail subsidies for all of this distance; but one must then stop at Rio de Janeiro and the other must proceed about 800 miles farther to Buenos Ayres. The one steamer to either port is not allowed by the following provision of this bill to do any mail business with the other port:

Provided, That a vessel receiving compensation for mail service pursuant to contract on a voyage on this route shall not also receive compensation for mail service pursuant to contract on said voyage on the first route as described above.

This is wasteful and extravagant, and the members of this committee who are insisting that the Pacific lines must be stricken out must have difficulty in reconciling themselves to paying for duplicate service for more than four-fifths of the entire distance from New York without relative benefit to the

United States. The above schedules show such waste is not permitted by the British or the German governments. They get full value for their payments, while here the service is almost duplicated, and in no other line now running on the ocean would such a condition be tolerated. Yet some gentlemen are willing to swallow this extravagance but cut out the Pacific lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more in order to compare the Pacific conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to show further some of the conditions on the east coast which should be understood by the gentlemen before they vote, but it will not be possible on account of time. Let us consider the conditions on the Pacific coast. From Seattle there will be only six sailings next month. Five of them are by foreign lines and only one by an American line. I insert the schedule in the Record.

Schedule of steamers from Seattle and Tacoma to Honolulu, Chinese and Japanese ports.

Date of sailing.	Sailing days.	Name of steamer.	Name of line.	Port of destination and intermediate ports of call.	Hour of closing mails at post-office at port of departure.		Mails to be conveyed.
					a. m.	p. m.	
FROM SEATTLE, WASH.							
1907. Mar. 1	Friday	Moana	Canadian Line	Honolulu, Suva, Brisbane, and Sydney.	7.00		Mails for Fiji Islands and Australia, except the colony of West Australia.
Mar. 5	Tuesday	Tango Maru	Nippon Yusen Kaisha.	Yokohama and Kobe	1.00		Mails for Japan, Korea, Shanghai, Hongkong, and dependent Chinese ports; also specially addressed correspondence for the East Indies, including British India, Straits Settlements, Siam, Cochin China, and Dutch East Indies.
Mar. 17	Sunday	Dakota	Great Northern Steamship Co.	Yokohama, Kobe, Nagasaki, Shanghai, and Hongkong.	1.00		Mails for Japan, Korea, Shanghai, Hongkong, and dependent Chinese ports, and for the Philippine Islands; also specially addressed correspondence for the East Indies, including British India, Straits Settlements, Siam, Cochin China, and Dutch East Indies.
Mar. 18	Monday	Empress of China.	Canadian Line	do	7.00		Same as per steamer Dakota, February 17.
Mar. 19	Tuesday	Aki Maru	Nippon Yusen Kaisha.	Yokohama, Kobe, Moji, Shanghai, and Hongkong.	1.00		Do.
Mar. 22	Friday	Lyra	Boston Tow Boat Co.	Yokohama, Kobe, Moji, Manila, and Hongkong.	1.00		Do.
FROM TACOMA, WASH.							
Mar. 20	Wednesday	Tydeus	Ocean Steamship Co.	Yokohama, Kobe, Shanghai, and Hongkong.	12.05		Specially addressed correspondence for and via Japan and China.

Remember further, that this House has already provided so that the Pacific Mail Line, or the Harriman lines, and the Great Northern Steamship Company, or the Hill line, can not take advantage of anything under this act by excluding existing ships. This is not the kind of a policy to encourage an enterprising and adventurous concern to embark in the shipping business, and it would seem to discriminate against those who have borne the burden of sustaining American commerce and favor the laggards who only wait for your bounty. But the House has so decided and so it stands. On the other side of the Pacific Ocean there are five to ten times the population that there is or can be for generations in South America, and their trade is many fold larger and more important and for generations, so far as we can see, will vastly exceed anything which can be expected from South America. Our exports to the Oriental and Australian ports are more than twice what they are to the South American ports, and there are five times greater opportunities to extend our trade on the Pacific than

there are in South America. Last year we exported to South America, to the ports reached on its eastern coast by the lines provided by this bill, about \$65,000,000; to the ports reached by the Pacific lines stricken from this bill more than \$135,000,000. The products of the section which I in part represent and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] in part represents do not go to South America. They go either to the Atlantic or to the Pacific. So that if it be the desire of Members of this House by the enactment of this measure to extend our foreign trade, if the products of our factories and fields are to bring the prices we want and need them to bring in order to maintain our standard of living, it must be more by the extension of the Pacific trade and not by depending upon the trade to South America. I herein insert a table showing our exports during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, of various articles to the South American countries reached by this bill, as compared with the Asiatic countries whose lines are stricken from it.

Total imports and exports to South America of domestic and foreign merchandise from the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906.

Country.	Twelve months ending June.	
	Imports, 1906.	Exports, 1906.
SOUTH AMERICA.		
Argentina.....	\$18,379,063	\$23,672,359
Bolivia.....		146,798
Brazil.....	80,416,524	14,530,471
Chile.....	16,945,478	8,667,227
Ecuador.....	2,632,206	2,009,861
Paraguay.....	750	51,917
Peru.....	2,454,706	4,833,307
Uruguay.....	2,711,807	2,905,573
Total South America.....	123,239,543	65,818,513
ASIA.		
Chinese Empire.....	28,531,207	43,774,375
China:		
British.....	7,109	307
French.....	7,771	228,743
German.....	21,548	
Russian.....		21,512
East Indies:		
British India.....	46,763,975	6,197,089
Straits Settlements.....	17,171,899	1,024,311
Other British.....	3,240,965	233,302
Total British East Indies.....	67,176,839	7,454,702
Dutch.....	20,575,521	1,766,159
French.....	12,073	8,672
Portuguese.....		420
Hongkong.....	1,829,040	7,034,907
Japan.....	52,551,520	38,464,952
Korea.....	218	1,005,294
Russia, Asiatic.....	282,207	2,813,544
Siam.....	63,244	355,471
All other Asia.....	259,387	98,185
Total Asia.....	172,218,084	103,086,652
OCEANIA.		
British Australasia.....	11,515,413	29,001,147
All other British Oceania.....	79,944	270,690
French Oceania.....	835,112	389,147
German Oceania.....	1,262	69,116
Philippine Islands.....	12,337,927	5,459,444
Total Oceania.....	24,769,658	35,139,544
Total to countries reached by Pacific lines.....	196,987,742	138,236,196

Total exports to South America of domestic and foreign merchandise from the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906.

	Quantity.	Value.
BREADSTUFFS.		
Corn (bushels) exported to—		
South America.....	29,891	\$19,628
Other Asia and Oceania.....	120,052	63,407
Oats (bushels) exported to—		
South America.....	71,597	26,323
Philippine Islands.....	312,219	122,239
Other Asia and Oceania.....	7,964	3,708
Wheat (bushels) exported to—		
South America.....	568,451	461,981
Asia and Oceania.....	1,792,865	1,362,440
Wheat flour (barrels) exported to—		
Brazil.....	248,756	1,211,881
Colombia.....	101,893	519,225
Other South America.....	661,180	2,638,009
Chinese Empire.....	154,221	594,014
British East Indies.....	4,755	18,616
Hongkong.....	926,180	3,391,687
Japan.....	1,292,853	4,536,354
British Australasia.....	5,183	22,361
Philippine Islands.....	39,661	152,175
Other Asia and Oceania.....	481,333	1,760,070
CARRIAGES, CARS, OTHER VEHICLES, AND PARTS OF—		
Exported to—		
Argentina.....		1,663,474
Brazil.....		227,477
Chile.....		501,447
Colombia.....		45,612
Venezuela.....		7,778
Other South America.....		272,567
Chinese Empire.....		12,962
British East Indies.....		49,948
Japan.....		1,876,025
British Australasia.....		540,592
Philippine Islands.....		82,851
Other Asia and Oceania.....		62,300
COTTON, AND MANUFACTURES OF.		
Unmanufactured:		
South America.....	bales.....	
Japan.....	bales.....	140,607
	lbs.....	73,634,591
		8,234,503

Total exports to South America of domestic and foreign merchandise from the United States, etc.—Continued.

	Quantity.	Value.
COTTON, AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued.		
Unmanufactured—Continued.		
Other Asia and Oceania.....	bales.....	4,134
	lbs.....	2,141,564
Manufactures of cloths (yards):		
Argentina.....		2,527,466
Brazil.....		8,263,354
Chile.....		12,747,824
Colombia.....		12,442,745
Venezuela.....		6,414,647
Other South America.....		6,753,509
Chinese Empire.....		498,521,402
British East Indies.....		9,170,688
Hongkong.....		374,963
Japan.....		2,066,888
British Australasia.....		8,462,645
Philippine Islands.....		3,836,059
Other Asia and Oceania.....		32,343,080
		29,641,142
		646,568
		53,861
		219,915
		743,333
		189,516
		1,898,653
TOBACCO, AND MANUFACTURES OF.		
Unmanufactured:		
Argentina.....		465,951
Colombia.....		82,429
Other South America.....		774,596
Japan.....		7,673,285
British Australasia.....		7,141,013
Other Asia and Oceania.....		6,759,878
Manufactures of, exported to:		
Colombia.....		1,115
Other South America.....		51,433
Chinese Empire.....		1,330,547
British East Indies.....		785,124
Hongkong.....		110,060
Japan.....		25,545
British Australasia.....		1,592,237
Philippine Islands.....		48,716
Other Asia and Oceania.....		31,236

Moreover, the vessels to South America to be provided by the bill have not the capacity for carrying but a small proportion of this freight, either of exports or imports. The cargo capacity of the steamers to be provided for the east coast of South America will probably not exceed 2,500 tons to each steamer if a 10,000-ton steamer be provided. The total capacity of all of them will not exceed 5,000 tons a month, or 60,000 tons per annum. That is only one-sixth of the coffee alone which is imported into this country from South America, and less than one-half or one-third of the sugar alone imported from South America into this country. It will not help to extend our trade to the extent which the gentlemen expect who are urging the passage of this bill. It will not furnish vessels for the national defense to any considerable number, though it will improve our facilities for direct communication. But how is it on the Pacific? Last year there was exported more than 3,000,000 barrels of flour alone from the Pacific coast over the Pacific lines.

There were exported over \$32,000,000 worth of cotton goods, and I think about \$3,000,000 to South American ports. If we desire to extend our trade, to employ our people, to dispose of our products, to steady our prices, the great avenue for extension is across the Pacific. Where will be the next great danger of the future requiring our naval strength? Will it be on the South Atlantic or on the Pacific? Where will it be necessary to construct our shipyards to provide for the national defense? Will it be facing the South Atlantic or on the Pacific? This question hardly needs an answer. Everyone realizes the great contests of the future, commercial and military, will be on the Pacific. No one foresees any possible danger on the South Atlantic. Is this now a time for this great nation to voluntarily abandon the field of the greatest contest? Shall we decide of our own motion to withdraw from the lists and leave the greatest field of the world's future activities to our more adventurous rivals? If this measure is destined to mean anything for our foreign trade, for the national defense, for extending our lines of communication, we need the extension across the Pacific many times more than we do to the South Atlantic. We all realize the provisions for our foreign trade everywhere are not exactly adequate, and it would be perhaps an improvement to have this bill passed improving our conditions to the South Atlantic, but it is a necessity to have an improvement of conditions across the Pacific. You provide two lines from the Gulf; you provide two lines from the Atlantic to the east coast of South America. Why not provide that in addition to existing facilities there shall be one, two, or three lines across the Pacific, the scene of the future great expansion of the trade, of the influence, of the danger of our country? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked by the gentleman from Michigan to modify his amendment so as to include paragraph 7.

