

Alliance No. 66, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring an extension of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Chicago Butchers and Grocers' Association, favoring the passage of the Mann pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Commercial Club of Omaha, for irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., with reference to reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SELBY: Resolution of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association No. 2, of Alton, Ill., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill 11641, granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Loewenstine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petitions of citizens of Bradford and Custer, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill 1637, granting an increase of pension to John A. Spalding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of Colonel Myran Barker Post, No. 33, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Carpenters' Union No. 651, of Jackson, Mich., for restriction of immigration, etc.—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of New Haven Pressmen's Union, for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of Brick Makers' Benevolent Association No. 1, St. Paul, Minn., asking for the passage of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: Petition of Barbers' Union No. 168, of Oneonta, N. Y., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Boise City Typographical Union, No. 271, of Idaho, against the passage of bills amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Petition of William F. Robertson, of Lawrence County, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George W. Taylor, trustee of estate of E. H. Metcalf, deceased, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of Granite Cutters' Union and Stone Masons' Union No. 29, of Worcester, Mass., relative to admission of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 92, of Worcester, Mass., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Resolutions of Coopers' Union of Townsend, Carpenters' Union of Leominster, Barbers' Union of Fitchburg, and Firemen's Union No. 94, of Waltham, Mass., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VREELAND: Resolution of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 109, of Dunkirk, N. Y., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Bricklayers' Union No. 24, of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring the continued exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolutions of Iron Molders' Union of Quakertown, Pa., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Perkasio Home, No. 33, B. U. (H. F.), of Pennsylvania, for a national military park at Valley Forge, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of International Bricklayers' Union No. 54, of Norristown, Pa., in favor of excluding Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Women's Suffrage Association of Montgomery County, Pa.; of the Village Improvement Association of Doylestown, Pa.; of the Century Club of Pottston, Pa., and of the Langhorne Sorosis Club, for a national forest reserve in the Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Southern Tier Division, No. 10, Order of Railway Conductors, for the enactment of the Foraker-Corliss bill, amending the law relating to safety appliances—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Iron Molders' Union of Port Huron, Mich., asking for a further restoration of the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of Retail Clerks' Union No. 55, Sacramento, Cal., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the California Miners' Association, San Francisco, Cal., for the establishment of a national department of mining, the chief officer of which shall be a member of the President's Cabinet—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of George Ridlen Post, No. 275, of Scottsburg, Ind., Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 11, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 65) to provide for the employment of extra clerical force in the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia.

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

A bill (H. R. 9332) to authorize the Dothan, Hartford and Florida Railway Company to construct a bridge across the East St. Andrews Bay, navigable water, at a point about 1 mile east of Farndale, in the State of Florida;

A bill (H. R. 10305) to amend section 14 of the act approved June 29, 1898, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River;"

A bill (H. R. 11728) to classify the rural free-delivery service and fix the compensation to employees thereof; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) granting permission for the erection of a monument or statue in Washington City, D. C., in honor of the late Benjamin F. Stephenson, founder of the Grand Army of the Republic.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 3090) to approve and ratify an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, entitled "An act to provide for the collection, arrangement, and display of the products of the Territory of Arizona at the international exposition to be held at St. Louis in 1903;" and

A bill (H. R. 199) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the congregation of the Morning Star Baptist Church, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution in the Southern States; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Cooperative Creamery Association, of Montague, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, of Lowell, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Cambridge; of the City of Homes Union, No. 622, of Springfield; of Paper Makers' Local Union No. 19, of Fitchburg, and of Boot and Shoe Workers' Local Union No. 259, of Stockton, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Interstate Irrigation Congress, held at Sterling, Colo., relative to the adoption of a plan for the disposal of the public lands and for the irrigation thereof; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of John M. Smith Post, No. 720, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mount Morris, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Civil Service Reform League of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the consular service; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Miss Jennie R. Bear and 79 other citizens of Illinois, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of E. C. Cook and 22 other citizens of St. Charles, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petitions of A. W. Carr and 41 other citizens of Somonauk, George C. Dodge and 25 other citizens of Millburn, C. E. Houghton and 40 other citizens of Woodhull, and of William Schuchardt and 14 other citizens of New Hanover, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Edwin C. Peterfish and 17 other citizens of Peoria, and of Local Unions Nos. 47, 7591, 2, 55, 259, and 83, of Elgin, Pana, Belleville, Springfield, Bloomington, and Galesburg, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Illinois, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of Terre Haute Division, No. 92, Order of Railway Conductors, of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called safety-appliance law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Gertrude Travis, Kennedy McGregor, Ruth Taylor, and Roy Middleton, of School No. 10, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the continuance of the light on the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 1, of Rutland, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from the United States and its insular possessions; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HEITFELD presented a memorial of Typographical Union No. 271, of Boise City, Idaho, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 2894, to amend the copyright law; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of Local Grange No. 51, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mullica Hill, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of Mrs. G. M. Jeffery, of South Orange, N. J., remonstrating against the regulation and control of vice by the board of health of Manila, P. I.; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 849, American Federation of Labor, of Orange, N. J., and a petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 750, American Federation of Labor, of Asbury Park, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Local Unions Nos. 13, 36, 27, 349, 132, 23, 29, and 318, of Bayonne, Rahway, Trenton, Perth Amboy, Orange, Camden, Hackensack, West Hoboken, and Elizabeth, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Spilman, W. Va., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Marion, Lockhart, Belleville, and of Marshall County, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Saginaw, Mich., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the tributaries of the Saginaw River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 145, of Travers, and of the Trades and Labor Assembly of St. Joseph and Benton Harbor; of the American Federation of Labor; of General O. M. Poe Post, No. 433, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the

Republic, of Detroit; of Whiteside Post, No. 143, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Cass; of William D. Wilkins Post, No. 91, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Loomis; of Ransom Post, No. 89, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Flushing, and of General Wood Post, No. 164, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Morley, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Belleville, Carsonville, Ransom, Jerome, Kalamazoo, Worden, Bridgeport, Clare, Loomis, Clinton, Cassopolis, Crisp, Marlette, Freeport, Rives Junction, Wyandotte, Woodland, Memphis, Eckford, Goodells, Monroe County, Stonington, Standish, North Morenci, Harbor Springs, Galesburg, and Midland, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Alanson and Thompsonville, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Unions Nos. 229, 475, 52, 17, 69, 50, 14, 8, 169, 7, and 359, of Detroit, St. Joe, Kalamazoo, Adrian, Three Rivers, Saginaw, Ann Arbor, Traverse City, Grand Rapids, and Soo Junction, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Michigan, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PROCTOR presented petitions of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 264, of Rutland; of the Granite Cutters' National Union, of Groton; of the Granite Cutters' Local Union, of Beebe Plains; of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 1, of Rutland, and of Typographical Union No. 384, of Montpelier, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BATE presented a petition of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 4, American Federation of Labor, of Nashville, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of 17 citizens of Greenville; of Local Division No. 135, Order of Railway Conductors, of Nashville; of Typographical Union No. 111, of Knoxville; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 3, of Knoxville; of Typographical Union No. 24, of Jackson; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 261, of Knoxville, and of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 4, of Nashville, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Tennessee, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of International Stone Masons' Local Union No. 6, American Federation of Labor, of Kansas City, Mo., and a petition of Local Division No. 30, Order of Railway Conductors, of Ozark, Mo., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of R. L. Ferguson Post, No. 358, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, of Sweet Springs; of Typographical Union No. 80, American Federation of Labor, of Kansas City, and of Local Union No. 259, American Federation of Labor, of Sedalia, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Grace, Springfield, Concordia, Weldon Spring, and Garden City, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Tompsonville, East Tawas, North Morenci, Memphis, Woodland, Moorland, Marlette, Wyandotte, Rives Junction, Freeport, New Holland, Holton, Lake Odessa, Willis, Chesterfield, Bridgeport, Worden, Kalamazoo, Ransom, Jerome, Loomis, Carsonville, Clare, Belleville, Ida, Hilliards, Crisp, Clinton, Cassopolis, Monroe, Eckford, Goodell, Stonington, Standish, and Galesburg, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Lake Seamen's Union, of Marine City, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed change in the title of the United States Marine-Hospital Service to that of the United States Health Service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Lake Seamen's Union, of Marine City, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed amendment to that portion of chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes which relates to the prosecution of seamen who refuse to join vessels on which they have engaged to serve; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of Typographical Union No. 122, of Kalamazoo, Mich., remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed amendment to amend the copyright laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, First Branch, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the immigration of illiterate persons; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 727, of Detroit; of Electrical Workers' Local Union No. 17, of Detroit; of Typographical Union No. 21, of Detroit; of Photo-Engravers' Local Union No. 12, of Detroit; of Journeymen Tailors' Local Union No. 229, of Detroit; of Barbers' Local Union No. 169, of Kalamazoo; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 17, of Kalamazoo; of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 59, of Kalamazoo; of Paper Makers' Local Union No. 52, of Kalamazoo; of Typographical Union No. 50, of Valley City; of Shirt Makers and Laundry Workers' Local Union No. 25, of Saginaw; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 69, of Three Rivers; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 14, of Ann Arbor; of Local Union No. 8, of Traverse City; of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 7, of Grand Rapids, and of the Detroit Branch of the Granite Cutters' National Union, of Detroit, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of William D. Wilkins Post, No. 91, of St. Louis; of Ransom Post, No. 89, of Flushing; of Post No. 455, of Montrose; of Stephen Munger Post, No. 425, of Freeland; of David Oaks Post, No. 135, of Centerville; of General O. M. Poe Post, No. 433, of Detroit; of Whiteside Post, No. 143, of Caro, all of the Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, and of Journeymen Barbers' Local Union No. 145, of Traverse, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. RAWLINS presented a petition of the Utah Irrigation Convention of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying that all the remaining arid lands within her borders be ceded to the State of Utah for the purpose of perfecting and extending the irrigation system of that State; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Utah Irrigation Convention, praying that that portion of the Territory of Arizona lying north of the Colorado River, between the points where that river enters the Territory on the north and where it leaves it on the west, be ceded to the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented the petition of Henry A. Noltimier and sundry other citizens of Church's Ferry, N. Dak., praying for a reduction in the import duties on Cuban sugar and remonstrating against any reduction of the tax on beer and tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of William N. Hess and sundry other citizens of Glenullin, N. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Absaraka, N. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Louisville, Ky., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 5, of Owensboro, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from the United States and its insular possessions; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. QUARLES presented the memorial of John C. Finney, of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the adoption of the measures and weights of the metric system as the standard weights and measures in the United States; which was referred to the Select Committee on Standard Weights and Measures.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Beaverdam, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waukesha, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Kaukauna, Wis., remonstrating against any reduction being made in the tariff on sugar and tobacco imported from Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 329, of Fond du Lac, Wis., remonstrating against a reduction of the tariff on cigars imported from Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Beaverdam, Wis., remonstrating against the adoption of a parcels-post system; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of James Comerford Post, No. 68, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wisconsin, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize an increase of pension in certain cases and remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the purchase of a sword for Rear-Admiral Winfield Scott Schley; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of 41 citizens of Rushboro, 25 citizens of Vanderbilt, 25 citizens of Campbelltown, 46 citizens of Unityville, 23 citizens of Montrose, 43 citizens of Elderton, 45 citizens of Carbondale, 40 citizens of Mansfield, 17 citizens of Valley, 32 citizens of Wismer, 47 citizens of Zeno, 46 citizens of Prospect, 13 citizens of Bellwood, 30 citizens of Thompson-town, 47 citizens of Evans City, 18 citizens of Moselm Springs, 47 citizens of Venango County, and of 41 citizens of East Rush, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the acquisition of the Danish West India Islands; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the College Hill Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Beaver Falls, Pa., remonstrating against the retail selling of intoxicating liquors in the island possessions of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 116 citizens of Clearfield and of 23 citizens of Evergreen, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of General Mansfield Post, No. 71, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mansfield, Pa., praying for the appointment of a committee to investigate the administration of the Pension Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Scranton, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the granting of pensions to certain officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy of the United States who shall have attained the age of 50 years and over, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 140, American Federation of Labor, of Pittston; of Finley Batch Post, No. 137, of Blairsville; of John R. Russell Post, No. 626, of Spartansburg, and of General Thomas C. Devin Cavalry Post, No. 363, of Philadelphia, of the Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of 17 citizens of Custer; of 48 citizens of Bradford; of Swift Union, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allegheny; of 101 citizens of Titusville, and of 117 citizens of Hydetown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of the College Hill Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Beaver Falls, Pa.; of the

Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Wahoo, Nebr., and of the Duwanish Club, of Georgetown, Wash., remonstrating against the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of 109 citizens of Irwin; of Core Makers' Local Union No. 83, of Meadville; of Jersey Shore Division 168, Order of Railway Conductors, of Jersey Shore; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 446, of Norristown; of Typographical Union No. 262, of Uniontown; of Brewery Workmen's Local Union No. 1, Branch 1, of Charleroi; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 31, of Braddock; of Switchmen's Local Union No. 38, of Erie; of Oil City Local Union, No. 157, of Oil City; of Youghiogheny Lodge, No. 218, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Connellsville; of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 56, of Greenville; of Bricklayers and Plasterers' Local Union No. 8, of Bethlehem; of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia; of A. L. Dunbar Lodge, No. 142, of Meadville, and of 35 citizens of Dunbar, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PENROSE. I present a petition of certain citizens representing the Cherokee and Creek nations and the Delaware and Santee Sioux tribes, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 600, for the relief of various tribes of Indians and individual Indians in the United States, and for other purposes. I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association of Denver, Colo., praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rye, Apache, and Pueblo County, in the State of Colorado, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., expressing sympathy for the people of the South African Republic; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of A. Lincoln Post, No. 4, Department of Colorado, Grand Army of the Republic, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Idaho Springs and Victor; of Division No. 44, Order of Railway Conductors, of Denver; of Newspaper Mailers' Union No. 8, of Local Union No. 63, of Pueblo, and of Local Union No. 5, of Florence, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Colorado, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of San Luis Valley Lodge, No. 401, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Alamosa, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

#### MEDAWAKANTON AND WAHPAKOOTA (SANTEE) SIOUX INDIANS.

Mr. GAMBLE. I present a memorandum in relation to the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863. I move that the memorandum be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, to accompany the bill (S. 594) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863.