Mr. KAHN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise in order that the House may take up privileged business.

The committee, under the order, accordingly rose, and the Speaker resumed the chair.

FISH-CULTURAL STATIONS ON PUGET SOUND.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a duplicate engrossed copy of Senate bill 1462, to establish one or more fish-cultural stations on Puget Sound, State of Washington, the original of which was missing this morning. The motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is to suspend the rules and pass the bill. Debate is closed upon the motion.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 145, noes 68.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Tellers were ordered; and the Speaker appointed Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington and Mr. WILLIAMS.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 129, noes 73.

Accordingly (two-thirds not voting in the affirmative), the motion was rejected.

MINING CLAIMS IN ALASKA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8984) to amend the laws governing labor or improvements upon mining claims in Alaska, with Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments, with the exception of No. 9; and I also move to disagree to No. 9 and ask for a conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman give some explanation of the bill. I do not see the Democratic conferee in his seat.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, it will only take a moment to explain this bill. Alaska having no legislature has been unable to pass a regulation as to the record of proof of work upon mining claims. This House passed a bill providing that 25 per cent of the work upon such claims could be done upon a public highway, and also provided for a record of the work that had been done on claims substantially in the same form that is now the law of Montana, Colorado, and various other mining States. The Senate has stricken out the original highway proposition, and that is not an essential in the proposition as to the record of the claim.

They have, however, stricken out one clause that ought to remain in the bill, and it is a provision that where the proof of labor has been filed and recorded that the burden of proof then shall shift to anyone contesting the claim; that the filing of this proof and recording shall be prima facie evidence of compliance with the law. That is substantially the same as the law now is in most of the mineral land States.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like the gentleman to explain the difference between that and the United States land laws on mining claims where it requires a ninety days' notice to be posted.

Mr. LACEY. This is not a question of location of a claim; it is a question of annual assessment work. The United States law is silent upon this provision. It leaves that to the local legislature. The State law usually fixes it so that any man can have this done at any time, thirty, or sixty, or ninety days after the time in which the assessment work should be done. Now, it can not be provided for in Alaska by local statute. The only legislation Alaska can have must come from Congress, so that we should by act of Congress give them the same advantage that miners have in the other States and Territories that do not have to come to Congress; and this bill substantially complies with the usual requirement that is provided in the other public land States and Territories.

There is one point that I think ought to go to conference, and I think the Senate should yield their judgment on that feature in this bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. How many clerks of record are there in Alaska where men may record their mining deeds and other deeds?

Mr. LACEY. As many as there are court commissioners.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And then these mining deeds are to be filed and kept of record?

Mr. LACEY. They have to be filed with the Federal officers, but there is no provision for keeping the record of the annual assessment work; and it is necessary to preserve these records and also desirable that the records should be made.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Under the laws of some of the Western Territories, particularly New Mexico and Arizona, it is not required to make any record of the work that has been done.

Mr. LACEY. The bill as amended permits the filing and record of proof of work.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. By the United States mining laws?

Mr. LACEY. The Revised Statutes give authority to States and Territories to legislate as to matters of detail of this kind.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. LACEY. And then, again, in the State and Territorial law this question is usually fully provided for, and this bill will give the same advantage in Alaska.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman why they make it mandatory to say that a man on a mining claim must have his proof recorded within sixty or ninety days or lose his claim.

Mr. LACEY. The provision of the House was it should require it to be filed, but on failure to file the burden of proof was changed. The Senate struck out the word "shall" and inserted the word "may." We think that the effect will be about the same. It merely transfers the burden of proof. And I want to say, for the information of those gentlemen who live in States outside of the operations of the mineral-land laws, that it complies with the provisions of the Revised Statutes expressly reserving to States and Territories the privilege of legislating on matters of this kind.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I believe, under the gentleman's explanation, that the Senate bill will be a better bill than the House bill, because you make it mandatory.

Mr. LACEY. I think that the conferees will restore the feature that the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have no objection if you make it "may" instead of "shall."

Mr. LACEY. As to the ninth amendment, I shall move to nonconcur and ask for a conference.

Mr. SULZER. What is the ninth amendment?

Mr. LACEY. The ninth amendment is this: We put in the bill a provision that when this affidavit has been filed the burden of proof should be on the contestant or the party opposed to the proof. If it has not been filed, if the claimant has neglected to file the proof, then the burden is on him to show that he did the work.

Mr. SULZER. That ought to be the law.

Mr. LACEY. The Senate struck that out and I trust that we can get them to recede.

The amendments, with the exception of amendment 9, were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on disagreeing to the amendment No. 9.

The question was taken; and Senate amendment No. 9 was disagreed to.

Mr. LACEY. I move that the House ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. LACEY, Mr. MONDELL, and Mr. BURNETT.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. LITTAUER, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 25851) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for prior years, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD reserved all points of order.

ALLEN V. REED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 7676, an act authorizing the appointment of Allen V. Reed, now a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a commodore on the retired list of the Navy, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DAWSON, Mr. BATES, and Mr. GREGG.

CHARLES W. DAKIN AND THOMAS J. HENNESSY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill H. R. 15909, an act to reward the widow and minor son of Capt. Charles W. Dakin, and the widow and minor children of Thomas J. Hennessy, late of the San Francisco fire department, who lost their

lives while fighting a fire on board of the U. S. Army transport *Meade*, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

DAM ACROSS ST. JOSEPH RIVER, ST. JOSEPH COUNTY, MICH.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25832) to authorize Herman L. Hartenstein to construct a dam across the St. Joseph River, near the village of Mottville, St. Joseph County, Mich.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Herman L. Hartenstein, a citizen of the State of Michigan, his heirs and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the St. Joseph River, at any point up the stream within 1 mile from the highway bridge at the village of Mottville, St. Joseph County, in the State of Michigan, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [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. HAMILTON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CONSIDERATION OF PRIVATE BILLS AT EVENING SESSION.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to so modify the order with respect to the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar at the night session as to require three objections instead of one to prevent the consideration of a bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman mean objections from three persons?

Mr. DALZELL. Three persons instead of one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DAM ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25846) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Calhoun Falls, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Hugh MacRae Company, a corporation organized under the laws of South Carolina, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct and maintain a dam across the Savannah River extending from a point in Elbert County, Ga., to a point in Abbeville County, S. C., upon or in the vicinity of Calhoun Falls, and all works incident thereto in the utilization of the power thereby developed, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. AIKEN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WHITE STONE HILLS BATTLEFIELD.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25365) to permit the State of North Dakota to sell a portion of certain lands heretofore granted to it as a memorial park on the White Stone Hills battlefield for the purpose of raising funds for improving and beautifying that park, which I send to the desk. I will state that the bill has been already read, and before asking unanimous consent for its present consideration, because it was objected to this morning, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota sends to the desk a bill which was objected to this morning, for which he desires unanimous consent for its present consideration, but before doing so submits the following proposed amendments, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, after the word "empowered," in line 4, page 1, by inserting "within five years from the passage of this act."

After the word "monuments," line 1, page 2, insert the words "upon an."

After the word "grounds," in line 2, page 2, insert the words "remaining unsold."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object,

I understand that this is a bill which was offered by the gentleman's colleague, Mr. GRONNA, this morning, and to which objection was made.

Mr. MANN. Yes; I objected, but some amendments have been proposed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of what these amendments are.

Mr. MANN. I can give an explanation of the amendments, so far as they are concerned. It first restricts the sale to within five years, and second, requires only that the monuments authorized shall be put upon the ground. As the bill was before it authorized monuments anywhere, and it required those monuments to be put upon the grounds remaining unsold.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. GRONNA, and in the absence of information as to whether these amendments would suit him, and in view of the further fact that when he offered the bill this morning it was objected, I shall object for the present.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will allow a word of explanation. This is my bill. Mr. GRONNA called it up for me at my request in my absence. He is absolutely satisfied with the amendments. They have been submitted to him. It is my bill. I was unable to come and my colleague, Mr. GRONNA, kindly called it up for me. There is no possible objection to it if the gentleman really understood the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would rather the gentleman would renew the request sometime when Mr. GRONNA is present.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

BRIDGE ACROSS OUACHITA RIVER AND D'ARBONNE RIVER, LOUISIANA.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25811) to authorize the Monroe, Farmerville and Northwestern Railway Company to construct a bridge over the Ouachita River and one over the D'Arbonne River in Louisiana, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Monroe, Farmerville and Northwestern Railroad Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, also a bridge across the D'Arbonne River at or near Farmerville, in the State of Louisiana, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or appeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. There seems to be a clerical error which will require an amendment, which the Chair will ask the Clerk to report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 2, line 13, strike out the word "appeal" and insert in lieu thereof the word "repeal."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTIONS 5 AND 6 OF TRADE-MARK LAW.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25474) to amend sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations, or among the several States, or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same," approved February 20, 1905, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 5. That no mark by which the goods of the owner of the mark may be distinguished from other goods of the same class shall be refused registration as a trade-mark on account of the nature of such mark unless such mark—

(a) Consists of or comprises immoral or scandalous matter.

(b) Consists of or comprises the flag or coat of arms or other insignia of the United States, or any simulation thereof, or of any State, or municipality, or of any foreign nation, or of any design or picture that has been or may hereafter be adopted by any fraternal society as its emblem; *Provided*, That trade-marks which are identical with a registered or known trade-mark owned and in use by another, and appropriated to merchandise of the same descriptive properties, or which so nearly resemble a registered or known trade-mark owned and in use by another, and appropriated to merchandise of the same de-

scriptive properties, as to be likely to cause confusion or mistake in the mind of the public, or to deceive purchasers, shall not be registered: *Provided*, That no mark which consists merely in the name of an individual, firm, corporation, or association, not written, printed, impressed, or woven in some particular or distinctive manner or in association with a portrait of the individual or merely in words or devices which are descriptive of the goods with which they are used, or of the character or quality of such goods, or merely a geographical name or term, shall be registered under the terms of this act: *Provided further*, That no portrait of a living individual may be registered as a trade-mark, except by the consent of such individual, evidenced by an instrument in writing: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall prevent the registration of any mark used by the applicant or his predecessors, or by those from whom title to the mark is derived, in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, which was in actual and exclusive use as a trade-mark of the applicant or his predecessors from whom he derived title for ten years next preceding the passage of this act."

Sec. 2. That section 6 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That on the filing of an application for registration of a trade-mark which complies with the requirements of this act, and the payment of the fees herein provided for, the Commissioner of Patents shall cause an examination thereof to be made; and if on such examination it shall appear that the applicant is entitled to have his trade-mark registered under the provisions of this act, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published at least once in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office. Any person who believes he would be damaged by the registration of a mark may oppose the same by filing notice of opposition, stating the grounds therefor, in the Patent Office within thirty days after the publication of the mark sought to be registered, which said notice of opposition shall be verified by the person filing the same before one of the officers mentioned in section 2 of this act. An opposition may be filed by a duly authorized attorney, but said opposition shall be null and void unless verified by the opposer within a reasonable time after such filing. If no notice of opposition is filed within said time, the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of registration therefor, as hereinafter provided for. If on examination an application is refused, the Commissioner shall notify the applicant, giving him his reasons therefor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [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. BONYNGE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER AT HATTONS FORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and pass the bill (H. R. 25847) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Hattons Ford.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Hugh MacRae Company, a corporation organized under the laws of South Carolina, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct and maintain a dam across the Savannah River, extending from a point in Hart County, Ga., to a point in Anderson County, S. C., upon or in the vicinity of Hattons Ford, and all works incident thereto in the utilization of the power thereby developed, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [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. AIKEN a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER AT ANDERSONVILLE SHOALS.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25848) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Andersonville Shoals.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the J. R. Earle Development Company, a corporation to be organized under the laws of South Carolina, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct and maintain a dam across the Savannah River, extending from a point in Hart County, Ga., to a point in Anderson County, S. C., upon or in the vicinity of Andersonville shoals, and all works incident thereto in the utilization of the power thereby developed, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. AIKEN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER AT CHEROKEE SHOALS.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25849) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Hugh MacRae Company, a corporation organized under the laws of South Carolina, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct and maintain a dam across the Savannah River, extending from a point in Elbert County, Ga., to a point in Abbeville County, S. C., upon or in the vicinity of Cherokee Shoals, and all works incident thereto in the utilization of the power thereby developed, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is this a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears 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. AIKEN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER AT TROTTERS SHOALS.

Mr. AIKEN. I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25850) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Trotters Shoals.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Hugh MacRae Company, a corporation organized under the laws of South Carolina, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct and maintain a dam across the Savannah River extending from a point in Elbert County, Ga., to a point in Abbeville County, S. C., upon or in the vicinity of Trotters shoals, and all works incident thereto in the utilization of the power thereby developed, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is this the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears 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. AIKEN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ELIJAH B. HUDSON.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return the bill (S. 6078) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah B. Hudson."

The question was taken; and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the order, the House stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House resumed its session, with the Speaker in the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the order under which the House meets.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That hereafter during this session a motion to consider in the House, as in Committee of the Whole House, bills on the Private Calendar of the classes hereinafter described shall have the same privilege as is given by the rules on Fridays to motions to go into Committee of the Whole House to consider bills on the Private Calendar.

All bills not objected to after five minutes' explanation thereof, reported from committees other than the Committee on Pensions, Invalid Pensions, Claims, and War Claims, excepting bills proposing to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will proceed with the order of business. The Clerk will report the first bill under the order.

LANDS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

The first bill upon the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17431) granting to the regents of the University of Oklahoma section No. 36, in township No. 9 north of range No. 3 west of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Okla.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the House has passed that same bill as another bill—namely, H. R. 25013—on January 28 last, which was an act granting to the regents of the University of Oklahoma in section No. 36, in township No. 9 north of range No. 3 west of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Okla. It seems to me that that bill covered the same thing.

The SPEAKER. What is the section that the gentleman has there? This is section No. 36.

Mr. MANN. Section No. 36, in township No. 9 north of range No. 3 west of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Okla. The SPEAKER. When did it pass the House?

Mr. MANN. On January 28.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Clerk will call the next bill, and the last bill will be passed without prejudice. There was no objection.

LANDS IN OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

The next bill on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 18850) donating lands in Oklahoma Territory for educational purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the northeast quarter of section 13, township 10 north, range 3 east of the Indian meridian, in Pottawatomie County, Okla., heretofore reserved for public school indemnity lands in said Territory, be, and the same is hereby, granted to the board of education of the city of Shawnee, in said county and Territory, for public school building and public school site purposes, or either of said purposes, as may be deemed by said board of education best suited to the interests aforesaid.

Sec. 2. That the said board of education shall, before taking possession of said tract of land, make satisfaction with the lessees for their crops, for all improvements placed thereon by them, and for the unexpired terms of their leases, out of funds to be contributed by popular subscription for that purpose: *Provided*, That in case the said board of education fails to agree with said lessees upon the value of their crops, their improvements, and their unexpired leases, said board is hereby authorized to condemn their interests in the same in like manner as lands are condemned for the use of railroads under the provisions of article 9, chapter 17, of the statutes of Oklahoma, 1893.

Sec. 3. That no indemnity shall be allowed to the said Territory on account of this grant, and the said board of education of the city of Shawnee is hereby authorized and empowered to sell and convey the said quarter section of land, in subdivisions or otherwise, and at public or private sale, as the said board of education may deem best: *Provided*, That no part of said quarter section shall be sold at a rate of less than \$100 an acre for the entire tract.

Sec. 4. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and approval.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection by three Members to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that the Secretary of the Interior in a letter states that the Commissioner of the General Land Office calls attention to the fact that legislation of this character has never heretofore been enacted by Congress, and that the passage of this bill would be a distinct departure from the policy heretofore pursued by Congress in the matter of land grants. It seems to me that unless there is some special reason for it it ought not to be passed without consideration.

Mr. WANGER. I would ask, what is the exceptional character of this legislation?

Mr. MANN. I really am not able to go into the matter with the gentleman except that the Commissioner calls attention to the fact that it is an entirely new departure in the matter of making land grants.

Mr. WANGER. It seems to me that it is, Mr. Speaker. It involves the question of voluntary contribution and adjustment of outstanding claims, when ordinarily their settlement is asked at the expense of the public Treasury. It is most extraordinary that the citizens of Oklahoma should propose to settle outstanding claims without a charge on the Federal Treasury; and I submit that however novel the experiment may be, if that is the only exceptional character of the proposed legislation it might be wise to try the experiment.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps it might be wise, Mr. Speaker, to try the experiment, but it does not seem to me that Congress ought to inaugurate a new policy without full consideration with reference to such matters.

Mr. WANGER. Inasmuch as the Delegate from Oklahoma [Mr. MCGUIRE] is not present, I would ask that the bill might be passed without prejudice.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to its being passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] asks that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM B. TODD.

The next bill on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2138) for the relief of the estate of William B. Todd, deceased.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to refund to the administrators of said estate the amount found to have been erroneously collected therefrom on account of an excessive special assessment levied against lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, in square 1040, in 1871, the said special assessment having been revised and reduced in accordance with the revising acts of Congress, with interest at 6 per cent per annum from the date of said erroneous collection to the date of said refund, and a sufficient amount of money to pay the principal and interest of the afore-

said is hereby appropriated, one-half from the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to pay a special assessment rebate, and one that has been before Congress a great many times, sometimes with a favorable report and sometimes with an adverse report. It also provides for the payment of 6 per cent interest on this old claim.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the small number present I would ask that the case be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GRANT OF CERTAIN LANDS TO PAWNEE, OKLA.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 22543) granting to the town of Pawnee, in Pawnee County, Okla., certain lands for park, educational, and other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the town of Pawnee, in Pawnee County, Okla., for park, educational, and other public purposes, all of that part of section 32, in township 22 north, range 5 east, Indian meridian, in said county, described as follows, to wit: Commencing at the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 32, in township 22 north, range 5 east, Indian meridian, in said county; thence running due east on the north line of said section 32 forty-four one hundredths chain, more or less, to the west boundary line of the Morris road; thence in a southwesterly direction along the west boundary line of said Morris road 16.25 chains; thence west parallel with the north line of said section 7 chains to a point; thence in a southwesterly direction parallel with the west line of said Morris road and 7 chains distant therefrom to a point in the center of the main channel of Black Bear Creek; thence in a southwesterly direction following the center of the channel of said creek to the dividing line between the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said section; thence north on said dividing line extended to the north line of said section, the same being the place of beginning; and the said lands hereby granted being a portion of the Pawnee Indian Reservation set apart for agency and school purposes at the Pawnee Agency in said county under act of Congress approved February 8, 1887, as amended by act of Congress approved February 28, 1891, and in accordance with the instructions from the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs dated March 17, 1891, the said land hereby granted to said town of Pawnee being subject to the rights of way of the Eastern Oklahoma Railway Company and the Arkansas Valley and Western Railway Company heretofore acquired.

Sec. 2. That the said lands are to be held and used by the said town of Pawnee for park, educational, and other public purposes: *Provided*, That the board of trustees of said town may authorize the board of education of said town to use the same for the erection and maintenance of school buildings thereon and the necessary grounds for use in connection therewith: *Provided further*, That said city shall pay \$1.25 per acre for said land.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MAHON. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 10.

Mr. MAHON. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point that a quorum is not present. A quorum not being present, the doors will be closed. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill; as many as are in favor of the engrossment and third reading of the bill will as their names are called answer "yea;" those who are opposed will answer "no;" those present and not voting will answer "present," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 6, answered "present" 51, not voting 178, as follows:

YEAS—143.

Bankhead	Clark, Fla.	Fassett	Humphrey, Wash.
Bannon	Clark, Mo.	Fitzgerald	Humphreys, Miss.
Bates	Clayton	French	Jenkins
Beidler	Cocks	Garber	Jones, Wash.
Bell, Ga.	Cole	Garner	Kelifer
Bennet, N. Y.	Conner	Garrett	Kelther
Bowers	Cooper, Pa.	Goebel	Kennedy, Ohio
Brantley	Cousins	Granger	Kitchin, Claude
Broussard	Cushman	Greene	Knopf
Brownlow	Dalzell	Gronna	Knowland
Burke, S. Dak.	Darragh	Grosvenor	Lacey
Burnett	Davey, La.	Hale	Lafean
Burton, Del.	Dawson	Hamilton	Landis, Frederick
Butler, Pa.	Denby	Hardwick	Lawrence
Butler, Tenn.	Dickson, Ill.	Hayes	Lee
Calder	Dixon, Ind.	Heffin	Legare
Candler	Draper	Hill, Conn.	Lever
Capron	Driscoll	Hill, Miss.	Littfield
Cassel	Dwight	Houston	Lloyd
Chaney	Edwards	Howell, Utah	Lorimer
Chapman	Englebright	Huff	Lovering

McCleary, Minn.	Murphy	Russell	Sulloway
McCreary, Pa.	Needham	Ryan	Thomas, N. C.
McKinley, Ill.	Olmsted	Samuel	Townsend
McKinney	Otjen	Shackleford	Underwood
McMorran	Padgett	Sheppard	Vreeland
McNary	Parker	Sherley	Waldo
Macon	Patterson, S. C.	Sibley	Wallace
Madden	Payne	Smith, Cal.	Watkins
Mann	Pollard	Smith, Ill.	Webb
Martin	Randell, Tex.	Smith, Iowa	Weems
Minor	Ransdell, La.	Smith, Md.	Wharton
Mondell	Richardson, Ala.	Smith, Mich.	Wiley, N. J.
Moon, Pa.	Rives	Smith, Pa.	Williams
Moon, Tenn.	Robinson, Ark.	Sparkman	Wilson
Morreil	Ruppert	Stafford	

NAYS—6.

Beall, Tex.	James	Sims	Smith, Tex.
Hepburn	Kitchin, Wm. W.		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—51.

Adamson	Deemer	Howard	Overstreet, Ga.
Allen, Me.	Esch	Hull	Scott
Barchfeld	Finley	Kahn	Slayden
Bartlett	Flood	Kline	Smyser
Bishop	Fordney	Knapp	Southall
Brick	Foster, Vt.	Lamar	Southard
Brooks, Tex.	Fulkerson	Lamb	Steenerson
Brundidge	Gaines, Tenn.	Law	Stephens, Tex.
Burgess	Gillespie	Le Fevre	Sullivan
Burke, Pa.	Goulden	McLain	Wanger
Byrd	Griggs	Mahon	Washburn
Cromer	Higgins	Marshall	The Speaker
Dawes	Holliday	Moore, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—178.