The motion was agreed to.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

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

A bill (H. R. 8486) granting a pension to Annie S. Hummel;

A bill (H. R. 4084) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Wickham;

A bill (H. R. 4209) granting a pension to Thomas Butler;

A bill (H. R. 1743) granting a pension to Samuel M. Graves; and

A bill (H. R. 5536) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Schram.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4821) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Boomhower, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11409) to authorize the construction of a traffic bridge across the Savannah River from the

mainland within the corporate limits of the city of Savannah to Hutchinsons Island, in the county of Chatham, State of Georgia, to report it with an amendment.

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

Mr. BERRY. I move that the bill (S. 4003) to authorize the construction of a traffic bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland within the corporate limits of the city of Savannah to Hutchinsons Island, in the county of Chatham, State of Georgia, being Order of Business 589 on the Calendar, be postponed indefinitely and that the House bill just reported by me be given the place of the Senate bill on the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11306) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Burlington, Iowa, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HANNA, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1375) for the relief of Louis Weber, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3121) for the relief of Thomas Amory De Blois, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3386) to promote Lieut. A. B. Wyckoff, United States Navy, retired, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3791) to provide suitable medals for the officers and crew of the United States vessel of war *Kearsarge*, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1798) for the erection of a public building at Hastings, Nebr., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 4421) to correct the military record of John Hudson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4422) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Eagleson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4423) granting an increase of pension to Silas C. Jewell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4424) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Wages; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Carrie R. Wages, widow of Shadrack R. Wages, Company N, Second Regiment Missouri Mounted Volunteer Infantry, Mexican war, with affidavits of Dr. G. W. Fitzpatrick, B. T. Buchanan, James A. Robinson, Robert O. McLin, and S. S. McGibbons, and also letter from the Record and Pension Office, War Department. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4425) to authorize the Navajo Indians to lease mineral lands on a royalty basis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 4426) to authorize the Secretary of War to loan arms to the institutions having companies of the Boys' Brigade connected therewith; which was read twice by title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 4427) for the relief of Emil J. Pepke; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BARD introduced a bill (S. 4428) providing for the purchase and making free of certain toll roads leading into and passing over the Yosemite National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 4429) granting a pension to Alvira Randall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. CLAPP) introduced a bill (S. 4430) to provide for allotments to Indians on White Earth Reservation, in Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN (for Mr. DANIEL) introduced a bill (S. 4431) for the relief of the estate of James M. Catlett, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 4432) for the relief of Florence Hefty Hewetson; which was read twice by its title,

and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 4433) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4434) to pay just compensation to William Wheeler Hubbell for his invention of high-power steel guns, and improvements in other guns, made and adopted by the United States for its military service and Navy at the present time; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4435) to correct the military record of Michael McGarry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 4436) granting an increase of pension to Caroline R. Boyd;

A bill (S. 4437) granting a pension to Reuben M. Mercer (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4438) granting a pension to Fidelia C. Losch;

A bill (S. 4439) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin K. Spangler; and

A bill (S. 4440) granting an increase of pension to Roderick Frazier (with an accompanying paper).

#### SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.

Mr. HOAR. I introduce a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be directed to inquire and report to the Senate whether the existing rules of the Post-Office Department concerning second-class mail matter, especially so much as excludes from the second-class matter papers published by religious or educational societies or institutions, be in accordance with law, and if found to be so in accordance, whether there should be further legislation on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not propose to ask the Senate to adopt the resolution at this time, because I do not want to have anything appear that might even be taken to be a criticism on the Post-Office Department. I have no doubt that the Post-Office Department has dealt and is dealing with this very difficult question in regard to second-class mail matter with great wisdom and prudence, and in general is right in its dealing. It has seemed to me, however, that the Department has erred possibly when it holds that periodicals, weekly or monthly, published by churches and other religious or educational associations, which are full of news, which have advertisements in them, but also contain a little of their own particular information (which they would have to print in the daily papers if they did not have this means of printing it), are not to be treated as ordinary newspapers. I should like to have that matter considered by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. However, I will not ask the Senate to pass this resolution directing the committee to consider it, but only ask that the resolution itself be referred to that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

#### SPANISH TREATY CLAIMS COMMISSION.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8586) amending the act of March 2, 1901, entitled "An act to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

The Senate recedes from its amendment to the House bill, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898,' approved March 2, 1901, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following provisions:

"Such rules and mode of procedure shall conform, so far as practicable, to the mode of procedure and practice of the circuit courts of the United States. The said Commission created by this act is vested with the same powers now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States to compel the attendance and testimony of parties, claimants, and witnesses, to preserve order, and to punish for contempt, and to compel the production of any books or papers deemed material to the consideration of any claim or matter pending before said Commission.

"That the said Commission is also vested with all the powers now possessed by the circuit and district courts of the United States to take or procure testimony in foreign countries. Such testimony may be taken, pursuant to the provisions of existing laws and the rules and practice of the district and circuit courts of the United States, so far as applicable, before the Commission or any commissioner or commissioners appointed under the provisions of this act.

"That the marshal of the United States for the District of Columbia or his deputies shall serve all processes issued by said Commission, preserve order

in the place of sitting, and execute the orders of said Commission; and outside of the District of Columbia the writs of said Commission shall be executed by United States marshals or their deputies in their respective districts.

"That said Commission or any commissioner appointed by it to take testimony in foreign countries is hereby authorized to appoint an officer to serve any subpoena or process issued by said Commission or commissioner.

"When testimony is to be taken before any commissioner appointed by said Commission within any district or Territory, the clerk of any court of the United States for such district or Territory shall, on application of either party or of his agent, issue a subpoena for such witness, commanding him to appear and testify before the commissioner at a time and place stated in the subpoena; and if any witness, after being duly served with such subpoena, refuses or neglects to appear, or after appearing refuses to testify, not being privileged from giving testimony, and such refusal or neglect is proven to the satisfaction of any judge of the court whose clerk issues the subpoena, such judge may proceed to enforce obedience to the process or punish the disobedience, as any court of the United States may proceed in case of disobedience to process of subpoena to testify issued by such court; and the production before such commissioner of any paper or writing, written instrument, book, or other document may also be required in the manner prescribed in section 869 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

The House recedes from its nonconcurrence with the Senate amendments, and agrees to the same with amendments as above set forth and stated.

S. M. CULLOM,

H. C. LODGE,

JNO. T. MORGAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

GEO. W. RAY,

JOHN J. JENKINS,

S. W. T. LANHAM,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CULLOM. The conference report has been agreed upon by the House, but on further investigation it is believed that the Senate ought not to agree to the report which the conferees of the Senate agreed to. I therefore ask that the report be disagreed to.

The report was rejected.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments and ask for a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. CULLOM, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. MORGAN were appointed.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1355. An act granting a pension to Lura B. Rogers;

S. 2012. An act granting a pension to Catherine Conroy;

S. 2098. An act granting a pension to George H. Morton; and

S. 3204. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Bruce.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

A bill (H. R. 9332) to authorize the Dothan, Hartford and Florida Railway Company to construct a bridge across the East St. Andrews Bay, navigable water, at a point about 1 mile east of Farmland, in the State of Florida; and

A bill (H. R. 10305) to amend section 14 of the act approved June 29, 1898, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River."

The bill (H. R. 11728) to classify the rural free-delivery service and fix the compensation to employees thereof was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) granting permission for the erection of a monument or statue in Washington City, D. C., in honor of the late Benjamin F. Stephenson, founder of the Grand Army of the Republic, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

#### ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement in reference to a measure pending before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

On the second day of the present session of Congress I introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], I think, also on the same day, perhaps, introduced a similar joint resolution, and probably there were others introduced. Since that time the House of Representatives, by a unanimous vote, as I understand it, passed a joint resolution of that character. I think that this is the fourth time the House of Representatives has passed such a joint resolution, and there has been no vote upon it in the Senate.

I am constantly in receipt of letters from all parts of the country urging me to press the joint resolution and to know why a vote can not be had on it. I do not wish to make a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of it, but I should like to ask the chairman of that committee if it will be

reported probably soon. I want to have the joint resolution reported at such a time as will certainly secure a vote during the present session of Congress. I want the Senate to vote upon the question. If there are not two-thirds in favor of it, of course it will be defeated, but I wish to urge upon the committee that they bring in the joint resolution and let us have a vote upon it.

The question has been pending almost since the formation of the Government, and it has been argued and debated in one way and the other. I imagine that each member of the committee knows at this time how he will vote on it, and I should like to urge the committee to report the joint resolution at the earliest date possible.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I desire simply to say, as chairman of the committee, that what the Senator from Arkansas has stated is true; that several propositions have been introduced by Senators looking to an amendment of the Constitution so as to provide for the election of Senators by the people, and a measure of that character has already passed the House of Representatives and been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I will say to the Senator that there is no disposition, so far as I know, on the part of the committee to shirk any responsibility in that matter, and the measure will be considered by the committee and action taken and a report made to the Senate.

Mr. BERRY. In time to secure a vote during the present session of Congress?

Mr. BURROWS. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, the House of Representatives has heretofore passed this proposed amendment several times, and at the present session by a unanimous vote, as I understand it. I desire to supplement the Senator's statement by the additional fact that in April, 1896, the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate as then organized reported favorably by a good majority a similar measure, but too late to receive action at that session.

I am receiving letters daily by the score urging me to do all I can toward securing early and favorable action on this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Privileges and Elections will see their way clear at an early date to take action of some kind on this important matter and bring it before the Senate, so that the Senate can have an opportunity to discuss and vote upon it.

Mr. HOAR and others addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. HOAR. I rose to ask leave to say something in addition to what the other Senators have said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The debate of course is proceeding by unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I think the statement of the two Senators from Arkansas and Oregon ought not to pass without a word or two in addition.

This is one of the most important questions which has come up for consideration in the Congress of the United States since the adoption of the Constitution. It is the first serious proposition to destroy the principle upon which the Constitution is founded or to depart from it. Other amendments have either been amendments to secure human rights, in the nature of a bill of rights, or in one instance to change the mechanism for the election of a President. But this is a proposition to change the principle upon which the Constitution is founded, a principle without the adoption of which it is notorious as a matter of history the Constitution never would have been agreed to.

The States agreed with great difficulty, and after there was great danger that the convention would break up without accomplishing anything, that there should be a union of the federative and the representative principle; that the States should remain as they then were, equal, with national power and authority in part, and in part should be merged into a nation, voting as nearly as conveniently might be by a majority of the people, and the solemn pledge was given to every State, small and great, that the equality of the States in a Senate should never be destroyed without the consent of every one. It was not merely that they should have some other form of legislative chamber. It was to be a Senate whose members were to be chosen by one remove from a direct popular vote—by State legislatures. That was the Chamber which every State pledged should be preserved, and which no majority was ever to be at liberty to abolish.

Now it is sought to substitute for that arrangement two Houses of Representatives, chosen in a different fashion, but still chosen by a direct popular vote in the method in which officials are chosen by a direct popular vote. For one I do not believe that can be accomplished without a breach of a national pledge which lies at the very foundation of our Government and the adoption of which was essential to its formation.

Further, when you get two Houses of Representatives, only differing in that one has a larger constituency than the other, I do not believe that the great States, like New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Massachusetts, and Indiana, will submit for a great while to an equality which makes two Senators from Rhode Island or from Nevada, admirably as both those States are represented here, in two Chambers elected in precisely the same fashion, able to hold in check and to vote down the fifteen millions of New York or Pennsylvania; and when this change is accomplished I believe that what is left of that whole promise will be swept away like a leaf before the wind.

Mr. President, this is a question upon which the American people may dwell for months and years, at least, if not for a generation. It is one of the greatest questions ever brought into legislative consideration and for legislative action on the face of the earth anywhere. If the Senate is not to defend itself against popular movements, sometimes hastily and lightly made, it is not to be defended at all.

It is true the House of Representatives have passed this proposition. It has been passed every time without debate there, I think as half a joke. The question is, Which speaks to us with most authority—the House of Representatives of to-day, without deliberation or discussion, or the Constitutional Convention of 1787, after long debate and anxious deliberation?

The Senator says he gets letters; and so do I. The letters show that they are all the product of one man's brain. We understand perfectly well the difference between a genuine popular feeling and one of these expressions that is worked up by some one man or some few men somewhere. I have had, I suppose, hundreds of letters from my State, where I have no doubt the sentiment is overwhelmingly opposed to this thing, although we are a large State, nearly every one of which ends with this phrase, "I hope to hear from you," or, "If you do not agree, please state your reasons." I wonder if there are any other Senators here who recognize that phrase in their correspondence.

Mr. BURTON and others. Yes; I do.

Mr. HOAR. If it is a real genuine popular movement, how does it happen that it comes in the correspondence on this subject as in no other, that every man ends his letter by saying, "I hope to hear from you," or "I hope you will state your reasons?"

Mr. President, I am willing to go to any representative assembly of intelligent American people and meet this proposition to strike at the very heart of our Constitution, and to strike at the constitution of the greatest legislative assembly on the face of the earth, and to meet any champion, however he may be my intellectual superior, secure of success in the goodness of the cause. But I do not mean without a struggle to consent to overthrow this body until the American people have thoroughly and fully understood and considered what they are about.

When the Constitution of the United States was adopted, and ever since, as the great thinkers on jurisprudence and constitutional law have declared their opinion, the homage of mankind has been paid to the men who sat in that great assembly and the generation who adopted their work for two reasons. The first is that they established that great tribunal—the Supreme Court of the United States—which, by its simple authority, sitting in that quiet and silent chamber, keeps State and nation, popular movements and popular excitements, great imperial interests of business or of party, each in its appointed orbit as the stars are kept in their courses. The other is this great assembly, never greater in its capacity to do the will of a free people, to carry out the deliberate and sober second thought of a free people, than it is at this moment.

It is worth waiting six weeks to see whether we are going to strike down one of the two great glories of our Republic and let it perish from the face of the earth. I for one mean to do my duty on that committee, but I will not be hurried, and the Senate shall not be hurried if I can help it.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to further debate? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas will proceed.

Mr. BERRY. I will occupy only a very few moments, if the Senate will permit me.

Mr. President, this is not the time nor the place to discuss the merits of the joint resolution. If the Senator from Massachusetts will urge his committee to bring the joint resolution before the Senate, where it can be debated in a proper way and at a proper time, then we will take up the question and answer his arguments.