Acheson	Fletcher	Littauer	Robertson, La.
Aiken	Floyd	Livingston	Rodenberg
Alexander	Foss	Longworth	Rucker
Allen, N. J.	Foster, Ind.	Loud	Saunders
Ames	Fowler	Loudenslager	Schneebell
Andrus	Fuller	Lowden	Scroggy
Babcock	Gaines, W. Va.	McCall	Shartel
Bartholdt	Gardner, Mass.	McCarthy	Sherman
Bede	Gardner, Mich.	McDermott	Siemp
Bennett, Ky.	Gardner, N. J.	McGavin	Small
Bingham	Gilbert	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Ky.
Birdsall	Gilhams	McLachlan	Snapp
Blackburn	Gill	Maynard	Southwick
Bonyne	Gillett	Meyer	Sperry
Boutell	Glass	Michalek	Spight
Bowersock	Goldfogle	Miller	Stanley
Bowle	Graff	Moore, Tex.	Sterling
Bradley	Graham	Mouser	Stevens, Minn.
Brooks, Colo.	Gregg	Mudd	Sulzer
Brown	Gudger	Murdock	Talbott
Brumm	Haskins	Nelson	Tawney
Buckman	Haugen	Nevin	Taylor, Ala.
Burleigh	Hay	Norris	Taylor, Ohio
Burleson	Hearst	Olcott	Thomas, Ohio
Burton, Ohio	Hedge	Overstreet, Ind.	Tirrell
Calderhead	Henry, Conn.	Page	Towne
Campbell, Kans.	Henry, Tex.	Palmer	Trimbale
Campbell, Ohio	Hermann	Parsons	Tyndall
Cockran	Hinshaw	Patterson, N. C.	Van Duzer
Cooper, Wis.	Hogg	Pearre	Van Winkle
Coudrey	Hopkins	Perkins	Volstead
Crumpacker	Howell, N. J.	Pou	Wachter
Currier	Hubbard	Powers	Wadsworth
Dale	Hughes	Prince	Watson
Davidson	Hunt	Pujo	Webber
Davis, Minn.	Johnson	Rainey	Weeks
Davis, W. Va.	Jones, Va.	Reeder	Weisse
De Armond	Kennedy, Nebr.	Reid	Welborn
Dixon, Mont.	Kinkaid	Reynolds	Wiley, Ala.
Dovener	Klepper	Rhinoek	Wood
Dresser	Landis, Chas. B.	Rhodes	Woodyard
Dunwell	Lewis	Richardson, Ky.	Young
Ellerbe	Lilley, Conn.	Riordan	Zenor
Ellis	Lilley, Pa.	Roberts	
Field	Lindsay		

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.
 Mr. FOSS with Mr. MEYER.
 Mr. VAN WINKLE with Mr. McDERMOTT.
 Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.
 Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.
 Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.
 Mr. DEEMER with Mr. KLINE.

Until further notice:

Mr. HUGHES with Mr. STANLEY.
 Mr. FULLER with Mr. HOPKINS.
 Mr. POWERS with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. PUJO.
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. COCKRAN.
 Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.
 Mr. MORRELL with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILBERT.

For the day:

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut with Mr. VAN DUZER.
 Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. LINDSAY.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. HARDWICK.
 Mr. PEARRE with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. LIVINGSTON.
 Mr. MCKINLAY of California with Mr. RHINOEK.
 Mr. MCGAVIN with Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky.
 Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.
 Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. RAINEY.
 Mr. KLEPPER with Mr. POU.
 Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. JOHNSON.
 Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. BURLESON.
 Mr. HUBBARD with Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey with Mr. JONES of Virginia.
 Mr. HEDGE with Mr. PAGE.
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. MOORE of Texas.
 Mr. HASKINS with Mr. MAYNARD.
 Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. HENRY of Texas.
 Mr. DOVENER with Mr. HUNT.
 Mr. GILLET with Mr. HEARST.
 Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. HAY.
 Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. GUDGER.
 Mr. COUDREY with Mr. GREGG.
 Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. BURTON of Ohio with Mr. GLASS.
 Mr. BROWN with Mr. GILL.
 Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. TALBOTT.
 Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. WEISSE.
 Mr. YOUNG with Mr. RYAN.
 Mr. MILLER with Mr. REID.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. NELSON with Mr. SAUNDERS.
 Mr. OLCOTT with Mr. TOWNE.
 Mr. PRINCE with Mr. SPIGHT.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.
 Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. TRIMBLE.
 Mr. SCHNEEBELI with Mr. ZENOR.
 Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.
 Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. LEWIS.
 Mr. ACHESON with Mr. AIKEN.
 Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BOWIE.
 Mr. AMES with Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia.
 Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. DE ARMOND.
 Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. ELLERBY.
 Mr. BEDE with Mr. FIELD.
 Mr. BOWERSOCK with Mr. FLOYD.

During the roll call,

Mr. MAHON said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement. The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CAPRON]. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be allowed to make a statement.

Mr. MAHON. I have no bills on this Calendar, and never had any, but I have consulted with gentlemen who are largely interested in bills which are on this Calendar. They say that they want this order to go ahead. If they do, I am content. It is nothing personally to me. Besides, I am told that a large number of the membership of the House are at a banquet tonight, and I do not want to bring them here. I move that the call of the House be dispensed with. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, we do not understand the gentleman's proposition over here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the further calling of the roll be dispensed with, for reasons stated by the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. And that the point of no quorum be withdrawn.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know whether by unanimous consent, after the absence of a quorum is disclosed and the roll call has been commenced, it can be dispensed with?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion and is advised that such a disposition of the matter in the middle of the roll call is not permissible under the rules of the House, and therefore the roll call will proceed.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Can we not do anything by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will the Chair inform the House at what point we can get rid of this dilemma in which we find ourselves?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that it is not possible under the present condition until a quorum is developed.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. By unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that it will take the House to decide the matter now pending, and it is now developed that the House is not present. The roll call is proceeding to determine whether or not the House is present. As soon as that condition is developed, then it will be for the House to take such action as it desires.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I thank the Chair for the information, depressing as it may be.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Rule XV, under which the House is now proceeding, provides for two forms of the call of the House. Under clause 2 there would be no question but that every Member brought into the House should come to the bar of the House—

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is addressing the Chair—

Mr. HEPBURN. One at a time.

Mr. KEIFER. I desire to make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order. We have no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair assumed that the gentleman from Iowa was later coming to that point.

Mr. HEPBURN. To the point of the quorum, Mr. Chairman! Under clause 2 there can be no question but that any Member brought in here would be under arrest and would have to be excused by the House. It may not be so plainly stated under clause 4 that this would be the procedure, and yet I am satisfied that it is, because in both instances we find that the word "arrest" is used.

Mr. LEGARE. I move that the gentleman have leave to print. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because I see here to-night a very distinguished gentleman, who works in very many fields of usefulness, always wisely and to the advantage of the House, who, during the past session, has devoted himself largely to securing the attendance of Members. He has gone so far, I think, as to introduce a bill providing penalties for those who, by failing to appear promptly in their seats, retard the public business.

The SPEAKER. Upon this vote the yeas are 143, nays 6, present 51, a quorum.

So the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HARRY A. YOUNG.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 7550) for the relief of Harry A. Young.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Harry A. Young shall be held and considered to have been mustered into the military service of the United States, in the office of assistant surgeon of the battalion of Utah Light Artillery, with the rank of first lieutenant, on the 18th day of January, 1899, and to have held said office and rank until he was killed in action on the 6th of February, 1899: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, compensation, or allowance shall accrue to said Harry A. Young by virtue of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

On motion of Mr. HOWELL of Utah, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LARVAN GORDON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 5869) for the relief of Larvan Gordon.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to confirm homestead entry No. 24813, made to the Camden, Ark., land office by Larvan Gordon, of Dial, Howard County, Ark., and cause a patent to the land embraced within said entry to be issued to said Larvan Gordon, provided there is no valid adverse claim for such land.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

FRANK J. LADNER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 20490) for the relief of Frank J. Ladner.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Frank J. Ladner be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter, at the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre, in virtue of his and his ancestors' long settlement and valuable improvements thereon, the following-described lands, to wit: Lots 1 and 8 of section 3, and all of section 2 except 78 acres on the eastern border of said

section, in township 8 south, range 14 west of the St. Stevens meridian, in the State of Mississippi, containing an area of 640 acres, more or less, located in Hancock County, said State, and upon payment of said sum a patent shall issue in favor of said Frank J. Ladner.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

In line 5 strike out the word "ancestors'" and insert "assignor's."

In line 7 strike out the words "Lots 1 and 8 of section 3 and all of section 2 except 78 acres on the east border of said section" and insert in place thereof "Section 13."

In line 11, after the word "Mississippi," insert the words "being the land shown on the plat of official survey, approved December 9, 1829, as the private land claim of John B. Lardner."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some information on this bill.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, John B. Lardner was the holder from the Spanish Crown of 640 acres of land when the United States purchased that territory as a part of the Louisiana purchase, and it provided the means for the confirmation of these grants. Lardner appeared and furnished this commission with evidence of his title, and his possession of the grant was reported for confirmation. It was surveyed and comprised 640 acres of land, laid out to him by the deputy United States surveyor. Lardner always claimed that the first survey was correct.

I should state that the land has been in actual occupation of the persons for whose benefit this bill is introduced as grantees for nearly, if not quite, one hundred years, the occupation of the land antedating the American possession. A short time after the first survey a second survey was made which shifted these lines somewhat in order to include Lardner's improvements, but really it left them out. The patent was issued according to the lines of the last survey, which this old creole ignored. Some years ago the persons to whom he sold—he is dead now—discovered that they had no patent for their land, and application was made to Congress.

It has been reported on three times by the Land Office, on each occasion favorably, and once the recommendation was made that the patent to the land be granted without payment. In the other cases it was recommended that the patent be granted on payment of \$1.25 per acre, the usual price of land in that vicinity. Now, in that connection the latest report from the Land Office is under date of to-day, which I will put in the RECORD. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 28, 1907.

CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose a copy of a report of the 27th instant by the Commissioner of the General Land Office on amended H. R. 20490, entitled "A bill for the relief of Frank J. Ladner," in which report I concur.

Very respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1907.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

SIR: I am in receipt, by your reference of this date, for early report in duplicate, with return of papers, of amended House bill No. 20490, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, which reads as follows:

"A bill for the relief of Frank J. Ladner.

"Be it enacted, etc., That Frank J. Ladner be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter, at the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre, in virtue of his and his assignor's long settlement and valuable improvements thereon, the following described lands, to wit: Section 13, township 8 south, range 14 west of the St. Stevens meridian, in the State of Mississippi, being the lands shown on the plat of official survey approved December 9, 1829, as the private land claim of John B. Lardner, containing an area of 640 acres, more or less, located in Hancock County, said State, and upon payment of said sum a patent shall issue in favor of said Frank J. Ladner."

The bill, except in one particular, viz, that provision is made for payment for the land, is identical in its provisions with H. R. 9747, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, and H. R. 3843, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, reported on by this Office July 7, 1898, and February 9, 1903, respectively, and describes the land involved as was suggested in said reports.

A copy of the report of February 9, 1903, is incorporated in House Report 6589, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, accompanying the bill. This office has received no additional information relative to the claim since said report of February 9, 1903, was made, and as suggested therein, will offer no objection to the bill in case the Congress deems the claim of Frank J. Ladner an equitable one and worthy of favorable consideration.