I simply wish to say now, as the Senator says he will not be hurried, that the Senate has a right to insist that a report of one kind or the other shall be made from that committee. With all his opposition to this joint resolution, I do not think that he will stand here and say that a committee has the power to deprive the Senate of the right to vote one way or the other upon this

great proposition. We want to have the joint resolution reported. We want to debate it in the Senate and to take a vote upon it.

I say again, the Senate has the right to insist that the committee shall report the joint resolution either favorably or adversely. I am certain so far as the chairman of that committee is concerned he intends to report it and wants to report it, and I trust the Senator from Massachusetts alone can not prevent a report of one kind or the other from being made.

Now, one word in regard to the popular sentiment. The Senator from Massachusetts says that it all originates from one man.

Mr. HOAR. No.

Mr. BERRY. I understood the Senator to say that it had been worked up by one man.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I said that the hundreds of letters which I got manifested that they, the letters, were all the product of one brain; that they ended with the phrase, "I hope to hear from you," or "I hope that you will state your reasons;" and there are twenty Senators about me who showed either by some expression or by their assent that they get the same kind of letters.

Mr. BERRY. I am certain the Senator from Massachusetts left the idea that there was no general sentiment throughout the country in favor of this proposition. Mr. President, is it to be supposed that the man to whom the Senator alludes had the influence to create such a great sentiment in favor of any proposition as that which exists to-day throughout the United States in regard to this measure?

The Senator says he can go before any intelligent assembly and defeat this proposition in debate. It is remarkable, if that is true, that in a body as intelligent as the House of Representatives of the United States of America there was in that great body not one man who recorded his vote during the present session of Congress against the joint resolution. It seems that there is a sentiment over and beyond what has been created by the letters to which the Senator refers.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I desire the indulgence of the Senate for only a moment in continuation of the remarks that have been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I am very loath, being a layman, to differ with my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] in regard to the Constitution; but the impression I have from my reading of the Constitution and the debates on it is that the fight revolved around the question as to whether each State should have two Senators, and not at all as to the manner in which they should be elected. The great contention was that the smaller States should be equally represented in this great body, and, while it might have been spoken of that the legislature should elect, the impression on my mind made by my reading is that the main contention was that each State should have two Senators.

I would call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact—I think it is a fact—that 29 States, through their legislatures, have from time to time demanded that Congress shall allow the States an opportunity to vote as to whether they would amend the Constitution so that the people may elect their Senators.

There is a provision of the Constitution which says in case Congress fails to act upon the demand of the people, if two-thirds of the States through their legislatures shall pass a resolution, the question shall be taken out of the hands of Congress, and must be submitted to the legislatures of the States. Five States have recently done that, and I think that unless the Senate is allowed to debate this question enough States will act to take it out of our hands. Now, it is a simple proposition. I come from a State which has petitioned and enacted, so that it is one of the five States demanding that the people shall be allowed in that State to elect their Senators.

I submit to the Senator from Massachusetts and to those who are opposed to this measure that it would be much better to allow a debate in the Senate on the proposition. I was very much gratified at what the chairman of the committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, said—that he would allow the Senate to discuss this proposition. I object very much to the intimation conveyed by the Senator from Massachusetts, that Senators would pursue the tactics which they have pursued for the last eight or ten years and not allow this question to come before this body.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I have a moment by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, after the Senator from Nevada has been heard, I shall insist upon the regular order.

Mr. STEWART. I thank you.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I wish to indorse the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr.

HOAR]. I believe that it would be a fatal movement to the equality of the States. When Senators are elected by popular vote of States and not by the legislatures thereof it will be forcibly argued that the constituents of Senators should be equal. The most difficult problem which the framers of the Constitution were called upon to solve was the preservation of the equality of the States and at the same time giving to the people of the United States at large their full share in the Government.

After a long controversy it was finally decided to have a Senate, representing the equality of the States, and a House of Representatives, representing the people of the United States at large. The States in their corporate capacity elect Senators, the people in their primary capacity elect members of Congress. This framework has produced a Senate the equal, if not the superior, of any legislative body which has ever existed. It is dangerous to tamper with the fundamental principles upon which our Government is founded.

There is another consideration which will appeal to the good sense of the people against electing Senators by popular vote. The dominant party would, of course, elect the Senator. The election of a Senator would be inaugurated in the primaries where political bosses, abundantly armed with ready money, are powerful factors. The suggestion has been made that the election of Senators by popular vote would avoid the scandal which sometimes attaches to their election by the legislature, and also secure full representation at all times for each State.

Would not the scandal of the primaries where millionaires would be contending for the prize eclipse all irregularities of State legislatures? Besides, Congress has it in its power to secure full representation from all the States. I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time the present law regulating election of Senators was passed. It was passed to avoid a method of preventing the election of Senators by the legislature, which had become quite prevalent. It was necessary for a joint meeting of the two houses to elect the Senator, and by the refusal of one house to meet the other a tie up was secured.

The election law removed that difficulty, but another method has since been adopted to prevent the election of Senators. The law requires a majority vote of all the members of both houses. The method now in vogue to prevent an election is the failure of any candidate to secure a majority. That difficulty is easily remedied by legislation. Let Congress provide that if after a reasonable time no one has secured a majority of all the members of the two houses, that a plurality may elect.

Thus that difficulty might be easily overcome by legislation of Congress. But the demoralization of State politics which would result from electing Senators by popular vote would sap the foundation of the Government. The governors and State officers of the various States are nominated in political conventions. Ordinarily good men are selected and good government is secured in every State. The State offices are not a sufficient prize to tempt millionaires, and consequently the will of the people is fairly represented in the political conventions of the two parties. But a seat in the Senate of the United States might be a sufficient prize to induce millionaires to arm the local bosses with sufficient funds to pack conventions.

Does anybody doubt that it would be much easier to pack conventions by the use of money than it would be to corrupt a legislative body chosen by the people? I do not believe that there is any general corruption in the election of United States Senators. I am aware of charges of corruption against legislatures, Congress, and even the President of the United States, but the people at large have faith in their legislatures, in their State officers, in Congress, and in the Executive. The Constitution is admirably framed to guard against usurpation and corruption.

The States in their corporate capacity have a Senate. The people at large have a House of Representatives, and the Executive is elected by a college of delegates chosen by the people of the various districts. I hope my friend from Massachusetts will press his bill to allow a plurality of the legislature to elect a Senator after a failure of any candidate to secure a majority. Such legislation would secure full representation of the States and remove the only reasonable excuse for election of Senators by the people.

I am surprised that any Senator from a small State should advocate the election of Senators by popular vote. When the constituents of Senators are the people and not the States, why should not each Senator have an equal constituency to every other? If it is the people and not the States, why should the people of Nevada have as many Senators as the people of the State of New York?

If the original compact by which it was agreed that each State should have an equal representation in a Senate is brushed aside and the people of the State are represented in the Senate and not the State in its sovereign capacity, upon what ground can the people of small States claim an equal vote in the Senate with the people of the large States?

I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts has called attention to the magnitude of this question. It is revolutionary. It is the most important question discussed since the adoption of the Constitution. It may be right to destroy the original compact and deny the States representation in the Senate, but before the revolution is effected the people ought to understand what the proposed amendment means. It means the destruction of this body on the principle upon which it was originally organized.

The pretext that the failure of certain States to elect Senators is a sufficient excuse for this revolutionary movement is idle. Legislation, as I have already shown, can remedy that difficulty by providing that in case of failure to secure a majority of the legislature that a plurality may elect, as in other elections. A plurality elects members of Congress, governors, State officers, and the President of the United States. The person receiving the greatest number of votes in the electoral college is declared President. Why should not, with equal propriety, the person receiving the greatest number of votes in a State legislature be declared elected Senator? This would remove the deadlocks that have deprived States of their representation in this body.

The pretense is that this revolution would prevent corruption, when everybody who is familiar with political conventions will understand at once that if there are millionaires in the country who would obtain a seat in this body by the use of money, the opportunity to accomplish such a result afforded by primary elections would be vastly superior to the opportunities now existing to corrupt State legislatures. Besides, the bosses who would control primaries to secure the election of United States Senators would have control of the State conventions to nominate other officers.

The good government which the States have uniformly enjoyed would be in danger. It is well that this question should be discussed. It is well that the people should consider whether they will break down the equality of the States and furnish a motive for the use of money in corrupting State conventions and thereby deprive themselves of the orderly government that they now enjoy, or whether they will stand by the compact of the Constitution and adhere to a Senate representing sovereign States, a body of men the equal of any other legislative body on earth and as competent now as it ever was to perform all the duties imposed by the Constitution.

Whatever may be said of the past, there can be no doubt that the Senate of the United States to-day is as competent to meet the increasing obligations which the growth of the United States imposes as the Senate one hundred years ago was to meet the exigencies which then existed.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to make one suggestion right there?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. The question to my mind is not what the House of Representatives does without debate or without consideration, but what our fathers, who framed the Constitution, did after very long debate.

Mr. STEWART. The great question and the one which was considered most difficult to solve was finally solved in a satisfactory manner, which has produced the results which we all know. It produced a body, I repeat, equal to any legislative body on earth, capable of conducting the affairs of the Government, capable of satisfying the whole country.

The clamor to destroy the Senate of the United States as ordained by the fathers of the Constitution ought not to prevail. Those who do not know that the Constitution could not have been formed if the equality of the States had not been recognized in the Senate, those who do not realize that the proposed movement is revolutionary, those who do not realize that the election of Senators by State legislatures is a safeguard against the corruption of primaries by the rich would do well to inform themselves before they take part in undermining the foundation of the Government of the United States ordained by the Constitution. No amendment heretofore made has changed the original framework of the Constitution. But the one now offered, if successful, I fear, would be the beginning of the end of our magnificent representative system.

JOHN Y. COREY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed, and the Secretary will report the first bill on the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to make a report from the Committee on Pensions. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4366) granting a pension to John Y. Corey, to report it with an amendment.

I will state that this soldier's claim rested in the Bureau of Pensions over fifty years. He is an old soldier of the Mexican war, over 80 years of age, and entirely blind. I ask that the bill be now considered as the first pension case this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hamp-

shire asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill reported by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4366) for the relief of John Y. Corey, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Y. Corey, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

GEORGE H. EVANS.

The bill (S. 2379) granting an increase of pension to George W. Evans was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the name "George," to strike out the letter "W" and insert "H;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George H. Evans, late of Company B, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to George H. Evans."

THOMAS E. SAULS.

The bill (S. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Sauls was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas E. Sauls, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM R. UNDERWOOD.

The bill (H. R. 3747) granting an increase of pension to William R. Underwood was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William R. Underwood, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

M. CALLIE GLOVER.

The bill (H. R. 6869) granting a pension to M. Callie Glover was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of M. Callie Glover, widow of Albert D. Glover, late major, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

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

ALFRED N. MOSIER.

The bill (H. R. 8954) granting an increase of pension to Alfred N. Mosier was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alfred N. Mosier, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EDWARD THOMPSON.

The bill (S. 2976) granting an increase of pension to Edward Thompson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "Regiment," to strike out "of," and in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and ordnance-sergeant, United States Army, war with Mexico;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Edward Thompson, late of



Company B, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, and ordnance-sergeant, United States Army, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

CHARLES ALLEN.

The bill (S. 3390) granting an increase of pension to Charles Allen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles Allen, late of Company A, Seventy-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$34 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EMORY S. FOSTER.

The bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Emory S. Foster was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "major," to strike out "of the," and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Emory S. Foster, late major, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask, now, to have read a part of the report of the Committee on Pensions. I will not ask that the whole of the report be read, but I ask the Secretary to read the part of the report commencing on page 2 with the words "Major Foster's wound is in the abdomen," and then the affidavit of Dr. McNutt. It will only take a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read from the report submitted by Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Pensions, on the 3d instant, as follows:

Major Foster's wound is located in the abdomen. When wounded, he was left upon the field of battle in a supposed dying condition, but afterwards taken from the field and for months lay in a hospital lingering between life and death. His partial recovery was a marvel to the surgeons and those who were familiar with the nature of his wound. In the spring or early summer of 1833 he rejoined his regiment, but in a very feeble condition. Nothing but his indomitable will and unconquerable spirit enabled him to continue with his regiment to the end of the war. He has suffered from his wound and its effects all these years while struggling to make a living for himself and dependent family. His vitality has been wonderful, but it has about given way under the continuing effect of his wound, until now he is disabled from further work and is in a very dependent condition.

There is ample evidence on file as to Major Foster's bravery and loyalty as a soldier and of his years of suffering from his terrible wound. His present condition and the serious nature of his disability are clearly shown by the following evidence of Dr. I. N. McNutt, of Pevely, Mo.:

STATE OF MISSOURI, County of Jefferson:

Personally came before me, a notary public in and for the aforesaid county and State, I. N. McNutt, a citizen of Pevely, county of Jefferson, State of Missouri, well known to me as responsible and entitled to credit, and who, being duly sworn, declares in relation to the case of Maj. Emory S. Foster, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, that he has this day examined said Maj. Emory S. Foster and finds his condition as follows: Bowels constipated; kidneys acting well; action of heart irregularly intermittent, varying during the four hours under observation from 40 beats regularly intermittent to 65 irregularly intermittent, and 80 and regular; pulse sometimes strong and full, then weak and small; again full and strong. This has been the character of his pulse for the last thirty-four years to affiant's certain knowledge, and in his opinion is due to some injury of the sympathetic nerves received at the time of the gunshot wound described in a former affidavit. While these symptoms are of the same character as they were more than thirty years ago, they have become intensified with increasing age.

The affiant further declares that the dragging sensation at the old site of the bullet in the front abdominal wall, which in his opinion is caused by adhesions between the abdominal wall and some part of the intestines, gives Major Foster more pain than it did at the time of former affidavit, especially when sitting erect or leaning a little back. The affiant further declares that a halt or inability to control the action of the left leg, with loss of sensation in the leg, a prominent symptom thirty years ago, and which had to some extent disappeared, though the anesthesia remained, has returned to the extent that unless he or his attendant is constantly on the watch the leg is liable to give way—that is, fails to perform its function—and the result is a fall, of which the abrasions and black spots on his knees testify he has had many since last affidavit.

Affiant further declares this trouble, in his opinion, is due to injury of the spinal nerves, received at the time of the gunshot wound.

Affiant further declares that there seems to be mental as well as physical exhaustion, as evidenced by loss of memory as to dates and words, and in a disposition to repeat incidents of early life, and an indisposition to mental effort, all of which were absent in former years.

Affiant further declares that said Maj. Emory S. Foster's mental and physical condition totally incapacitates him for any manual labor, and that he is entirely dependent on his ever-faithful wife, who devotes her whole time to him.

Affiant further declares that he has no interest, either direct or indirect, in the prosecution of this claim.

I. N. McNUTT, M. D.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of November, A. D. 1901; and I hereby certify that the affiant is a practicing physician of good standing, and that all the words added and all the words erased were done before

the execution of this paper; and that I have no interest, either direct or indirect, in the prosecution of this claim.

[SEAL.]

CLARA E. ZOLLMANN,  
Notary Public.

(My term expires January 19, 1905.)

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, it is a very rare thing that I differ with the Committee on Pensions or undertake to change any report they have made, for I believe they aim to do exactly right. This report changing the proposed amount of the pension from \$100 per month to \$50 is in accordance with their rule; but I submit that what has already been read from the report proves beyond the shadow of a doubt the total physical disability for which, under the pension laws, the claimant is entitled to \$72 per month. Therefore I move to amend the amendment of the committee by making the amount \$72 per month. I hope there will be no opposition to it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not resist the motion; but I will venture to suggest, and I think the Senator will agree with me, that this is one of the cases which shows that the soldier has not received what is due him at the Bureau of Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think so myself.

Mr. GALLINGER. He got only \$25 a month there, and we proposed to increase the pension to \$50 per month, but I think, as the Senator suggests, this man is entitled to the full rating for disability requiring the constant aid and attendance of another person.

Mr. COCKRELL. I happen to know this gentleman from boyhood. He was wounded at Lone Jack in one of the most desperate battles ever fought between two volunteer commands, one of them under Major Foster and the other under my brother.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM T. PRATT.

The bill (H. R. 3297) to correct the military record of William T. Pratt was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "died," to insert "substitute therefor;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the record of William T. Pratt, late a private of Company A, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and substitute therefor "died November 28, 1864."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BENJAMIN WYLIE.

The bill (H. R. 3694) granting a pension to Benjamin Wylie was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Benjamin Wylie, late an unassigned private, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$10 per month.

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

ELIAS LONGMAN.

The bill (H. R. 4035) granting an increase of pension to Elias Longman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elias Longman, late of Company H, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

J. V. DAVIS.

Mr. MARTIN. I notice that in going over the Calendar the Clerk has passed over Order of Business 603, being the bill (H. R. 1831) for the relief of J. V. Davis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is not a pension case.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not know that there had been an agreement merely for the consideration of pension cases; I thought we were going on with the Calendar regularly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The agreement was limited to pension cases and bills for the correction of military records.

Mr. MARTIN. Very well.

## BENJAMIN F. H. LUCE.

The bill (S. 3849) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. H. Luce was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Benjamin F. H. Luce, late principal musician Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## MARY A. HOUSE.

The bill (H. R. 3515) granting a pension to Mary A. House was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "nurse," to strike out "army" and insert "late;" and in line 7, before the word "war," to insert "Medical Department, United States Army;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary A. House, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

## CHARLES H. BAKER.

The bill (H. R. 4827) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Baker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles H. Baker, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## GEORGE C. LEIGHTON.

The bill (H. R. 1018) granting an increase of pension to George C. Leighton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George C. Leighton, late of Company E, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## JOSEPH W. GRANT.

The bill (H. R. 1350) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Grant was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph W. Grant, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## CARLETON A. TRUNDY.

The bill (H. R. 6515) granting an increase of pension to Carleton A. Trundy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Carleton A. Trundy, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and acting master's mate, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## ALICE M. BALLOU.

The bill (H. R. 7907) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Ballou was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alice M. Ballou, widow of Schuyler S. Ballou, late of Company E, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, provided, however, that in the case of the death of the helpless child, Gilbert T. Ballou, on whose account the pension of Alice M. Ballou is increased, the pension of said Alice M. Ballou shall continue only at the rate of \$8 per month from and after the date of death of said helpless child, Gilbert T. Ballou.

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

## SARAH FRANCES TAFT.

The bill (S. 4021) granting a pension to Sarah Frances Taft was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to insert "acting;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "seventeen;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah Frances Taft, widow of Charles Sabin Taft, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

## JOHN G. HUTCHINSON.

The bill (S. 2768) granting an increase of pension to John G. Hutchinson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John G. Hutchinson, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## LEANDER PARMELEE.

The bill (S. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Leander Parmelee was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## CHARLES W. FOSTER.

The bill (S. 4086) granting a pension to Charles W. Foster was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles W. Foster, late of Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Foster."

## SARAH A. CARTER.

The bill (S. 3650) granting a pension to Sarah A. Carter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah A. Carter, dependent mother of Joseph S. Carter, late of Captain Cobb's company, Maine State Guards Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## ABNER J. PETTEE.

The bill (S. 4111) granting an increase of pension to Abner J. Pettee was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Abner J. Pettee, late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## ABBIE GEORGE.

The bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Abbie George was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the words "widow of," to strike out "the late;" in the same line, after the name "George," to insert "late;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "sixteen;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Abbie George, widow of Rufus L. George, late of Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

## CHARLES H. STONE.

The bill (S. 6) granting a pension to Charles H. Stone was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles H. Stone, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Stone."

## MARY MORGAN.

The bill (S. 1095) granting an increase of pension to Mary Morgan was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Morgan, mother of Algernon Morgan, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## GEORGE DANIELS.

The bill (S. 13) granting an increase of pension to George Daniels was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "Fifteenth" and insert "Eleventh;" and in the same line, before the word "Cavalry," to insert "Volunteer;" so as to make the bill read:

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

## ANNIE E. BROWN.

The bill (S. 4022) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions

and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Annie E. Brown, widow of Frederick T. Brown, late chaplain Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## WILLIAM WHEELER.

The bill (S. 2079) granting an increase of pension to William Wheeler was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "captain;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Wheeler, late captain Company D, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## SUSAN E. CLARK.

The bill (S. 3995) granting a pension to Susan E. Clark was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Indiana," to insert "Regiment;" in line 8, before the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Regiment;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Susan E. Clark, mother of James M. Clark, late of Company B, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

## KEPHART WALLACE.

The bill (H. R. 2175) granting an increase of pension to Kephart Wallace was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Kephart Wallace, late of Company M, Nineteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## JAMES HARPER.

The bill (H. R. 5160) granting an increase of pension to James Harper was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Harper, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## WILLIAM RHEUBY.

The bill (H. R. 6014) granting an increase of pension to William Rheuby was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Rheuby, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

## JOSEPH K. ASHBY.

The bill (H. R. 6861) granting an increase of pension to Joseph K. Ashby was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph K. Ashby, late private Company E, First Regiment Missouri Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN S. MITCHELL.

The bill (S. 3916) granting an increase of pension to John S. Mitchell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John S. Mitchell, late of Company B, Second Regiment Mississippi Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SARAH ANNE HARRIS.

The bill (S. 3378) granting a pension to Sarah Anne Harris was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the name "Harris," to strike out the word "Lieutenant" and insert "Theodore F.;" in line 7, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "second lieutenant;" and in line 8, after the words "New Jersey," to strike out "Volunteers" and insert "Volunteer Infantry;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah Anne Harris, mother of Theodore F. Harris, late second lieutenant Company C, Twelfth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JOHN S. HUNTER.

The bill (H. R. 9220) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hunter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John S. Hunter, late of Company M, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SELDEN E. WHITCHER.

The bill (H. R. 4488) granting an increase of pension to Selden E. Whitcher was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Selden E. Whitcher, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend in line 8, before the word "dollars," by striking out "twenty" and inserting "twelve;" so as to make the rate of pension \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL M. HOWARD.

The bill (S. 1979) granting a pension to Samuel M. Howard was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of that he is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel M. Howard, late of Companies A and H, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Howard."

EUGENE J. OULMAN.

The bill (S. 1982) granting a pension to Eugene J. Oulman was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of that he is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eugene J. Oulman, late of

Company B, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Eugene J. Oulman."

THOMAS FENERAN.

The bill (S. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Feneran was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the name "Thomas," to strike out "Feneran" and insert "Feneran;" and in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas Feneran, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

JAMES LEHEW.

The bill (S. 2006) granting an increase of pension to James Lehen was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

PETER BITTMAN.

The bill (S. 2329) granting an increase of pension to Peter Bittman was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Peter Bittman, late of Company P, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that amendment ought not to be agreed to. I have examined the report.

The amendment was rejected.

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

JESSE W. BICE.

The bill (S. 3252) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Bice was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 6, after the word "major," to strike out "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jesse W. Bice, late major, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the amendment be disagreed to. The amendment was rejected.

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

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

## ELIZABETH STEELE.

The bill (S. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Steele was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the words "widow of," to strike out "the late;" in the same line, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "first lieutenant;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "seventeen;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth Steele, widow of James Steele, late first lieutenant Company K, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

## JAMES L. PROCTOR.

The bill (H. R. 718) to correct the military record of James L. Proctor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to James L. Proctor, of the county of Kings, State of New York, late a private in Company F, Nineteenth Regiment of New York Veteran Volunteers.

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

## RICHARD FRISTOE.

The bill (H. R. 5247) granting an increase of pension to Richard Fristoe was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Richard Fristoe, late of Company G, First Regiment Missouri Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## NARCISSA TAIT.

The bill (H. R. 9883) granting a pension to Narcissa Tait was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Narcissa Tait, widow of Felix Tait, late a private in Captain Green's company, First Texas Mounted Rifles, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

## ADELLA C. CHANDLER.

The bill (H. R. 597) granting a pension to Adella C. Chandler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adella C. Chandler, widow of Bartley M. Chandler, late of Captain West's company of Tennessee Volunteers, Cherokee disturbances, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

## CHARLES G. BRIGHAM.

The bill (S. 1809) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Charles G. Brigham was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "discharge," to insert:

As of date July 22, 1861: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or allowance shall accrue by virtue of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Charles G. Brigham, private, of Company B, First Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and issue to him an honorable discharge as of date July 22, 1861: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or allowance shall accrue by virtue of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## HENRY BURNS.

The bill (H. R. 7997) granting an increase of pension to Henry Burns was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry Burns, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

## HARRY H. SIEG.

The bill (H. R. 8493) granting a pension to Harry H. Sieg was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the words "United States," to insert "Regiment;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harry H. Sieg, helpless and dependent son of Henry A. Sieg, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

## CHARLES A. SHEAFE.

The bill (H. R. 7432) granting a pension to Charles A. Sheafe was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles A. Sheafe, late captain of Company I, Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month.

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

## EMANUEL KLAUSER.

The bill (H. R. 3762) for the relief of Emanuel Klauser was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 4, after the words "directed to," to strike out:

Remove the charge of mutiny against Emanuel Klauser, late corporal of Company H, Fifty-fourth Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and grant said Emanuel Klauser an honorable discharge to date from the 1st day of April, 1865: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

And insert:

Revoke and set aside General Orders, No. 10, headquarters United States forces, Pine Bluff, Ark., July 31, 1865, issued by G. M. Mitchell, colonel commanding, approving the proceedings, findings, and sentence of the general court-martial in case of Emanuel Klauser, of Company H, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to issue to said Klauser an honorable discharge as of date July 31, 1865: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to revoke and set aside General Orders, No. 10, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

## THOMAS CORDINGLY.

The bill (S. 1634) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Cordingly was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Navy to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the name of Thomas Cordingly, a seaman, charged with desertion from the U. S. S. *Flag and Vermont* April 27, 1865.

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

## MARY LOUISE WORDEN.

The bill (S. 3182) granting an increase of pension to Mary Louise Worden was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Louise Worden, widow of Charles A. Worden, late captain, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of thirty dollars per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## SARAH C. NICKLIN.

The bill (S. 3662) granting a pension to Sarah C. Nicklin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah C. Nicklin, widow of Arthur I. Nicklin, late of Benjamin Hayden's company, Capt. B. F.

Burch's company, and Capt. Marion Goff's company, Oregon Volunteers, in the Oregon and Washington Indian wars of 1855 and 1856, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

RICHARD A. LAWRENCE.

The bill (H. R. 1697) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Lawrence was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Richard A. Lawrence, late of Company K, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHARLES ARMSTRONG.

The bill (H. R. 1688) granting an increase of pension to Charles Armstrong was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles Armstrong, late of Company L, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES M. STRADLING.

The bill (H. R. 280) for the relief of James M. Stradling was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in line 6, before the word "day," to strike out "nineteenth" and insert "sixteenth;" and in the same line, after the words "day of," to strike out "July" and insert "September;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That James M. Stradling shall be held and considered to have been mustered into the service of the United States as a second lieutenant of the First Regiment of New Jersey Cavalry Volunteers on the 16th day of September, 1864, and that the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue to him a certificate of discharge as a second lieutenant of said regiment, to date from the 16th day of September, 1864: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ELMER J. STARKEY.

The bill (H. R. 3288) granting an increase of pension to Elmer J. Starkey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elmer J. Starkey, late of Company G, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SUSAN P. CRANDALL.

The bill (H. R. 6435) granting a pension to Susan P. Crandall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Susan P. Crandall, widow of Henry B. Crandall, late of Company A, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

MATTHEW T. LEWIS.

The bill (S. 2293) for relief of Matthew T. Lewis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "directed," to strike out:

To grant an honorable discharge to Matthew T. Lewis, late of Company K, Third Michigan Cavalry: *Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or emolument shall become due by virtue of the passage of this act.

And insert:

To remove the charge of desertion on the records of Matthew T. Lewis, of Company K, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to grant him an honorable discharge as of date April 18, 1864.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion on the records of Matthew T. Lewis, of Company K, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to grant him an honorable discharge as of date April 18, 1864.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the usual proviso be added. It must have been left out by mistake.

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

*Provided,* That no pay, bounty, or emoluments shall become due by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LIZZIE C. YOUNG.