This report is made in duplicate, as requested, and all papers are returned.

Very respectfully,

W. A. RICHARDS, Commissioner.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BOWERS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM N. HUGHES.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 5660) for the relief of Capt. William N. Hughes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Capt. William N. Hughes, United States Army, retired, detailed July 14, 1902, for duty at East Florida Seminary, Gainesville, Fla., shall be held and considered as having been detailed under the act of November 3, 1893.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WILLIAM MITCHELL, DECEASED.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8791) authorizing the Secretary of War to recognize William Mitchell, deceased, as having been a member of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, civil war:

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to recognize William Mitchell, deceased, as having been a member of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, civil war, from the 25th day of August, 1863, up to his death, which occurred the 18th day of September, 1863.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to declare that a man was mustered into the Army, but who, whatever the equities of the case may have been at the time, was never in the service of the United States. To pass the bill would be to open a precedent to put into the service of the United States, and thereby put them upon a pensionable status, everyone who ever did anything in behalf of the Union. I ask that the bill go over.

The SPEAKER. Do two others object?

Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is it permissible to reserve the right to object?

The SPEAKER. For five minutes. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard?

Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee. I desire to make a statement of the facts in the case, Mr. Speaker. This report shows that Mitchell was enlisted. He joined the Army, joined the company, but before he got to the place of rendezvous to be mustered in they were run upon by a set of Confederate guerrillas and this man, with others, was killed. This bill is only to give him a military status. Those are the facts.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BUTLER] will permit me, I will say that I was a member of the subcommittee that investigated that case and of the committee that reported it. The facts are as he stated. This man was on the way to be mustered in when he was killed at Carthage, Tenn.

Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee. He had enlisted. He had joined the Army. The captain who was making up the company had taken his name.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the facts as disclosed by the report in the case are that this man intended to join a company. There was no company organized at the time. He did not join the company. He intended to join the company, according to the report. To allow him in is to let a very large class in.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that the captain had the soldier's name, together with the names of ninety-nine other men.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, the gentleman from Kentucky has not read the report, and I have.

Mr. JAMES. If I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BUTLER] correctly, the facts are as I have stated.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from Tennessee is mistaken about there being ninety-nine other men.

Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee. The gentleman from Kentucky misunderstood me. I did not state that. The captain was making up the company.

The SPEAKER. Do two others object?

Mr. PAYNE. I object.

Mr. GREENE. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

BIRCHIE O. MAHAFFEY, JOHN A. CLEVELAND, AND TRAUGETT F. KELLER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 23630) authorizing the President to nominate and appoint Birchie O. Mahaffey, John A. Cleveland, and Traugett F. Keller as second lieutenant in the United States Army.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Birchie O. Mahaffey, John A. Cleveland, and Traugett F. Keller as second lieutenants in the United States Army.

With the following amendment:

Line 7, after the word "Army," insert the words "notwithstanding the bar of age."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

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. GOULDEN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LOUISIANA MOLASSES COMPANY, ETC.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 24833) for the relief of the Louisiana Molasses Company (Limited) and the Louisiana Distilling Company.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the vinegar factory of the Louisiana Molasses Company (Limited) and the distillery of the Louisiana Distilling Company, both situated in New Orleans, La., and having their respective premises separated from each other by a distance of only 425 feet in a direct line, may, to avoid special hardship to the proprietors of said premises, both continue to be operated as now situated and in like manner as they have been operated for seven and one-half years past in the belief that the premises were duly separated according to law, notwithstanding that the said premises are not distant from each other full 600 feet in a direct line as required by the general statutes in that regard.

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.

JOHN CROWLEY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16740) to place John Crowley on the retired list of the United States Navy.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some explanation of this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This bill is to place on the retired list of the Navy a man who retired before the act authorizing the retirement pay went into effect. If this bill should pass, every man who retired previous to that time will be placed on the list.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a third objection?

Mr. MAHON. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAHON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ANNULING CERTAIN TITLES TO LAND ACQUIRED BY JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN TEXAS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 24466) to annul certain titles to lands acquired by judicial proceedings in the courts of the United States in Texas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a Senate bill, 8427, that was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims. I ask that the Senate bill be taken up in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Senate bill will be read. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Private Land Claims from the further consideration of the Senate bill and consider the same at this time. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on the 11th day of December, 1873, the United States obtained judgment in the circuit court of the United States sitting at Tyler, Tex., in the then western district of Texas, for \$50,000, against William T. Scott, William Umbdenstock, and others, sureties on the official bond of Davis B. Bonfoy, late collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of Texas, cause 1037, and it appearing from the facts that on the trial of the cause against the said sureties they were deprived of their defense by having, through mistake, presented their accounts and facts in favor of Davis B. Bonfoy, their principal, then deceased, to the wrong accounting officer at Washington, D. C., for his action thereon, and said accounts were returned by said officer to the United States attorney representing the Government in the cause without any action thereon, which fact was not known to the defendants until they had announced themselves ready for trial; and

Whereas facts subsequently discovered show that at the date of said judgment Davis B. Bonfoy, as collector aforesaid, was not really indebted to the United States, which facts could not have been known at the time to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury Department, for the reason that the money belonging to the United States in

the hands of Bonfoy at the time of his death were taken charge of by the military authorities of the United States then commanding at Marshall, Tex. (the State being under military rule), and returned to and accounted for by said military authorities to the War Department instead of the Treasury Department; and

Whereas since said money so returned to the War Department has been taken up by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department in a readjustment of the accounts of the said Davis B. Bonfoy as collector, and it appearing from said last adjustment, including the newly discovered funds in the War Department, that at the time said judgment was obtained against said sureties Bonfoy really owed the Government nothing, but in fact had a balance due him from the Government: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby relinquishes to the heirs or legal representatives of William T. Scott, late of Scottsville, Harrison County, Tex., and to his assigns, all the right, title, and interest, real or pretended, of the United States in and to fifty-two sections of land of 640 acres each, aggregating 33,280 acres, lying and being situated in the counties of Tom Green, Mitchell, Concho, Irion, Coke, Sterling, and Atascosa, in the State of Texas, which said lands were bought in for the United States by Stillwell H. Russell, then United States marshal for the western district of Texas, at a public sale made by him, the said Stillwell H. Russell, United States marshal, on the first Tuesday in October, 1878, under and by virtue of an alias pluries execution, dated June 10, 1878, issuing out of the circuit court of the United States on said judgment obtained by the United States in a circuit court of the United States sitting at Tyler, Tex., in the western judicial district of Texas, on the 11th day of December, 1873, against William T. Scott and others as sureties on the bond of Dalvis B. Bonfoy, collector aforesaid, cause 1037, and levied on said lands on the 5th day of September, 1878, and by him as such marshal, following the statute in such case made and provided, deeded to the United States in a deed bearing date December 9, 1878, and recorded in Tom Greene County, in Book C of deeds of said county, folios 128 to 138, inclusive; and that all the right, title, and interest of the United States, real or pretended, to said lands be, and the same are hereby, as fully and thoroughly divested out of the United States as if no such judgment had ever been obtained.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to inquire what committee reported this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Judiciary Committee reported the bill to the House.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. The Judiciary Committee of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. A private land-claim bill reported from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. This was a claim held on a judicial decree of the court that carried it to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MANN. I may say to the gentleman from New York I have examined the claim somewhat carefully. The reason it went to the Committee on the Judiciary was on account of action taken by the Department of Justice. The report on the bill is taken on the recommendation of several Attorney-Generals, including practically the present Department of Justice, of course not the present Attorney-General.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 64466) was ordered to lie on the table.

HAROLD D. CHILDS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 22027) to place Harold D. Childs on the retired list of the United States Navy.

The Clerk read the substitute amendment, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Harold D. Childs, late midshipman, an ensign in the United States Navy, and to place him upon the retired list as such, with three-fourths the pay of his grade.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to have some explanation on this.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is another bill to put a man on the retired list who is not entitled to go on the retired list, to allow him three-fourths of pay, when, under the law, he would receive only one-half. It seems to me we have run the limit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LYMAN W. WENTWORTH.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9892) to correct the military record of Lyman W. Wentworth.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lyman W. Wentworth shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged from the military service of the United States on the 21st day of September, 1899, as a member of Company M, First Regiment California Infantry Volunteers, by reason of disability resulting from wounds and sickness incurred in line of duty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there are two or three bills like this upon the Calendar. There are many thousands of such cases in this country, and if this bill passes we will be called

upon to pass thousands more. The only purpose of the bill is to permit a man who has an honorable discharge to have it recite he was discharged for disability in order that he may get a Government position ahead of other people, and I object.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a third objection?

Mr. MACON. I object.

Mr. FINLEY. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

JOSEPH Y. PORTER.

The next business upon the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 5365) to appoint Joseph Y. Porter a lieutenant-colonel and deputy surgeon-general and to place him on the retired list of the Army.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Joseph Y. Porter, late a captain and assistant surgeon of the United States Army, to the position of lieutenant-colonel and deputy surgeon-general, and to place him on the retired list of the Army without pay as of that rank, and the retired list is hereby increased for that purpose only: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments, either heretofore or hereafter, shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

WILLIAM PEACOCK.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14133) for the relief of William Peacock.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is just the same kind of a bill. And to show how it goes, the only reason given in this report is that a similar bill was passed sometime ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

Mr. FINLEY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CHARLES A. GOING.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17013) for the relief of Charles A. Going.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the disqualification of Charles A. Going to enter lands under the homestead laws in force in the Territory of Oklahoma and applying to lands opened to settlement in the Pawnee Indian Reservation, in the said Territory, arising by reason of the said Charles A. Going having heretofore entered a homestead in the State of Kansas, be, and the same are hereby, removed, and that the entry of said Charles A. Going of the southeast quarter of section No. 4, in township No. 22 north, of range No. 3 east of the Indian meridian, in Pawnee County Okla., be, and the same is, restored as fully and to all intents and purposes as if the said Charles A. Going at the time of entering said lands had been qualified under the laws of the United States to enter the same.

The following committee amendment was read:

At the end of line 16 add: "*Provided*, That the said Going shall pay the sum of \$1.25 per acre for said land."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

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

M. I. GALLUPS AND OTHERS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 24945) for the relief of M. I. Gallups, R. S. Smith, W. N. Gill, J. A. Weaver, I. S. Cadenhead, Davis Gillenwaters, and John McLemore.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas on the 14th day of October, 1895, M. I. Gallups entered as homestead the following-described lands situated in Russell County, Ala.: Southeast quarter of section 35, township 16, range 28, and did on the 8th day of January, 1901, make final proof of his improvement and residence on the land as required by law, and did on the 13th day of December, 1901, receive a patent to the land from the United States;

Whereas on the 30th day of September, 1895, Robert S. Smith entered as homestead the following-described lands situated in Russell County, Ala.: Northeast quarter of section 35, township 16, range 28, and did on the 23d day of November, 1900, make final proof of his improvement and residence on the land as required by law, and did on the 4th day of December, 1901, receive a patent to the land from the United States; and

Whereas on the 1st day of August, 1897, John McLemore entered as homestead the following-described lands situated in Russell County, Ala.: Southeast quarter of southwest quarter, section 35, township 16, range 28, and took up his homestead and residence upon said lands and lived thereon continuously until the 25th day of March, 1901; and

Whereas on the 5th day of May, 1896, William N. Gill entered as homestead the following-described lands situated in Russell County, Ala.: South half of northeast quarter and north half of southeast quarter, section 33, township 16, range 28, and took up his homestead and residence on said lands and lived thereon continuously until the 25th day of March, 1901; and

Whereas on the 11th day of December, 1895, Davis Gillenwaters entered as homestead the following-described lands situated in Russell County, Ala.: South half of southeast and southeast quarter of southwest quarter, section 33, township 16, range 28, and took up his homestead and residence on said lands and lived thereon continuously until the 25th day of March, 1901; and

Whereas on the 5th day of May, 1896, Ivey S. Cadenhead entered as homestead the following-described lands situated in Russell County, Ala.: Southeast quarter of northwest quarter and north half of southwest quarter and southwest quarter of southwest quarter, section 33, township 16, range 28, and took up his homestead and residence on said lands and lived thereon continuously until the 25th day of March, 1901; and

Whereas on the 28th day of October, 1895, James A. Weaver entered as homestead the following-described lands situated in Russell County, Ala.: East half of northwest quarter and southwest quarter of northwest quarter and northwest quarter of southwest quarter, section 25, township 16, range 28, and took up his homestead and residence on said lands and lived thereon continuously until the 25th day of March, 1901; and

Whereas on the 25th day of March, 1901, these parties, the said M. I. Gallups, Robert S. Smith, John McLemore, William N. Gill, Davis Gillenwaters, Ivey S. Cadenhead, and James A. Weaver, were sued out of possession of said lands by C. H. Dudley, who had purchased the lands from the Mobile and Girard Railroad Company, whose title was founded upon an act of Congress granting said lands to said railroad company, but which land grant had been held by the Department of the Interior as forfeited, which ruling was held by the Supreme Court of the United States to be erroneous, and upon the strength thereof said above-named persons, who had made homestead entries, were ousted; and

Whereas these parties above named lost their land and homesteads and their improvements, houses, fences, and labor for five years: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That each of said persons be, and he is hereby, entitled and authorized to select and receive patent for an equal quantity of unappropriated nonmineral public lands subject to homestead entry without any requirement of previous residence thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill how it happens to come from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. CLAYTON. It was brought about as the result of a lawsuit in which these parties lost their lands, and I suppose it is for that reason. Having grown up out of a lawsuit, the merits of this case went to the law committee of the House.

Mr. LACEY. Some judge being responsible for the loss of it, it went to the Committee on the Judiciary for relief?

Mr. CLAYTON. I can not say that.

Mr. LACEY. Now, I would ask the gentleman if any investigation has been had as to the facts, from the records of the Interior Department, recited in this preamble?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir; and I can state to the gentleman that I have ascertained those statements to be true.

Mr. LACEY. There is no report from the Land Office. Of course, this bill ought to have gone to the Committee on Public Lands, but I am not disposed to object if the facts as stated have been established before the committee.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is all a matter of public record, and the facts were so stated.

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.

The preamble was stricken out.

On motion of Mr. CLAYTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

STEPHEN THOMPSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 3863) to correct the military record of Stephen Thompson.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. MANN. This bill was probably reported from the Committee on Military Affairs by an error. The report recites that when the man was discharged the surgeon certified that it was not a case for a pension and that the man should be discharged without bounty or a pension, it being probably a case of fraudulent enlistment, and he was discharged by the commandant-general without a bounty, and that is all the report discloses. So that probably is intended to be an adverse report, and I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

W. D. CLAY.

The next bill on the Private Calendar was the bill H. R. 22182.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That William D. Clay, James W. Clay, and Maggie Click, heirs of James W. Clay, deceased, be, and they are hereby, authorized to select in lieu of lands heretofore erroneously patented by the Government to their father, James W. Clay, and lost by said heirs, any other 80 acres of nonmineral, unappropriated surveyed public lands subject to homestead entry: *Provided,* That before making such

selection they shall deliver to the Secretary of the Interior a duly executed and recorded quitclaim deed to the United States, conveying only such right and title as the said James W. Clay, deceased, acquired to the east half of the northwest quarter of section 16 township 6 south, range 3 east, in Alabama, by virtue of a patent issued to him for the said lands on the 2d day of April, 1857, and surrendering such patent to the Secretary of the Interior if in their possession, or filing with him an affidavit that they are unable to procure said patent, if such is the case, and shall file an abstract and affidavit showing that they, or James W. Clay, the patentee, have never conveyed to anyone the title derived from said patent: *Provided further,* That the right of selection of lieu lands provided for above shall be exercised within five years from the approval of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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. BURNETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PATRICK NADDY

The next bill on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 20128) to complete the naval record of Patrick Naddy.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to so amend the naval record of Patrick Naddy, late first-class boy, United States Navy, on United States receiving ship North Carolina and U. S. S. Galena and Princeton, as to show him honorably discharged, to date from June 30, 1863.

The following committee amendment was read:

In line 7 strike out the word "honorably."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and the committee amendment was rejected.

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

On motion of Mr. CALDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GERMAN BARK MARIECHEN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 25437) to grant an American registry to the German bark *Mariechen*.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25437) to grant American registry to the German bark *Mariechen*.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation be, and he is hereby, authorized to register as an American vessel the German bark *Mariechen*: *Provided, however,* That such registry shall not give to said vessel the right to engage in the coastwise trade.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

And this act is recommended favorably for passage based upon the express condition that said bark is to be used as a barge, and that no application shall be hereafter made for the right for said vessel to engage in the coastwise trade for said vessel.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the amendment. It is to be supposed that the amendment recommended by the committee shall accomplish some purpose, but it reads, "And this act is recommended favorably for passage based upon the express condition that said bark is to be used as a barge," etc. Now whatever was intended to be done by the committee, certainly it could not be accomplished by the words "this act is recommended favorably for passage," upon a certain condition, which will certainly not accomplish what is desired.

Mr. MANN. You ought to strike out the words in line 7, "recommended favorably for passage."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have no objection to having these words stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The first question is, Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now the gentleman offers an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the committee amendment by striking out of line 7 the words "recommended favorably for passage."

The question was taken; and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Also amend by striking out at the end "for said vessel," which is a repetition.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the last three words in the amendment "for said vessel."

The question was taken; and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment of the committee as amended was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, a motion to re-

consider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WEBB C. MAGLATHLIN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 6729) authorizing the President to appoint Webb C. Maglathlin a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint Webb C. Maglathlin a second assistant engineer in the United States Revenue-Cutter Service upon the occurring of the first vacancy after the passage of this act in the grade of second assistant engineer in said Service: *Provided*, That the said Webb C. Maglathlin passes satisfactorily the physical examination required by the regulations of that Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAHON. I would like to inquire if this would interfere with the promotion of an officer now in the service?

Mr. MANN. I see that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING] is present.

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Speaker, this is a case where a young man passed the professional examination and was recommended for appointment. He stood at the head of the list. At that time he was well within the limit of age, which was fixed at 28. He was not needed then. Before taking the physical examination Congress passed a law fixing 26 years as the limit, and then he was over age. This is a specially exceptional case, and requires action. The service is in need of this man, and he is recommended by the Treasury Department; and I will say the bill has the unanimous report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAHON. He went through the cadet service.

Mr. HULL. How old is he now?

Mr. LOVERING. Twenty-seven.

Mr. MAHON. His appointment will not interfere with anybody else?

Mr. LOVERING. Nobody else is on the eligible list.

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

On motion of Mr. LOVERING, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MARTHA SANDERS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 23988) to authorize a patent to be issued to Martha Sanders, widow of Levi B. Sanders, for certain lands therein described.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 23988) to authorize a patent to be issued to Martha Sanders, widow of Levi B. Sanders, for certain lands therein described.

Be it enacted, etc., That the entry of Levi B. Sanders of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 28, township 18 north, range 25 west, fifth principal meridian in the Harrison land district, in the State of Arkansas, held for cancellation by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and ordered canceled by the Secretary of the Interior, be, and the same is hereby, allowed and permitted to remain of record as of the date of said entry, so that title to said land may inure to the benefit of Martha Sanders, widow of the said Levi B. Sanders, and her grantees, as far as she may have conveyed the same, and that patent for said lands be issued to said Martha Sanders, widow of said Levi B. Sanders.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Provided, That if satisfactory proof be presented to the Commissioner of the General Land Office that said Martha Sanders has conveyed said land, the patent herein authorized to be issued to said lands shall be issued to the present owner of the land holding and claiming under her.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it as accordingly read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS F. WALTER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill S. 4964.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 4964) for the relief of Thomas F. Walter.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to review the record of Thomas F. Walter, late first lieutenant of Company A, Ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to revoke the order of courts-martial promulgated in orders dated April 16, 1865, and grant to him an honorable discharge as of the date of his separation from the service: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to have some explanation of this bill.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will read from

the report, which states all the facts much more briefly than I could:

This officer had a very honorable service from the date of his enlistment, in August, 1861, up to the date of his separation from the service, in April, 1865. He was but 19 years old when entering the service. During this service he was captured while serving as a volunteer in a perilous trip from near Warrenton, Va., into Snickers Gap, in the Blue Ridge, and passing through the enemy's lines about 30 miles. He was in prison at Winchester, and in a march of nearly 100 miles to Libby Prison "got away on a 'flag-of-truce boat' and returned to the front without waiting to be exchanged."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for an explanation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the President himself endeavored to correct this man's discharge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

On motion of Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ANNA JOHNSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 25697) granting land to Anna Johnson.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill to the same effect, which came over to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Private Land Claims from further consideration of the Senate bill and consider it in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. LACEY. This bill should have been sent to-day to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MANN. It seems to have been sent to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. LACEY. The Senate bill has not yet reached the committee.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 8580) granting land to Anna Johnson.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue to Anna Johnson, wife of Ging Sing, alias Jim Johnson, a patent to the following-described land, to wit: The southwest quarter of section 29, in township 13 south, of range 3 east of the New Mexico principal meridian.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, that should be "range 25" instead of "range 3." I move that as an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7 strike out "3" and insert "25."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the similar House bill was ordered to lie on the table.

COMMANDER WILLIAM WILMOT WHITE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 25179) transferring Commander William Wilmot White from the retired list to the active list of the Navy.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, William Wilmot White, now a commander on the retired list of the Navy, a lieutenant-commander on the active list of the United States Navy, to take rank next above Lieut. Commander Emil Theiss, United States Navy: *Provided*, That the said William Wilmot White shall be carried as additional to the number of the grade to which he may be appointed under this act or at any time thereafter promoted: *And provided further*, That the said William Wilmot White shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to back pay of any kind.

The following amendment, recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs, was read:

After the word "kind," in line 2, page 2, insert:

"*And provided further*, That the said William Wilmot White shall pass a physical examination before said transfer showing his fitness to enter the active service of the Navy."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the Navy Department has disapproved of this bill, and recommends that it do not pass. It sets forth the reasons in the report. For that reason I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a second objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there a third?

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I object.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, am I not entitled to make an explanation? The Navy Department does not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Gentlemen may object after that if they desire to do so. It is nothing to me.

Mr. MANN. Are we required to wait five minutes before we object?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to five minutes' explanation.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in justice to the Department—

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry. Must we object just at the end of the five minutes, losing the right if we do not?