The bill (H. R. 2609) granting a pension to Lizzie C. Young was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lizzie C. Young, widow of Richard J. Young, late of Company G, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month and \$2 per month additional for each of the minor children of said soldier until such children shall have arrived at the age of 16 years.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report in the case be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. FOSTER of Washington on the 7th instant, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2609) granting a pension to Lizzie C. Young, have examined the same and report: The report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives, hereto appended, is adopted and the passage of the bill is recommended.

The House report is as follows:

"This bill proposes to pension the beneficiary named in the bill at \$12 per month.

"The records of the War Department show that Richard J. Young, the soldier named in this bill, was enrolled on October 17, 1864, at Rock Island, Ill., in Company G, Third Regiment United States (rebel) Volunteers, and that he was mustered out with his company November 29, 1865; that at the time of his enlistment he was a rebel prisoner of war in the hands of the United States military authorities, and that from April 12 to April 25, 1865, he was under treatment for intermittent fever.

"The records of the War Department also show that this soldier enlisted July 16, 1861, at Arkadelphia, Ark., in Company E, Thirty-third Arkansas Volunteers, C. S. A.; that he was originally a member of Company A, Twelfth Arkansas, C. S. A.; that the rolls for August and October, 1862, and February and April, 1863, show him present for duty, and the roll of June and August, 1863, as left sick at Monroe, Ga., August, 1863.

"He was pensioned in 1881 under the general law at \$8 per month from the date of his discharge, on account of an injury to the left leg, with resulting disease to bone and ulceration, which injury was received by him on the march from Fort Riley, Kans., to Fort Kearney, about April, 1865. He died February 5, 1897, of pneumonia.

"The claims of the beneficiary as the widow of the soldier, filed under the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, was rejected March 30, 1897, upon the ground that title to such pension could not obtain, for the reason that the records of the War Department show that the soldier engaged in the late rebellion against the United States, and her claim under the general law was also rejected, in 1898, upon the ground of claimant's declared inability to furnish the necessary evidence to connect her husband's death, in 1897, from pneumonia, with the military service. The beneficiary was married to the soldier on June 26, 1888, and the soldier left surviving him three minor children, all of whom are still under 16 years of age.

"The claimant alleged that her husband had been unable most of the time since the war to perform manual labor; that he had been under medical treatment, but that she was unable to obtain the affidavit of the physicians who had treated him.

"Pension Office papers also show that the beneficiary is in destitute circumstances.

"Your committee is of the opinion that section 4716, Revised Statutes, as to disloyalty should not be a bar to pension under the act of June 27, 1890, and that, following precedents, the beneficiary named in the bill should be entitled to the rate provided by the act of June 27, 1890, to widows whose husbands served ninety days or more in the military service of the United States and were honorably discharged, etc.; hence report the bill back with the recommendation that it pass."

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I wish now to read Senate joint resolution No. 8, introduced by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] on the 4th of December, 1901, and reported by him on February 10, 1902:

A joint resolution construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents."

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," is construed and held to include all persons who served for ninety days in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing shall not apply to those who served in the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Regiments United States Volunteer Infantry, who had a prior service in the Confederate army or navy, nor to those who, having had such prior service, enlisted in the military or naval service of the United States after the 1st day of January, 1865.

I wish to know if the Committee on Pensions have reversed their decision in this case. In this joint resolution they expressly exclude from the benefits of the pension law all the members of the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Regiments, most of whom were in prison at the time those regiments were organized.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if this soldier was in one of those regiments? If so, it has escaped

my attention. He was a member of Company G, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly. The joint resolution says the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth regiments.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say that the committee have not reversed the opinion they expressed in reporting the joint resolution, and for that reason I would ask that the pending bill be passed over.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to say just a few words more. As I understand from a report made at the last session of Congress, those six regiments were made up of Confederate prisoners—

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. COCKRELL. Who were in prison there, and I infer from that report that it was distinctly understood at the time when they were mustered into the service that they were not to be made to fight against their former comrades.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was the agreement.

Mr. COCKRELL. And they were therefore sent out to the West, and for that very reason they were excluded in the last bill from the operations of the pension law of June 27, 1890.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator states it with precise accuracy. That was the reason.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, then, there is another point. There were a considerable number of men both in Arkansas and Missouri who in the beginning of the war were either in the Missouri State Guard or in some Arkansas organization. They afterwards went into the Union Army and served. A great many of them were pensioned, and their names have all been stricken from the pension rolls on the ground that under the law of June 27, 1890, no one could be pensioned who had seen voluntary service in the Confederate army.

Now, I want all those men treated alike. Not a week passes that I do not get a letter from some of them, wanting his pension restored. I have answered them all alike—that it all depends upon the passage of joint resolution No. 8, and therefore I do not want any special favoritism shown. Let them all stand alike or fall alike, and it is for the Senate to determine what action shall be taken.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is undoubtedly right in that contention. I will state to the Senator that during the Fifty-sixth Congress the Senate passed a joint resolution similar to the one now on the Calendar, or substantially the same.

Mr. COCKRELL. Exactly. It was passed here and reported favorably in the House, but not acted upon in the House.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was reported there with amendments. That is right.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, in addition to that, it is a part of the history of these matters that there were some Federals who enlisted in the Confederate service and did service in camp and battle. I know whereof I speak, as some of them were assigned to my own command. Some of them came from Andersonville prison. These men, some of them, have occasionally made application for restoration to the rolls with a view of getting pensions, and the Military Committee, of which I am a member, has invariably set them aside on the same principle. While this party here may not belong to one of those regiments designated in the order just read by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], yet the principle should hold good in this and all other such cases, and this application should be denied.

Mr. GALLINGER. This bill coming from the House evidently failed to get that careful scrutiny which the committee always gives to every bill, and I will now move that it be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES E. DEXTER.

The bill (S. 3481) granting an increase of pension to James E. Dexter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James E. Dexter, late surgeon Fortieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

GEORGE C. TILLMAN.

The bill (S. 4071) granting an increase of pension to George C. Tillman was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Alabama," to insert

"Regiment;" in the same line, before the word "Infantry," to insert "Volunteer;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George C. Tillman, late of Company C, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JOHN M'DONALD.

The bill (S. 4214) granting an increase of pension to John McDonald was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John McDonald, late of Company E, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

NATHANIEL C. GOODWIN.

The bill (S. 1039) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel C. Goodwin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nathaniel C. Goodwin, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

AUGUSTA TURNER.

The bill (S. 4346) granting a pension to Augusta Turner, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Augusta Turner, widow of John E. Turner, late of Company C, Fourth Battalion, District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

HENRY M. TAYLOR.

The bill (S. 3216) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Taylor was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

FREDERICK SHAFER.

The bill (H. R. 9227) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Shafer was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JOHN BARNARD.

The bill (S. 2505) granting an increase of pension to John Barnard was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Barnard, late of Company B, Brackett's Battalion Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

EDWARD H. ARMSTRONG.

The bill (S. 3696) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Armstrong was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Edward H. Armstrong, late of Company I, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

J. J. GROFF.

The bill (S. 142) granting a pension to J. J. Groff was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of J. J. Groff, late scout and guide in the United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CHARLES AMBROOK.

The bill (S. 951) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ambrook was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles Ambrook, late of Company K, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and first lieutenant Company B, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

GEORGE H. SMITH.

The bill (S. 952) granting an increase of pension to George H. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George H. Smith, late musician, band, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ELIZA B. GAMBLE.

The bill (S. 965) granting a pension to Eliza B. Gamble was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eliza B. Gamble, widow of David C.

Gamble, late captain Company E, Sixty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ANDREW J. FELT.

The bill (S. 2371) granting a pension to Andrew J. Felt was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew J. Felt, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The thirty minutes have expired.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HALE. Now, I hope we will proceed with the Calendar under the five-minute rule, and we can easily dispose of all cases in perhaps an hour—

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from Maine will not insist upon that. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] has a bill which is very important to my State, and it will take but a little while to pass it.

Mr. HALE. Is it not on the Calendar?

Mr. BERRY. He has not yet reported it. He is ready to report it from the Judiciary Committee, and I should like to have it passed now, if possible. I hope the Senator from Maine will permit it to be passed.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask leave to make a report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HALE. Before I yield I wish to make an appeal to the Senate. The Calendar has never been reduced to so small a number and in so small a space as it is to-day, and the reason is that, contrary to the usage which we have had for years of taking up particular bills on the Calendar and passing them at the request of Senators, we have for several days gone to the Calendar and taken them up in order, and bills in which Senators are interested have been passed, and we have almost cleared the Calendar. By doing that every Senator is put on the same basis. We reach his bill in order. He is not obliged to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate.

Now, I do not propose, if that course has not vindicated itself to the Senate, and if it is better to fall back on the old way, when every Senator scrambles for his own bill and gets it through and other Senators who have bills upon the Calendar do not get theirs in, I am not going to stand alone. The interest I have taken in the Calendar is in the interest of all the members of the Senate who have bills in which they or their constituents are interested.

I will not resist the appeal now of the Senator from Alabama, but I give notice that to-morrow morning after the routine business I shall object to the consideration of any particular bill and I shall ask the Senate, as it has done for several days heretofore, to go to the Calendar and take up bills in their order.

COURTS IN ARKANSAS.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, by instruction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back without amendment the bill (H. R. 7458) to re-form the western judicial district of the State of Arkansas. It is simply to establish another court in the western district of Arkansas, which is very much needed there, and I have also been instructed by the committee to ask that the bill be now put on its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

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

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

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask that the bill (S. 3327) in amendment of sections 23 and 26 of an act approved February 2, 1901, entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States," be taken up.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont asks for the present consideration of a bill which will be read for the information of the Senate.

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

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in section 2, page 4, after line 12, to add the following:

Vacancies which shall occur in the position of Chief of the Corps of Engineers, the Medical Department, or the Judge-Advocate-General's Department shall be filled by detail from the corps where the vacancy occurs for the term of four years, and at the expiration of such detail or of a redetail such chief shall be returned to his proper grade in his corps in the manner provided in this section for the return of the chiefs of other corps to their proper grade.

Mr. PROCTOR. From the committee, in lieu of the amendment at the close of the bill, I submit an amendment which is the same in substance, but expressed in another form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill, in lieu of the committee amendment, the following:

The provisions of this section relative to the appointment, duration of service, and return to proper grades of the chiefs of the staff, corps, and departments hereinbefore named shall also apply in the case of any officer who shall hereafter be appointed to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, of the Medical Department, or of the Judge-Advocate-General's Department, except that the chief of the corps or of either of the departments last named above shall be selected from the corps or department in which the vacancy as chief shall occur.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. I propose a further amendment. On page 3, line 23, I move to strike out the word "redetailed" and to insert the word "reappointed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. In line 25, just below, I move to strike out the word "detailed" and to insert the word "appointed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, it is difficult to see from the reading of these meager amendments, which carry nothing of intelligence in them, but which may be all right, what is their effect. Now, I want the Senator to tell me and to tell the Senate, after this bill passes as amended here to-day, how it leaves the appointments of the heads of these corps in the War Department as to their time of service. Are they all hereafter to be appointed or detailed—whichever phrase may be used—for four years?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, they are to be. That is the purpose of the single amendment of section 22. By a slip in the purpose of the committee in the act called the reorganization bill of February 2 of last year, in reference to the Engineer Corps, the line was inserted, "Provided, That the Chief of Engineers shall be selected as now provided by law." As then provided by law, the Chief of Engineers was selected for the term of his active service.

Mr. HALE. And he remained until he retired?

Mr. PROCTOR. He remained until he retired. A few months since, when Colonel Gillespie was made general and Chief of Engineers, the nomination was first sent in as a detail for four years. Then attention was drawn to this line, and the nomination was withdrawn, and he was nominated during his active service. It makes no practical difference in that case, because his active service only continues about five months beyond the four years' detail, but of course we wish to have it conform to the principle we adopted of a four years' detail.

Mr. HALE. I am very much in favor of the scheme that has been adopted by the committee of selecting these heads of corps with the limitation of time that has always applied in the Navy Department. It works well in the Navy Department, and there has never grown up in the Navy Department the feeling that there has been with reference to the long duration of terms in the corps of the Army. There is less jealousy on the part of the line and staff of the Navy of the heads of these bureaus than has heretofore been seen and known by us all in the Army. I believe that the new scheme will work well, I only rose for the purpose of seeing whether that is to be applied hereafter in all these cases.

Mr. PROCTOR. The question was a pertinent one. I will say that this measure has been gone over very carefully by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] and myself as a subcommittee, and the purpose of it was to correct some slight errors (and we were surprised there were not more) in the large bill that was passed last winter, so as to make the whole thing symmetrical and harmonious, in accordance with the general plan that was then fixed upon.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I think I am in favor of this measure, but I had the impression that when we passed the Army reorganization bill at the last session we deliberately excepted the Engineer Corps, the Judge-Advocate's Corps, and perhaps one other from the application of this principle of a

four-years' detail. I wish to inquire whether that was the case, and if we are now changing the Army reorganization bill in that respect?

Mr. PROCTOR. Those corps—the Engineer Corps, the Judge Advocate's, and the Medical Corps—were excepted from the general detail system. The engineers are not obliged to go to the line, but the chief of those three corps. It was the purpose of the bill last winter to make the chief, and the chief only, subject to the four-years' detail.

Mr. COCKRELL. But only detailable from the corps.

Mr. HALE. These corps do not interchange?

Mr. PROCTOR. No; they do not interchange. We provide in this bill a clause which was not fully expressed, but it was our purpose that the selection of chiefs of those three corps shall be made from the corps.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. You do not change the existing law in that respect in this bill?

Mr. PROCTOR. No.

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

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

#### PROMOTION OF COMMERCE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1348.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1348) to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and the common defense; to promote commerce, and to encourage the deep-sea fisheries.

Mr. MALLORY rose.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Senator from Florida proceeds I ask that the pending amendment, if there is any pending amendment, may be read. I wish to know the state of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that no amendment is now pending.

Mr. ALLISON. No amendment is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment is pending.

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. President, this bill is an expression of the sentiment of the dominant party of the country to-day and is in keeping with the policy which, since that party first came into power, has animated it. It is in keeping with that system of legislation which for many years has proceeded on the theory that it is proper and just for the Government to lend its aid to individuals for the purpose of building up industries in which such individuals may be engaged on the plea and theory that by so doing they are contributing to the public weal.

This bill is divided into three separate and distinct parts, each part relating to an apparently different subject, but all three bearing directly in their ultimate analysis on the result sought to be attained by the Republican party in its policies in the past, namely, building up of private enterprises at the expense of the taxpayers.

The bill is divided into three titles. Title 1 proposes to provide a system of increasing the mail communications of this country with foreign countries. Title 2 proposes to add to the merchant marine of the United States engaged in foreign commerce by giving a subsidy or bounty to those who own ships engaged in foreign commerce, and title 3 is devoted to the purpose of conferring bounties upon persons engaged in what is known as the deep-sea fisheries of this country.

The reasons alleged in the bill for the provisions relating to title 1, whereby it is sought to promote the means of postal intercourse between the United States and foreign countries, are that it is necessary in order to advance our trade; that we must take advantage of the opportunities which are presented to us by the fact that our products can be placed in foreign markets at rates that will compete with the products of foreign countries and thereby secure the exchange of our products with foreign products and at the same time open a new commercial evangel between the United States and the nations of the world.

The argument of the eloquent Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], who is the father of this bill, and who was a very able exponent of a measure not entirely dissimilar from this which occupied the attention of the Senate something like a year ago, is that our postal communications are so inefficient at present that it is absolutely necessary in order to carry on business with foreign countries that the facilities for communication should be increased at any cost. For the purpose of doing that, and to facilitate the passage of a large postal subsidy through Congress, it is contended that we can at the same time provide a number of vessels of such size and of such character as will, in the event of a maritime war, become very useful to the United States as an adjunct to its naval power.

The bill contains a provision to that effect, that such vessels as shall have the benefit of the contracts provided for in the bill for the transmission of the mails shall undergo inspection while under construction, and shall be favorably reported on by naval inspectors as to their capacity and qualifications for auxiliary cruisers.

Under title 1—the postal-subsidy title—provision is made whereby the vessels which receive the benefit of the immense subsidy provided in the bill may in the case of necessity, in the event of war between this nation and any great maritime nation, be utilized as auxiliary cruisers; and much stress is laid upon the advantage which would accrue to the Government from having at its command a number of swift ocean-going vessels that may be used for the purpose of scouting or preying upon the enemy's commerce.

Now, Mr. President, to one who examines closely that argument it would seem that it is hardly a justification for the extraordinary expenditure which is proposed under this bill. The Senator from Maine estimates that up to five years from now the expenditure authorized under this title, or under the entire bill, will not exceed the sum of \$6,000,000. That is purely a guess. It is impossible to say what will happen within the next five years. Very probably the Senator from Maine has figured it out very carefully, taking into view all the possible contingencies that occur to his mind, but, Mr. President, it strikes me as being rather a wild conjecture to say that within that time any particular number of vessels will or will not be built in the event this bill becomes a law.

The question of encouraging the building of swift trans-Atlantic steamers for the purpose of furnishing auxiliary cruisers in case of war with foreign nations is one which has not been examined very closely, as far as I have been able to observe, either in this body or in the other. We did have some little experience, in our recent war with Spain, with what are called auxiliary cruisers, inasmuch as two vessels of the American Line were employed as aids or scouts to our fleet down in the West Indian waters, and I believe they rendered some good service. But I hardly think that our experience in the Spanish war will furnish a just and proper criterion for our guidance when we come to legislate with reference to a war with a great maritime nation.

Spain had no fleet except the unfortunate fleet that came across the ocean and, like a flock of partridges, sought shelter in the nearest cover they could find and were finally destroyed. In the event of war with a maritime nation such as Great Britain or Germany, Russia, or France, these auxiliary cruisers would not be left alone to scour the seas and to scout from port to port.

The policy of the maritime nations of the world to-day is to build vessels, armored cruisers, protected cruisers, and even battle ships of such speed as to be able to overtake on the high seas any of those fleet greyhounds of the ocean that are referred to as such desirable material for auxiliary cruisers; and it is a fact that we have now in the course of construction 10 cruisers of 22 knots capacity, any one of which would be able in a four or five hours' chase to run down any one of the vessels which are contemplated by this bill. Besides a large fleet of 22-knot cruisers, we are also constructing and have constructed a large number of torpedo-boat destroyers, vessels of small tonnage, averaging probably about 400 tons, but seagoing vessels of great power and speed, well armed, and with great steaming capacity and ability to carry coal.

Some of those torpedo-boat destroyers are of a speed of 30 knots an hour; others are of a speed of 29 knots an hour, and a number of a speed of 26 knots an hour. All of them could run down at sea any merchant vessel that now flies the flag of any nation in the world. There would be no earthly chance for one of those auxiliary cruisers to escape from one of those torpedo-boat destroyers or from one of the armored cruisers of the 22 or 23 knot capacity; and I take it that if we were to add a large number of such auxiliary cruisers to our Navy we would be simply weakening our offensive strength and adding nothing whatever to our defensive power. Therefore I hold that there is but little in the suggestion contained in this bill and given forth in the arguments of those gentlemen who have undertaken to sustain it, that the auxiliary-cruiser feature of the measure is one of very great importance and worthy of much consideration.

It will be observed on a close examination of the measure that the compensation under title 1 is based principally upon tonnage. It is true that it requires also certain speed rates, which are fixed in the measure. I will state the provision which is made for compensation for the different classes of vessels which are provided for in the measure.

There are seven distinct classes. Under the act of 1891, of which this particular chapter of the bill is an amendment, there were only four classes of ships. It has been thought proper—and I think perhaps the distinction is well founded—that there should be a larger division of classes, so that vessels of varying speed should be paid according to the differences in their speed ability.

The maximum size of vessels provided for in this bill is 10,000 tons and over, and under that head of 10,000 tons, which constitutes one class, there are included two classes of speed, namely: Vessels of 20 knots or over, and vessels of 19 knots and less than 20 knots. The 19-knot vessels are of 10,000 tons, but are put down as of the second class. Then the bill provides that there shall be vessels of 5,000 tons, and under that description there are four distinct classes, namely: The third class, which is to be 18 knots or over; the fourth class, 17 knots and less than 18 knots; the fifth class, 16 knots and less than 17 knots, and the sixth class, 15 and less than 16 knots. These vessels all must be over 5,000 tons. Then the last division, based upon tonnage, is for vessels of over 2,000 tons, which of themselves constitute the last and seventh class, which are required to have a speed of 14 knots or over.

The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, in his speech on this bill the other day, stated very frankly what his purpose was in making this classification and in providing the payments which are provided in the measure upon the different classes of ships here provided for. He stated that he desired to encourage the building of ships of great tonnage in order that freights might be cheapened, because freights by vessels carrying very large cargoes can be reduced to lower rates than are the freights of vessels carrying small cargoes. Therefore he takes the first class of vessels of 10,000 tons and 20 knots or over and provides that they shall receive 2.7 cents per ton for every hundred miles traveled.

Steamships of the second class, that is, of 10,000 tons, of 19 knots speed and less than 20 knots, shall receive 2.5 cents per ton for every 100 miles traveled. Vessels of the third class, that is, vessels over 5,000 tons and of 18 knots or over, are to receive 2.3 cents per ton for every 100 miles traveled. Of the fourth class, namely, vessels of 5,000 tons or over and 17 knots or over in speed, shall receive 2.1 cents per ton. Vessels of the fifth class, of 5,000 tons or over and 16 knots or over, are to receive 1.9 cents per ton; and vessels of the sixth class, of 5,000 tons or over and 15 knots and less than 16 knots, are to receive 1.7 cents per 100 miles per ton. Finally, the last, steamships of the seventh class, that is, of 2,000 tons or over and which have a speed of 14 knots or over, shall receive 1.5 cents per ton.

The Senator from Maine contends that this will contribute to the construction of a fleet of very large-sized vessels, and his argument is very powerful in leading to the conclusion that it will greatly facilitate the transportation of the products of this country to foreign nations; but, Mr. President, it seems to have been forgotten that there must be a limitation upon the size of ships. It is a fact, which statistics demonstrate, that the great bulk of the carrying trade of the world on the ocean is done by vessels of less than 6,000 tons; in fact, it is done by vessels of very much less than 6,000 tons.

The reason for that is very obvious, if one undertakes to give the matter consideration, because, as you increase the size of the ship, you increase its draft, and a vessel of 10,000 tons must necessarily draw more water than a vessel of 5,000 tons, build them as you may, and it has been a problem, which shipbuilders have been striving with for a number of years, to put the largest carrying capacity, together with a safe character of ship, on the least possible draft. It is a fact that south of Newport News or the Chesapeake Capes there is but one port in the United States into which a vessel drawing over 27 feet of water can enter, and that is a port on the Gulf. There is said to be 27 feet of water between the jetties at New Orleans, but if there are 27 feet of water there, a vessel drawing 26 or 26½ feet sometimes runs aground in going out of the Passes.

The shipbuilders of the world and the shipowners of the world are aware of the fact that the deep-water ports of the world are very limited in number, and that, if they want to do the commerce of the world successfully, they must accommodate themselves to the conditions which qualify that commerce; and with the exception of the relatively very few ports in the United States, and a very few ports in South America, it is an absolute necessity that vessels of smaller tonnage than 6,000 tons must be employed in that trade. Because of their great draft vessels drawing more than 22 or 23 feet when loaded will not be able to enter such ports. Therefore I do not think there is any occasion for us to proceed hastily with the idea that it is essential that all the merchant ships of the United States should be great carriers.

The tramp steamers of Great Britain, the ships that constitute the great majority of the mercantile fleet of Great Britain, are vessels under 4,000 tons. They pass into every port of the world; they visit our ports, the ports of Africa, the ports of Europe, and the ports of Asia; and they transport the products of the Tropics and of the Temperate zones from one part of the world to another, and really control the carrying trade of the world. We have none. I think there are no such vessels in the United States merchant marine.

Take our own seagoing fleet. On page 14 of the last report of the Commissioner of Navigation I find a list of vessels, with their

tonnage and their speed, belonging to the United States, in which are set forth our ocean-going steamships. We have 113 steam vessels, ranging from 1,000 tons to 10,000 tons. Of that number 106 are vessels of less than 6,000 tons. The rest run up to 10,000 tons. We have four vessels of 10,000 tons or over. We have no vessels of 9,000 tons, none of 8,000 tons, and none of 7,000 tons. All the balance of our vessels are from 6,000 tons down to 1,000 tons.

So far as speed is concerned, we have four vessels of 20 knots or over; we have no vessel of 19 knots; one vessel of 18 knots; five of 17 knots; four of 16 knots; eleven of 15 knots; sixteen of 14 knots; six of 13 knots; nine of 12 knots, and fifty-seven under 12 knots, making a total of 113, of which number 99 are less than 16-knot vessels. I have compared the tables of the world's commercial marine with ours and I find about the same ratio exists in all sea-going ocean vessels of the world—the same ratio of small vessels—that is, vessels under 6,000 tons to vessels over that tonnage.

The Senator from Maine proposes to upset, by this bill, this natural arrangement of proportion of ships of fairly ordinary size and to substitute ships of large and exceedingly great size. The commerce of the world has so adjusted itself that it has been found necessary for the great majority of the steam tramps to be vessels of less than 6,000 tons; and I take it, notwithstanding the very excessive aid which is proposed to be given by this bill to the building of ships, that the construction of vessels of over 6,000 tons will not be advanced in any special degree. Certainly this bill will not increase the number of vessels of the class of the *St. Louis*, the *St. Paul*, the *New York*, and the *Philadelphia*, which constitute, I believe, the four fast ships of the American merchant marine.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA], in his very able speech delivered in this Chamber about a year ago upon the subsidy bill which was then pending, gave it as his opinion that that bill would not contribute one ship of that class to the merchant marine of the United States. He used this language:

As to this bill offering any further inducement, even at the advanced compensation, for the people in this country engaged in that trade to continue the construction of fast liners as a matter of business investment, I doubt if anyone would venture any further in that direction. We all know that in the competition in trans-Atlantic lines to-day England and Germany and France are all competing to have and to operate the ship which will cross the Atlantic Ocean between Sandy Hook and the ports on the other side in the shortest time.

We also know that that spirit of competition is in the way of advertising for the passenger traffic. Therefore I say that it is only a question, as far as American interests are concerned, how much loss they are prepared to meet in order to advertise their ships as the swift ships crossing the Atlantic Ocean. There is no profit in the business; there never has been to that line, and there never will be under these conditions. And I say that in my own judgment and from my own standpoint there will not be another dollar, for years to come, of American capital invested in 21 or 22 knot ships.

Therefore it may be contended, I think very properly, if we accept the authority of the Senator from Ohio, who, I believe, is an authority upon this subject, that, unless the subsidy which is provided for in this bill is larger than that which was provided for in the bill which was before the Senate last year, there will be no addition of the 21-knot or 22-knot class of vessels to our merchant marine.

This bill, Mr. President, does not propose to make as large an appropriation as the bill which we had last year. I did have a comparison of the rates—I can not lay my hand on it now—but it is a fact that the provisions in regard to pay in this bill are considerably less than they were in the bill which was considered at the last session; and if the Senator from Ohio is correct in his judgment that that bill would not add one ship to the swift greyhound class of vessels that we then had, certainly we are justified in concluding that it is his opinion to-day that this measure will not add anything to that class of ships.

I find that the figures furnished by the bill that was under consideration last year, when worked out on the lines of this bill, give us the following: Vessels over 10,000 tons of 20 knots were to receive  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents up to 1,500 miles, and 1 cent thereafter per gross ton for every 100 miles sailed. The general subsidy, 2 cents in addition, would make  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents per gross ton up to 1,500 miles, and 3 cents per gross ton thereafter. Vessels of 21 knots were to get the same general subsidy, and  $2\frac{2}{5}$  cents per gross ton per 100 miles up to 1,500 miles each way, making  $3\frac{2}{5}$  cents per ton for 3,000 miles and  $3\frac{3}{5}$  cents per ton for distances over 3,000 miles. The figures of the present bill, as I read them a while ago, indicate very plainly that the amount of money which will be realized by vessels on their trips under this measure is considerably smaller than it would have been under the other measure.