The SPEAKER. The House has been proceeding informally, without objection, in the nature of unanimous consent; but under the order the gentleman is entitled to five minutes before the objection comes.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this transfer from the retired list to the active list is requested by the Bureau of Steam Engineering of the Navy. It is true that the Bureau of Navigation does not approve it, because it does not desire, as stated in a letter written to the Naval Affairs Committee, to set a precedent. I will inform the House that the precedent has already been set during the present session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this officer is one of about thirty or forty left of the old engineers of the Navy. Last year or the year before he went upon the retired list, taking advantage of the personnel act of 1899, and was promoted to the rank of commander. He has now consented to go back and take his place in the line with the rank of lieutenant-commander. His transfer will not interfere with the promotion of anyone. My friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will notice that this transfer, if made, demotes him from the rank of commander to the rank of lieutenant-commander. I hope the gentleman will not object. The passage of this bill is requested of the Naval Affairs Committee by the Bureau of Steam Engineering.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Navy disregarded the recommendation of the Bureau of Steam Engineering and followed the recommendation of the Bureau of Navigation and that he says—

Concurring in the views of the Bureau of Navigation, as above set forth, the Department does not commend this measure to favorable consideration.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. That is true.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then is it not a fact, as I asserted, that the Department does not recommend this bill for favorable action?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I suppose, considering all these bureaus as part of the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy speaking for them, that perhaps the Navy Department does not approve of the transfer; but the Bureau of Steam Engineering, to which this officer belongs, most urgently recommends, for the good of the service, that this man may go back and take his place in the line and go to sea. I ask my friends on the other side not to object. There is nothing personal in this. I am endeavoring to get a man from the retired list back on the active list. This will be a saving to the Government and will place on one of our great ships an engineer of the highest skill and possessing great intelligence for his profession. I appeal to my friends not to object.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman really think we ought to pass a bill of this sort, against the recommendation of the Navy Department, against the recommendation of the Bureau of Navigation, and not with a favorable recommendation, but only a half-hearted suggestion from the Bureau of Steam Engineering?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I will say to my friend that the Bureau of Steam Engineering most urgently requests the passage of this bill.

Mr. MANN. It only says:

So it seems but just to him that he should be restored to his former position in the service.

There is no recommendation contained in the report. If there was any such recommendation, it ought to have been printed in the report.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is the language used by the Bureau of Steam Engineering:

As these officers are fast disappearing from the list, the Bureau feels that in the near future it will be embarrassed for lack of officers with sufficient experience to do the work of design and inspection of new vessels as well as the necessary work on shore at navy-yards. As this officer's record is most excellent and his professional ability well recognized, also as he is an active worker and comparatively young for his place on the list, it is believed that it will be advantageous to the naval service to retain his services as long as possible.

I ask my friend not to object.

Mr. MANN. That certainly is not a recommendation for the

passage of this bill. I said they had regarded it favorably, but they did not recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. The Bureau of Navigation does not recommend the passage of the bill, but the Bureau of Steam Engineering has urged us by communications and otherwise that the bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. The five minutes has elapsed. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

MYRA CLARK GAINES.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5437) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue to the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased, late of the parish of Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, land scrip for 38,457 acres of land in lieu of 39,737 arpents of land to which the said Myra Clark Gaines was entitled as legal representative of Daniel Clark under a grant made by Spain to Thomas Urquhart, being claim No. 2 in House Executive Document No. 60, Forty-third Congress, first session, and in lieu of 5,470 arpents of land to which the said Myra Clark Gaines was entitled as legal representative of Daniel Clark under a grant made by Spain to John Lynd, being claim No. 6 in the said House Executive Document No. 60, Forty-third Congress, first session, the said scrip to be receivable in payment for the public lands, at the rate of \$1.25 per acre, in the same way that military bounty land warrants are now receivable in payment for the public lands: *Provided,* That the said scrip shall be received by the said heirs in full settlement and satisfaction of all claims of the said Myra Clark Gaines, deceased, arising out of the said grants of Spain to Thomas Urquhart and John Lynd.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this is the old Gaines claim, so familiar to everybody who was an adult twenty-five years ago. I believe it has gone through all the courts, and I think they decided invariably against the claim of these claimants.

Mr. LACEY. No; it was decided the other way; and I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like an explanation.

Mr. LACEY. It was decided the other way shortly after the gentleman from Iowa was born, and has been awaiting the action of Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, complying with the request of the gentleman from Iowa, I will make a brief statement of this bill. It is indeed a very old claim. In November, 1803, the intendant-general of the Spanish province of West Florida granted to Thomas Urquhart 50,000 arpents of land—and an arpent is equivalent to seven-eighths of an acre. In 1806 the same grantor conveyed to John Lynd 5,470 arpents of land. In 1803 Thomas Urquhart conveyed this land so granted him to Daniel Clark, and in 1812 John Lynd also conveyed to Daniel Clark. In 1803, under the treaty between France and the United States, the United States acquired a claim to the territory within which this land is situated. Spain also claimed the land by treaty of Ildefonso, of 1800, by occupancy, having established military posts and garrisons. These claims were disputed claims between the United States and Spain and France and between the United States and Spain, and remained unsettled until 1819, when there was executed the treaty of amity settlements and limits between the United States and Spain.

By the terms of that treaty the United States recognized in some sense the title of Spain to these lands, and agreed to confirm the grants of all titles similar to this grant. It would seem that this treaty would have been sufficient to confirm the title of Daniel Clark to these lands. But in 1829, after years of litigation in the courts, Justice Marshall held in an opinion in Foster and Elam v. Neilson, in the second of Peters, 396, that it involved a political question, and that inasmuch as the United States had, by the act of 1804 and other acts of Congress, asserted claim of title to these lands under the treaty with France that Congress was the proper forum to grant relief to Daniel Gaines or his heirs.

In 1860 Congress passed a law pursuant to these decisions, providing for the confirmation of these claims and for the relief contemplated by this bill if the lands had been disposed of by the Government. Five years were allowed in which to present claims under the act. The civil war came on and no applications were made under that act, but in 1867 the term was extended three years. Myra Clark Gaines, as the heir of Daniel Clark, presented her claim to the Commissioners of the consolidated land office at New Orleans within the period fixed by the statute of 1867 extending the limitation of the act of 1860, and these Commissioners proceeded to confirm her claim. The Commissioner of the General Land Office, Willis Drummond, rejected the claim and refused to confirm it for several reasons

relating to the evidence, claiming that certain necessary evidence did not appear in the record.

This evidence was subsequently supplied, and it was made to appear to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of the Land Office that the claim was just, and he stated in a report to this Congress that if that evidence had been before his Office at the time he first passed upon the matter the claim would not have been rejected by him, but would have been confirmed. It is claimed, and the record shows, that the evidence was filed with the commissioners at New Orleans, but through some oversight of those officers it was not certified to the Commissioner of the General Land Office at Washington. The United States Congress subsequent to that time has had bills pending before it for the greater part of the time. It is a singular fact that the Committee on Public Lands of this House has repeatedly favorably reported this legislation.

There has never been one unfavorable report made on this bill by the House. It passed the House in the Forty-sixth Congress, if I remember correctly, and went to the Senate, but the committee of that body made an adverse report on the ground that the claim was not presented within the limitation fixed by the statute of 1867, and so no action was taken in the Senate, but the record shows conclusively that the claim was presented in December, 1869, and within the three-year period fixed by that statute of 1867. In 1886, I think it was, Myra Clark Gaines, the heir of Daniel Clark, died, and from that time for a period of ten years no action was taken before this body. Since that time bills have been continually pending before the Committee on Public Lands, and subcommittees have been appointed to consider the bill during every Congress. A subcommittee at the present session took the matter up and had very extended hearings.

I wish to say for myself and my colleagues on that subcommittee that we started into the investigation of the claim with the assumption that the doctrine of laches, or limitations, ought to apply; but after a careful consideration of the matter we have come to the conclusion that instead of being negligent in the prosecution of this claim Daniel Clark and his heirs have been singularly persistent in pressing their claims. They have gone to the courts, and they have come to Congress, and it is true that almost one hundred years have passed since the cause of this litigation has arisen; but the committee was of the opinion that the claim was meritorious, and that the bill ought to pass.

The SPEAKER. The five minutes have expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the value of this land scrip?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. One dollar and twenty-five cents an acre.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What would the total be under this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The total appropriation carried by the bill—

Mr. FITZGERALD. About \$45,000?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Something more than that, if I figure it correctly. There are about 38,000 acres.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard a moment.

The SPEAKER. But the five minutes have expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

JOSÉ MARCH DUPLAT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the joint resolution 92 to authorize the Secretary of War to permit José March Duplat to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to permit José March Duplat, of Venezuela, to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point: *Provided,* That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby; and that the said Duplat shall agree to comply fully with all regulations for the police and discipline of the United States Military Academy; that he shall be studious, and that he shall give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction: *And provided further,* That, in the case of the said Duplat, the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be suspended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire how many foreigners are now being educated at West Point?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I think there are some five or six altogether. This resolution comes from the State Department, from the War Department, in the usual form, applied for by the Venezuelan Government, and costs our Government nothing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman think, under the present relations with Venezuela, we ought to grant this?

Mr. HULL. It is a courtesy we have never refused any of the South or Central American republics, and I think it is certainly a desirable thing to do in order to make them feel better toward us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

SETH DAVIS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 25801) granting an honorable discharge to Seth Davis.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Seth Davis shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as first lieutenant Company E, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, on April 23, 1866, and that the Secretary of War shall issue to him an honorable discharge as of that date: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

On motion of Mr. FORDNEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DAVID ROBERTSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 4089) to place David Robertson, sergeant, first class, Hospital Corps, on the retired list of the United States Army.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in consequence of the long, faithful, and meritorious services in the United States Army of David Robertson, sergeant, first class, Hospital Corps, for a period of fifty years in the same grade, the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to place said David Robertson on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army with full pay of his grade and commutation of allowances at the following rates per month: Clothing, \$4.56; rations, \$30, and fuel and quarters, \$20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is an adverse report, but nobody will endeavor to pass the bill to-night. This bill is on the Calendar on an adverse report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois object.

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Speaker, I will not take one-fifth of five minutes. I just desire to say that of all records made in the service here is the record of a man who has served fifty years in active service, a man who besides that is recommended that this action be taken by every major-general in the United States Army living to-day, by the Secretary of War, and by, I think, fifteen brigadier-generals now in command of the Army or recently retired, so it seemed to a considerable number of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs that it is one case where we might except the usual rule that is adopted by the committee and allow this action to be taken. I believe the man is one of the most worthy men in the United States service or has been, and I hope this vote will carry unanimously.

Mr. PARKER. Can I say a word to the House in favor of the report of the committee?

Mr. MANN. Is the right to object reserved?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the right to object is reserved.

Mr. PARKER. I desire to say that the committee stood about 8 to 6 on this question, eight voting against David Robertson and six in his favor.

David Robertson has served fifty years as hospital steward. He has done his work exceedingly well. At the same time, during the whole war he remained at the forts near the city of New York and saw no active service. If he had been in active service, probably he would have been commissioned and retired at high pay. There is one thing about this man: He has the greatest number of reports, recommendations from Army officers, from the Secretary of War, and major-generals down, but with them there is usually a letter directed to somebody or other asking for it. It is against the rules for one to apply for favors except through regular military channels, and the committee, on the whole, did not like communications from pharmacists and others throughout the country, and that kind of thing, when asked for by the man himself to get a favor in this way. Now, in the third place, there is a precedent in this House. This is not the only case. In 1896 a bill for Frank Marshall, who served thirty-five years as head pharmacist in the Army, was passed. I argued in favor of its passage. It was argued in this House for two days and then was voted down, I think,

by a vote of 60 to 24 in the House. We feel very sorry, and I feel a great respect for the man, but the majority of the committee could not feel that an exception should be made in this case. The Navy pay their pharmacists of like standing \$1,600 a year, whereas the Army pays but \$59 a month. There is much to be said in favor of raising the pay of Hospital Corps sergeants of experience, both on the active and retired list. It ought to be provided for by general law, but if the House, as a matter of equity, should give this relief, I am the last man to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FINLEY. I object.