The Senator from Ohio has given us to understand that nothing is to be expected from this measure in the way of an addition of 21 or 22 knot vessels to our fleet. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], in his speech the other day, gave us to understand, unless I have misinterpreted his language, that this bill adds nothing whatever to the inducement for the construction of vessels of less

than 6,000 tons. Not to misstate the language of the Senator, I will read what he said:

Below 16 knots there could not be any increase over the present law. Indeed, the price would be lower than the present law. The lower-powered vessels received more than it was necessary to pay. Higher-powered vessels did not receive so much as was necessary. Quite a number of contracts made with the low-powered classes have been made for considerable less than the maximum amount named in the existing law.

Therefore I take it that vessels under 16 knots will receive no additional benefit from this bill over what they have been receiving under the act of 1891. Further on, in explanation of his view upon this subject, the Senator from Maine said:

Broadly speaking, all the mail steamers, 14 knots or over, of 7,000 tons or over, may be paid at higher rates than under the present law, except 20-knot steamers under 10,000 tons. Steamers of 4,000, 5,000, and 6,000 tons are to be paid at rates not differing greatly from those payable under the present law.

Therefore, Mr. President, so far as this bill is concerned, vessels of 6,000 tons and less and vessels of 16 knots speed and less are not to be advantaged to any great extent over the position which they hold under the act of 1891, of which this title is in amendment, and then the only advantage which is proposed to be conferred upon the merchant marine of this country is upon vessels between 7,000 and 10,000 tons, or, say, 7,000 tons and over, and vessels of over 16 knots.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MALLORY. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator will please read that inclusive of the 16-knot ships—16 knots and upward. I said below 16.

Mr. MALLORY. Below 16?

Mr. FRYE. Below 16.

Mr. MALLORY. He included the 16-knot ship in the upper class. I do not remember exactly how I spoke of it, but the language of the Senator is below 16 knots.

Mr. FRYE. Below 16 knots.

Mr. MALLORY. Including 16-knot vessels, which would be benefited; but in the other statement of 4,000, 5,000, and 6,000 ton vessels, he includes the 6,000-ton vessels among the vessels which would not be benefited by this alleged improvement.

To pass on from this explanation of the first title, we go on to the second title, which passes from the matter of ocean mail steamships and takes up what is designated as general subsidy. Under this provision all vessels, with the exceptions hereafter to be named, owned and duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States shall have the benefit of the subsidy provided for in this bill. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to the owners of those vessels the subsidy which is provided for in the second and third clauses of that title. Clause (a) provides:

(a) On each entry, not exceeding 16 entries in any one fiscal year, of a sail or steam vessel, 1 cent per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed.

And the third clause, known as clause (b), provides:

(b) On each entry, not exceeding 16 entries in any one fiscal year, and for a period of five years from the date of registration of a vessel of over 1,000 gross registered tons, which shall be completed and registered after the passage of this act, one-fourth of 1 cent per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed, in addition to the compensation provided in paragraph (a).

In other words, a vessel up to the time she is five years old shall receive  $1\frac{1}{4}$  cents per gross ton for every hundred knots sailed, provided she does not make more than 16 entries in a year.

Mr. President, that is a very long and bold step; but it is sought to qualify this donation by excepting certain descriptions of vessels from its application. Excepted from its application are the following:

(a) A vessel on a voyage extending only to a foreign port less than 150 nautical miles from her last port of departure in the United States or from a foreign port less than 150 nautical miles from her first port of arrival in the United States.

(b) A vessel on a voyage less than one-half of the whole length of which, on her outward and homeward voyages, respectively, shall have been on the sea between a port of the United States and a foreign port.

(c) A vessel which shall not be at least of the Class A1, as classified either by 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.

(d) A vessel of which less than one-fourth of the crew shall be citizens of the United States or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2174 of the Revised Statutes.

Which, as I understand it, are individuals who have declared their intention to become citizens.

(e) A vessel without motive power of its own, or a tugboat, or a vessel engaged in wrecking.

(f) A foreign-built vessel, hereafter admitted to American registry pursuant to the provisions of section 4138 of the Revised Statutes.

Which means that a vessel that has been wrecked in American waters, and which has been admitted to carry the American flag and to registry, shall not, however, get the advantage of that provision. And lastly:

(g) A vessel while employed in the coasting trade,

All other vessels engaged in our foreign commerce, except

those just specified, are to receive the benefit of this 1½ cents up to and including the fifth year and 1 cent thereafter, whether they carry any cargo or not and irrespective of what business they may be engaged in.

There are qualifications attached to this donation, and I invite the attention of the Senate to those qualifications, because it is upon them I think there is based the claim that the donation may be justified.

Section 10 provides:

That any vessel, before receiving compensation—

Mark the word "compensation," and that word is used throughout this title—

That any vessel, before receiving compensation under this title, shall, when required so to do by the Secretary of the Treasury, carry on each foreign voyage, as a member of the ship's company, one American boy, under 21 years of age and suitable for such employment, and one such boy in addition for each 1,000 gross registered tons, who shall be taught in the duties of seamanship or engineering, or other maritime knowledge, as the case may be, respectively, and receive such pay as shall be reasonable.

The vessel has to carry them if the Secretary of the Treasury says so. If the Secretary of the Treasury does not say so, it is not essential. It is not a prerequisite that it shall be complied with, but if the Secretary says so a vessel shall carry one American boy under 21 years of age, and one such boy in addition for each 1,000 gross registered tons. In other words, a registered vessel of 10,000 tons could be required to carry 11 young men or boys, ostensibly for the purpose of preparing them to take part, after they reached manhood, in the carrying trade of the United States upon the ocean.

Section 11 provides—

That the owner of any vessel, before receiving compensation pursuant to this title, shall agree in writing—

And it is well to notice the solemnity that marks this proceeding. He shall agree—

in writing that said vessel may be taken or employed and used by the United States for the national defense or for any public purpose at any time; and in every such case the owner of any such vessel so taken or employed shall be paid the fair value thereof, if taken, at the time of the taking; and if employed, shall be paid the fair value of such use. And if there shall be a disagreement as to such fair value the question of the valuation shall be submitted to and determined by three impartial appraisers.

These constitute the provisions of title 2. Title 1, as I have undertaken to show, professes to be a postal subsidy measure, simply an amendment to the act of 1891, which has been in force ever since the date of its passage and under which now fast mail is transported across the Atlantic and the Pacific. But title 2 comes in under an entirely different heading and under different auspices.

Title 1 professes at least to be for the benefit of the postal service, and as we have a right to establish post-offices and post-roads there is probably no reason why we could not go on and establish post-offices and post-roads all over the world. Certainly there is no question about our right to do so in our possessions, and I am not disposed to take any issue with the advocates of this measure on that point.

Title 1 also proposes to justify itself by a provision which is therein made for auxiliary cruisers for the United States, however inadequate and however incapable of being carried out such a provision may be. But there is a pretext, at least, Mr. President, of a public purpose. It is for the purpose of public defense, and is a justification undoubtedly in the minds of gentlemen who advocate this extraordinary measure for the provisions set forth in title 1.

But under title 2 the only pretense that even squints at a public purpose is that the vessel shall carry a certain number of young men, subject to the control of the Secretary of the Treasury, who may or may not require it, as suits his pleasure, and that the owners of the ships receiving this bounty shall pledge themselves in writing that when the Government needs the services of such vessels it can require their services, and will pay whatever is a fair and reasonable compensation therefor. In the event of war I take it there would be no difficulty on the part of the United States, if we had a merchant marine, in getting, so far as concerns the purposes for which such vessels are included in this provision, all the vessels that might be desired.

But it is to this title particularly that I should like the attention of the Senate to be directed. Heretofore I do not think we have ever passed a measure of this character. Congress has enacted many laws whereby individuals received great benefit under the profession or pretense that it was a public purpose, but I do not think Congress has ever in the history of the country gone to the extent of passing a measure so absolutely bold and bald in its character as a donation from the public Treasury for private purposes.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MALLORY. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. Congress has not, but the Senate, in 1891, passed a bill precisely like title 2, only the subsidy allowed in it was 3 cents a mile for the outward voyage, which would be a cent and a half for the round voyage, which is half a cent more than this bill provides for.

Mr. MALLORY. Yes, sir; I understand that. I understood that the Senate had done so, but I was speaking of the enactment into law by the legislative power of this Government; and I think I am correct in saying that never before in the history of this country has any such measure been put into the shape of legislation. In its protean forms the idea has come before Congress time and time again. We had it here last year in a different shape, but it was the same old purpose of bestowing benefits from the public Treasury upon individuals. But it never yet has succeeded in getting the support of a majority of both Houses of Congress, although I am free to admit that I think it very possible this year the thing will be accomplished.

Upon this point I desire to call attention to the utterances of one or two gentlemen, whose opinions in the past have held some position of respect in this country, upon questions akin to this that I am now presenting to the Senate. It is like repeating a twice-told tale, Mr. President, to read these authorities. They have been read here before and we are all familiar with them; but I take it that the principles which they enunciate are so sound, that they appeal so strongly to the best judgment of the intelligent men and patriotic people of this country, that even at the risk of wearying my hearers and overloading the RECORD I am justified in calling the attention of the Senate and the country to them.

Judge Cooley, who as an authority on constitutional law stands among the highest in this country, speaking on the subject of special privileges conferred upon individuals in the shape of donations from the Treasury, says:

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, in the belief that by doing so his own industry will be more certainly enlisted and his prosperity and happiness more likely to be secured. 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. Any incidental benefits to the public that might flow from it could not support it as legitimate taxation.

One would be justified in thinking Judge Cooley, in giving utterance to this expression, had this particular provision of the pending measure in view.

Another eminent jurist of this country, whose weight as an authority in matters of this kind is unquestioned, in a very prominent case before the Supreme Court, namely, the case of the Loan Association against Topeka, to be found in 20 Wallace, page 655, gave utterance to the expression which I will read. Justice Miller 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 enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law, and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

Justice Sharswood, of Pennsylvania, a name eminent in the judicial history of this country, speaking in a case that was before him, namely, Durach's Appeal, 62 Pennsylvania Reports, used this language:

No doubt all taxation should be general, and, as far as practicable, equal. Legislation either to benefit or burden particular classes under the idea that it is for the good of the State at large infringes upon the natural and guaranteed right of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, subject to fair and equal contributions to the just and necessary expenses of government in the exercise of its proper and legitimate functions. A government which assumes the office of controlling and directing the lawful industry of the citizens into the channels which it may choose to deem best assumes what does not legitimately belong to it. Some States in modern times, in undertaking to find work for the people, have discovered that it was a sure way to make work for themselves.

I take it that no one will dispute the wisdom or the patriotism embodied in these expressions from the eminent jurists from whom I have just quoted. I do not think anyone will question the application of their ideas to this particular piece of legislation. To say that money taken from the pocket of the citizen by the strong hand of taxation and deposited in the Treasury for a public purpose, and only for a public purpose, can be taken therefrom and delivered gratuitously to individuals for their private gain is to utter a statement which certainly can not be justified as correct under any system of government. Certainly it could not be sustained as right and proper under our system of constitutional government.

Now, Mr. President, let us see how the practical working of

title 2 will affect vessels engaged in navigation. I find that we have probably several hundred vessels which would be affected by this provision of 1 cent and 1½ cents, the quarter of a cent depending upon the age of the vessel. Among them are all classes of vessels—vessels engaged in commerce for the benefit of the general trade of the country and vessels engaged in commerce for the benefit of certain particular lines of transportation of the country.

I find that there are building to-day among the numerous vessels under construction in this country ships that are intended for certain specific lines of transportation. At New London there are two vessels now under construction, probably the largest vessels in the world—vessels of 21,000 tons, of 14 knots. Their slow speed will probably not permit them to have the advantage of the postal subsidy, if they desire it. They are being built for the Great Northern Railroad Company, to run in connection with the western terminus of the Great Northern Railroad and connect with the Asiatic countries. Those vessels would come in for benefit under this subsidy if they chose to avail themselves of it, and it is not unreasonable to suppose they would. I have figured out what those two vessels will realize from this title.

Under the table furnished by the Commissioner of Navigation, on page 25 of his report of this year, we have the speed of various vessels put down, and in an opposite column the number of miles per annum which vessels of that rate of speed will probably make.

I find that each one of these vessels of 14 knots will make 58,000 miles per annum. These two ships, of 21,000 tons, traveling 58,000 miles per annum, with a bonus or a subsidy of one and a quarter cents per ton per hundred miles, will realize \$152,250 per annum for attending to the business of one great railroad system; not for the general public, but simply in the interest of a particular railroad. This is on condition that they will carry a certain number of apprentice boys, if required, and will charter to the United States in time of war, if the United States needs them, for which they are to receive fair and reasonable compensation.

I find further on that the Arthur Sewell Company, of Bath, Me., is building some large sailing vessels. They are the *Acme*, already launched, the *William P. Frye*, which has already been launched, and the *Atlas*, which was to have been launched in December, 1901, and I suppose has been launched. These are very large sailing vessels, 3,300 tons. The *Acme* and the *Atlas* belong to the Standard Oil Company. The Standard Oil Company, I suppose, in constructing those vessels has done so for the purpose of transporting its own products. Its business requirements make it necessary that it should own its own peculiar vessels—peculiar, because many of them carry oil in bulk, and in order to economically carry on that business the interior of those ships is constructed in a way to adapt them to this purpose.

But here is an illustration to which I should like the attention of the Senate to be especially directed. One of the most powerful and richest corporations in the world, which certainly needs no governmental aid or assistance, builds two ships in this country for the purpose of transporting its own products, and because it puts those vessels on the ocean and transports its own product it is to receive a subsidy, on the basis of the payment provided for in the second title of this bill, of \$11,312.50, on the theory that those vessels will travel 25,000 miles per annum, which is a reasonable assumption.

Now, the sum is small. It is a bagatelle as compared with donations which go to other vessels, particularly steam vessels. But, Mr. President, it is money which has been wrung from the taxpaying public of this country. I do not know that I should use the word "wrung." However, it has been exacted from the taxpaying people of this country only for governmental purposes. I take it all patriotic men are perfectly willing to donate their due proportion to the expense which the Government has to bear, but the patriotic people of this country are unwilling to pay a single, solitary cent to the Government for the purpose of having it transferred to the coffers of any individual or corporation.

I do not know that there could be a better illustration of the wrong and the injustice which are sought to be perpetrated by this particular title of the bill than is furnished by the instance I have just given. No one for an instant will question the right of the Government to exact the last dollar from the citizen if necessary, to meet the emergencies of the Government, for the just dues of the Government, to meet the necessities of the public defense or the general welfare; but when it comes to exacting one cent from one individual for the purpose of conferring it upon another, with no public purpose in view, as Judge Miller has said, it is robbery and is not legislation.