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CONVEYING LAND TO NORTH DAKOTA.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 6134) providing for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota of certain tracts of land for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State Historical Society.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to allow Milton Lowrie, of Mandan, N. Dak., who on July 25, 1904, made homestead entry of the south half of the northwest quarter and the north half of the southwest quarter, section 13, of township 138 north, of range 81 west, North Dakota, to amend said entry by relinquishing to the United States the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of said section 13, and taking in lieu thereof the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said section 13.

Sec. 2. That, subject to rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, the owner in fee simple of lots 3 and 4 of section 13 of township 138 north, of range 81 west, west of the river, in the State of North Dakota, containing 35½ acres, may convey said land to the United States and select in lieu thereof lots 1 and 2 and the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 24, same township and range, and receive patent therefor.

Sec. 3. That when the United States shall have acquired title as aforesaid to said lots 3 and 4 and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of said section 13, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause patent to issue to the State of North Dakota for said described tracts for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State Historical Society, conveying to said State all the right, title, and interest of the United States therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GRONNA, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HEZEKIAH DAVIS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 21091) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter on the roll of Capt. Orlando Humason's Company B, First Oregon Mounted Volunteers, the name of Hezekiah Davis.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of giving to the widow title to the arrears of pay due the soldier for his services in the Oregon Indian war of 1855 and 1856, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter on the roll of Capt. Orlando Humason's Company B, First Oregon Mounted Volunteers, now on file in the office of the Auditor for the War Department, the name of Hezekiah Davis, and such entry shall show that the said Hezekiah Davis was enlisted as a private by W. H. Farrar at The Dalles, Oreg., on the 1st day of March, 1856, and was discharged on the 19th day of May, 1856, as shown by the original roll and records on file in the office of the adjutant-general of the State of Oregon.

Sec. 2. That when the name of Hezekiah Davis has been entered on the roll of Captain Humason's company, as authorized and directed, his widow, Elizabeth C. Davis, shall be granted the pay due said soldier for his services in the same manner as such claims are granted to the widows of Indian war volunteers whose names now appear on the original company rolls and records of the various Indian wars.

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. JONES of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that on all the several bills where the motion has not been entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the several bills were passed be laid upon the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POWERS, for the evening, on account of sickness.

To Mr. MOORE of Texas, for the evening, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BOUTELL, for three days, on account of absence from city because of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 24118. An act granting to the Central Colorado Power Company a right of way over certain public lands for irrigation and electric power plants in the State of Colorado;

H. R. S. An act for the relief of the Harbison-Walker Company, of Pittsburg, Pa.;

H. R. 24537. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes;

H. R. 23720. An act to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company;

H. R. 23940. An act for the extension of Albamarle street NW., District of Columbia;

H. R. 24374. An act to fix the boundaries of lands of certain landowners and entrymen adjoining the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation;

H. R. 12188. An act for the relief of George T. Larkin;

H. R. 25627. An act to authorize the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River in Armstrong County, Pa.;

H. R. 25671. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River, State of Illinois;

H. R. 25440. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine Lipps;

H. R. 12857. An act to validate certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico with reference to the issuance of certain bonds;

H. R. 5. An act to provide for the refunding of certain money, etc.;

H. R. 16085. An act for the relief of Gordon, Ironsides & Fares Company (Limited);

H. R. 25184. An act to relieve the Tanana Mines Railroad, in Alaska, from taxation;

H. R. 21944. An act to amend section No. 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend the homestead laws as to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands in Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904; to restore to and confer upon certain persons the right to make entry under said act, and to amend existing law as to the sale of isolated tracts subject to entry under said act;

H. R. 25041. An act to provide for the creation of additional land districts in the district of Alaska;

H. R. 3462. An act for the relief of Franklin Patterson;

H. R. 16581. An act for the relief of George W. Schroyer;

H. R. 24046. An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America;

H. R. 25611. An act to authorize the Burnwell Coal and Coke Company to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River;

H. R. 12840. An act for the relief of L. Biertempfel;

H. R. 9109. An act for the relief of J. H. Henry;

H. R. 10703. An act authorizing the extension of Monroe street NE.;

H. R. 24987. An act to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus or unallotted lands in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect;

H. R. 21721. An act granting a pension to John R. Kissingar; and

H. R. 25005. An act granting an increase of pension to Emeline H. Hardie.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. R. 91. Joint resolution adjusting the status of certain officers of the Army as to their period of service required by the act of Congress approved June 30, 1882, to entitle an Army officer to retirement on his own application—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 8580. An act granting land to Anna Johnson—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

S. 7382. An act to encourage the holding of an Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition at the city of Seattle, State of Washington, in the year 1909—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, March 1, 1907, at 11 a. m.

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 War, transmitting, with a letter from the chief of engineers, report of examination and survey of Galveston channel, Galveston Harbor, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Association of the Fifth Pennsylvania Cavalry, transmitting resolutions thanking Congress for recent pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A letter from Encampment No. 20, Union Veteran Legion, transmitting resolutions thanking Congress for recent pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a reply to an inquiry of the House as to certain lands in townships in the vicinity of the New Mexico principal meridian—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25741) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty," etc., approved February 8, 1901, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8145); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25832) to authorize Herman L. Hartenstein to construct a dam across the St. Joseph River, near the village of Mottville, St. Joseph County, Mich., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8122); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25811) to authorize the Monroe, Farmerville and Northwestern Railway Company to construct a bridge over the Ouachita River and one over the D'Arbonne River, in Louisiana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8138); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25846) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Calhoun Falls, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8139); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25847) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Hattons Ford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8140); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25848) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Andersonville Shoals, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8141); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25849) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8142); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25850) permitting the building of a dam across the Savannah River at Trotters Shoals, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8143); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills 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. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25567) authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and adjudicate the claims against the Choctaw Nation of Samuel Garland, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8144); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3020) for the relief of John P. Hunter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8146); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTAUER, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 25851) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for prior years, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 25852) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 25853) authorizing the purchase of the historical art window, by Maria Herndl, of George Washington, etc.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 25854) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded white lead, paint, or other compound intended for use as such—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 253) relating to securing a channel of 6 feet depth over Foy's Flats, in the Trent River, North Carolina, about 4 miles above Newbern—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A resolution (H. Res. 894) providing for the consideration of Senate bill No. 6249—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A resolution (H. Res. 895) concerning clerk hire for Members and Delegates to the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MARTIN: Memorial of the legislature of North Dakota, relating to the proposed survey and drainage of the valley of the Red River of the North—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Memorial of the legislature of North Dakota, relating to the drainage of the valley of the Red River of the North—to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 25855) granting a pension to George D. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 25856) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25857) granting an increase of pension to Richard Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 25858) granting an increase of pension to Mary McGarrah—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 25859) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Wheeler—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 various organizations in the States and the District of Columbia, against the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles W. Pinckney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of the Daily Mining Record, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: Petition of the Legion of the Red Cross, Grand Council of Delaware, against the bill to codify the statutes relating to the classification of second-class mail matter (bill H. R. 608)—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of the Iowa State Retail Merchants' Association, for the Dixon bill (H. R. 3090), etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Wisconsin Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, for reciprocal demurrage by railways—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for bill S. 6923, for reduction of first-class postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of the Pocatello Commercial Club, of Idaho, for bill carrying an appropriation for the reclamation of lands of Fort Hill Indian Reservation and lands south of the same—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to be filed with bill H. R. 24325—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Max J. Levy, of New York City, against any legislation to deprive once naturalized citizens of the United States of citizenship after they may have lived abroad for five years (H. R. 24122)—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of H. Klingensmith, of Pittsburg, Pa., representing 400 railway telegraph operators, for the Murphy nine-hour-day bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of P. H. McKenna, for an appropriation to test the value of the electric signagraph as a railway safety device—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William N. Gladney—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 55 citizens of Pierce County, Wis., to amend the free-alcohol bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNARY: Petitions of W. J. Cassidy, president of the Leitrim County Club, and C. F. Forrester, president of the County Dublin Association, of Boston, Mass., favoring bill H. R. 21511—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of Jeremiah J. Carroll, David J. Moynihan, Lawrence H. Sullivan, and other citizens of Boston, in aid of bill for relief of Joseph Manning (H. R. 2151)—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of F. G. Baker, for such legislation as shall secure an intelligent understanding of the shipping articles of seamen on whaling vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., for the Penrose bill (S. 6923)—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., for bill S. 6923 (reduction of first-class postage)—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petitions of Oriskany Falls Legion, No. 170; Lafargeville Legion, No. 1590, and East Utica Legion, No. 769, against the bill to amend and codify the statutes relating to the classification of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for bill S. 6923, as a first step for adoption of a 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Linn S. Judd and other citizens of New York City, for passage of the Appalachian and White Mountain forest-reserve bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of members of the Presbyterian Church of Geneseo and citizens of Geneseo County, N. Y., for the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Winslow Brothers & Smith, of Norwood, Mass., for amendment to the free-alcohol bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Paper to accompany bill (S. 7238) for relief of Dr. James Carroll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, for the Sherman mileage rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Goethe Lodge, No. 112, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Fond du Lac, Wis., against the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of Delaware Tribe, No. 184, Improved Order of Red Men, of Trenton, N. J.; Assanpink Lodge, No. 16, Improved Order of Red Men, and the Ludentafel Singing Society, against bill H. R. 13655 (the Littlefield bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 1, 1907.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

BOOKKEEPING IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that an appropriation of \$7,000 be made to provide for a change in the methods of bookkeeping in the Treasury Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN AND FREEDMEN ENROLLMENT CASES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 28th ultimo, a statement with respect to the number of Indian and freedmen enrollment cases pending before the Commissioner to the Five Civilized Tribes, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on review from said Commissioner, and the office of the Secretary on review February 25, 1907, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULE OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of this date, a schedule of all claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury under appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT BY CIRCUIT COURT OF ALABAMA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of this date, the record of a judgment rendered against the United States by the circuit court of the United States for the middle district of Alabama under the act of March 3, 1887, as submitted by the Attorney-General, \$247.86; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LISTS OF JUDGMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of this date, lists of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to \$201,044.68, which have not been heretofore presented to Congress; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of this date, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of claimants in Indian depredation cases, amounting to \$55,209, as submitted by the Attorney-General; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

- S. 4964. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Walter;
- S. 5365. An act to appoint Joseph Y. Porter a lieutenant-colonel and deputy surgeon-general, and to place him on the retired list of the Army;
- S. 5660. An act for the relief of Capt. William N. Hughes;
- S. 5869. An act for the relief of Larvan Gordon;
- S. 6134. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota of certain tracts of land for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State Historical Society;
- S. 6729. An act authorizing the President to appoint Webb C. Maglathlin a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service;
- S. 7550. An act for the relief of Harry A. Young;
- S. 8427. An act to annul certain titles to land acquired by ju-