Why is this? What is the pretext that is alleged by the advocates of this measure both for the postal subsidy and for this very astounding provision? It is that the merchant marine of the United States has fallen into the sere, the yellow leaf; that the effects of the war between the States upon it have never been overcome; that Great Britain and the other nations of the world

have resorted to subsidies and aids for the purpose of building up their mercantile marine, and that there is nothing else for us to do if we wish to hold up our heads in the face of the world and to carry our flag proudly to the ports of the great nations of the earth.

The eloquent Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] delivered a most stirring oration the other day upon this subject, in which he thought that it ought to appeal to the patriotism and the sense of right of every citizen to do away with the existing condition of things and to build up the merchant marine, so that the American flag could be flaunted in the face of all the nations of the world at all times.

Mr. President, I come from a seacoast State, a State that has more seacoast than any other in the United States. It has more ports and bays and harbors than any other State in the United States, and I am deeply interested in the rehabilitation of the mercantile marine of the United States. My home is an important port, and I experience humiliation almost every time I visit the water front of my city. The fact is, that with the exception of schooners and coasting vessels, the American flag is never seen upon a mast in that harbor, and I will go as far as any Senator, I will do anything that I believe we conscientiously and consistently can do to once more put the American mercantile marine upon a footing of equality with that of other nations. But, sir, notwithstanding my full appreciation of the importance and the necessity of taking some step to advance progress in that direction, I can not indorse a measure that is so absolutely at variance with every principle of right and justice as is this particular provision of the bill.

It is not a fact, Mr. President, as has been asserted here, that our merchant marine is in a condition of stagnation. It is a fact which we gather from the official reports that it is, so far as last year and this year are concerned, in a most promising condition. It is small it is true, but the increase in shipbuilding and ship owning in this country within the last twenty-four months has been absolutely phenomenal. I am inclined to think that the advantages we possess in having all the materials necessary for shipbuilding in abundance and cheaply at hand will in the natural course of events give us an immense advantage over the other nations of the world in shipbuilding; but if it is necessary, and it may be so, to resort to some legislative measure to advance the interests of shipping, I am perfectly willing to do anything that we can consistently do in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution to that end. Upon this question of the upbuilding of the United States merchant marine I read from page 18 of the Report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1901. He says:

Construction during the current fiscal year promises nearly, if not quite, to equal the greatest in our history. In 1855 we built 583,000 tons. The strike in the shipbuilding trade about the end of the past fiscal year delayed work on some vessels nearing completion which under ordinary conditions would have been included in last year's figures. Four large steamers for the Pacific, aggregating over 60,000 tons, will have been under contract for two years and should be completed before next July. Two of these, *Korea* and *Siberia*, the finest vessels yet designed by any nation for trade with Asia, have been launched. In the winter and early spring, when the passage of shipping legislation seemed probable, contracts were made for eight large steamers, and part of this tonnage will be completed before the close of the current fiscal year.

The Senate will note the expression used by the Commissioner in the last sentence, "when the passage of shipping legislation seemed probable." The Commissioner evidently in preparing this report had in mind the fact that such a measure as this would be before the Senate and the other body of Congress this winter, and there will be found throughout this report such expressions as that, implying that proposed legislation of this character has given this remarkable impetus to shipbuilding and shipowning in this country, and is the cause and only cause thereof.

He further on gives a table in which it appears briefly that in 1901 there were constructed 25 ocean-going steamships, of a gross tonnage of 95,243 tons, while in the year 1902 it is estimated that there will be constructed 33 ocean-going trans-Atlantic, trans-Pacific, and foreign-going steamships, of a total tonnage of 255,325 tons, the greatest amount of tonnage built in this country since the year 1855. Commenting on that the Commissioner says:

The table appears to promise that 33 steel screw ocean steamers of 255,325 gross tons will be built in the United States this year, compared with 25 of 95,243 gross tons for the past year. This promise will not be made wholly good, but, barring strikes or other unforeseen causes, it is reasonably certain that nearly 200,000 gross tons will be added to our ocean steel steam fleet before July 1, 1902—a tonnage equal to 70 per cent of the recent Leyland purchase by Americans.

The possible addition of 10 steamers of 110,800 tons to our trans-Atlantic fleet within twelve months presumably rests on anticipated legislation by Congress.

There we are again. The Commissioner of Navigation can not forbear giving us his belief. He says it "presumably rests on anticipated legislation." He recognizes the fact that there has been within the past three years a wonderful increase and impetus in the shipbuilding of this country, and he does not assert but

suggests that presumably it was the anticipated legislation by Congress which gave occasion to this wonderful increase in shipbuilding.

I think, Mr. President, that that is rather a wild and a violent presumption. When vessels cost from one to two million dollars, it is not likely that the individuals who are to pay for them will be willing to invest that amount of money dependent upon the possible passage of a particular measure, and that a very extraordinarily exceptional measure, through Congress.

There are some other reasons, Mr. President, why the shipbuilding interest in this country has begun to look up, and I certainly believe that with ordinary care and attention on the part of Congress to that interest there will be no difficulty whatever as to its continuing to improve.

It is necessary, say the advocates of this measure, that this wonderful subsidy should be given because foreign countries are obliged to give it to their merchant marine. It has been said upon this floor from time to time that Great Britain, which owns something more than one-half of the merchant steamships of the world, gives an immense subsidy to her ships. It is a fact that Great Britain pays a higher rate of wages to her masters and crews engaged in her merchant fleets than any other nation in the world, unless we except the United States, and I believe that she pays fully as high a rate of wages as the shipowners of the United States, notwithstanding the figures that have been presented here to the contrary.

But though she does pay a great deal more to her seamen, her firemen, her mates, her masters, her engineers, her assistant engineers, than do France, Germany, Italy, Norway, or Sweden, it is a fact that Great Britain to-day controls more than one-half of the merchant tonnage of the world. She has controlled it for years. She controls it to-day, and notwithstanding the frantic efforts on the part of France to build herself up by means of general subsidy, or of Italy by the same means and in other shapes, Great Britain to-day stands the leading shipowning nation in the world.

We are told that this is due to the fact that Great Britain subsidizes very extensively. That, Mr. President, is not sustained by the facts. Great Britain does not pay a larger subsidy for her postal service than is proposed in this bill. She does not pay a larger subsidy combined for all her service than is proposed, or at least is sought to be proposed, by the gentlemen who advocate this measure.

Great Britain never has given one single dollar of general subsidy to any of her fleets. Of the immense number of ships which fly her flag in all the ports of the world only 5 per cent receive any aid whatever from the Government of Great Britain. She does pay postal subsidies, but she bases her payments upon weight of mails and not, as is proposed in this bill, upon the tonnage of the vessel. She has what is called an admiralty subvention, whereby vessels, as is proposed under title one of this bill, which can be utilized as auxiliary cruisers in the event of war, are provided for, but she makes no provision whatever for any subsidy or any aid to her ocean commerce that is not given for a good and valid consideration.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. President, Great Britain to-day leads all the nations in her commercial power and her ability to take charge of the ocean transportation of the world. Yet we are told again and again that it is essential that we should go into the business of donating to private individuals large sums of money for the purpose of carrying on their business because Great Britain has been doing so in the past. That, Mr. President, is not so. Other nations have done it, it is true, and in every instance where they have resorted to that means for the purpose of bolstering up their decaying fleets their decaying fleets have continued to retrograde.

But, say the advocates of this measure, it is necessary that the American ship should be sustained because of the increased expense that the American owner has to go to in building his ship, and we have been furnished here with some evidence, or something that purports to be evidence, in the shape of letters whereby it is professed to be shown that as much as a difference of 25 per cent exists between the cost of building certain classes of American ships and the same classes of British ships. That has been harped on, Mr. President, and was advanced here last year in the face of the fact that twelve years ago we had the testimony of expert shipbuilders in this country to the effect that even such vessels as the *New York* and the *Paris* could be built in this country at an expense over what it costs in England not exceeding 8 per cent.

Whether that is true or not, it is a fact that all the shipyards of this country are busy. They are all engaged in doing most of the work that is within their capacity, and the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, if I read it aright, bears me out in the statement that most of the shipyards of this country to-day are engaged on the maximum amount of work that they have the capacity for doing.

I have here an editorial from the *Scientific American* of January 25, this year, in which some reference is made to the work that is being done on the Pacific coast. I will read a short extract from it:

The increasing trade of the Territory of Alaska, sure to be increasingly permanent, employs at least 400 vessels, sail and steam, where less than 40 were required four years ago. In the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands commerce is increasing by leaps and bounds, and will before long require hundreds of vessels to accommodate it, while trade with all the ports of all the countries bordering on the Pacific is growing rapidly. All the indications point to an immense augmentation of the national marine. Every shipyard on the coast, from Puget Sound south to San Diego, for three years past has been working at full capacity to execute orders for new ships, and many shipyards of the Atlantic coast have been kept busy in the attempt to supply the Western demand. Though Pacific shipyards have turned out hundreds of vessels, there is apparently no let-up in the demand.

Mr. President, that is a reputable journal, a paper which is esteemed as an authority in matters of that kind generally, and I take it that that statement is correct. I take it that it is not necessary, in view of the very glowing report as to the increase in shipbuilding in this country made by the Commissioner of Navigation, to go beyond or behind this statement. There we have the fact asserted that every shipyard on the Pacific coast from Puget Sound down to San Diego is so busily engaged in the building of ships that it has really not the facilities for building any more and the overplus has been carried over to the Atlantic shipyards. Yet the advocates of this measure would have the country believe that the shipbuilding interest is in such a poverty-stricken condition and so languishing and moribund that it is necessary in order to stimulate it into life to provide a gratuity to the ships of the United States in order that shipbuilding may be stimulated.

In addition to the point that the original and first cost of a ship in this country is 25 per cent greater than it is in Great Britain or any other nation of Europe, it is urged that the operating expenses are greater on American ships than they are on foreign ships; and that has been urged here with as much vehemence and energy and persistency as any other error upon which this measure has been based. It is said that the American sailor receives about 25 per cent higher wages than the sailor of any other nation, and figures have been brought in here to demonstrate that fact.

The Commissioner of Navigation has furnished us detailed statements of the operating or running expenses of American steamships, German steamships, British steamships, and, I believe, also of French steamships in the Atlantic trade between New York and England and the continent of Europe, and he has shown by those figures that the expenses incident to the mates, to the engineers, to the coal passers, and the firemen on the part of American ships, as compared with vessels of corresponding size of other nationalities, and particularly of England, are greater by one-fourth. That, Mr. President, I think, is not sustained either by the experience of those who have traveled, or by the experience of those who have observed the practice with regard to men following the sea in the ports of this country.

It was said the other day by the Senator from Maine that it was absurd to talk about having a portion of the crew composed of American sailors, or American citizens paid at a certain rate, while the other portion, not Americans, were paid at a less rate. Before the session had closed that evening we were furnished with a statement by the master of a vessel engaged in the trade between California and Asiatic ports to the effect that about two-thirds of the employees, the men on the line with which he was connected, were Asiatics, and that they were drawing pay considerably less than that paid to Americans sailing on the same vessels from the same port.

The Commissioner of Navigation has furnished us with page after page of statistical figures showing the rates of wages which prevail in the United States and in Europe, and he would have us draw the inference that because wages in certain ports of the United States are quoted in certain years at an advance over what they were in European ports for the same period necessarily the sailor or the employee on a ship who is an American receives greater wages than the employee on the ship of one of the foreign nations. But anyone who has lived for any length of time in a seaport, or who has had an opportunity of studying this question, knows at once that this is fallacious—knows at once that the wages on the ordinary ship, whether it be a British tramp or a Norwegian sailing ship or an American schooner—the wages of the men employed on those ships are dependent upon the rate of wages which is given at the ports at the time they are employed.

They may be employed for particular voyages, they may be employed by the month for a certain length of time, and the wages change in accordance with that. The wages will also differ according to the port of destination of the vessel. There are certain ports of the world to which sailor men are opposed to going if they can avoid it. The port of Rio de Janeiro or any of the South American ports north of Rio, during the yellow-fever season are ports which are avoided by seamen if they can possibly do so, and when solicited to ship aboard a vessel bound for Rio, anticipating that she will strike Rio about the beginning of the

yellow-fever season, they will demand a higher rate of wages than they would to go to a port on the North Atlantic. Those differences will be observed in every port, and they will be found by reference to the statistics furnished by the Commissioner of Navigation to differ in the same ports from time to time.

The rate of wages does not depend upon the nationality of the ship; and if it did there would be every reason in the world why the wages on an American ship would be less than they would be on ships of any other nationality, because the provisions and conditions for health, the hygiene of the sailor, provided for by law on American ships, are better than they are on the ships of any other nations of the world. If a man is seeking a comfortable berth, one where he will at least have such comforts as a man pursuing that rugged life can have, he will find that he will have more of them while serving on a ship under the American flag than while serving on a ship under any other flag.

I think, Mr. President, that so far as these two headings or chapters of this bill are concerned, I have adverted to most of the points that I had contemplated criticising.

The last chapter, heading, or title of the measure relates to the deep-sea fisheries, and proposes to give a bounty to vessels engaged for three months during the year in that occupation, and also a bounty to the men themselves engaged in that occupation. The conditions are:

(a) To the owner or owners of a documented vessel of the United States engaged in the deep-sea fisheries for at least three months in any one fiscal year, \$2 per gross ton per annum: *Provided*, That at least one-third of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2174 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) To a citizen of the United States serving as a member of a necessary and proper crew of a vessel of the United States documented and engaged in deep-sea fisheries for at least three months during any one fiscal year, \$1 per month during the time necessarily employed in the voyages of such vessel.

The vessel must have at least one-third of her crew American citizens, or men who have declared their intention to become American citizens, in order to receive this bonus. That, Mr. President, is an old subsidy that is sought to be revived by this measure. Its object is apparent on its face. Originally, when the sailing ship constituted the battle ship of the Navy, it was essential for the Navy that there should be a reserve of skilled, active, and capable seamen to man the men-of-war of the nation; and for the purpose of providing a training school for them it was thought advisable to give a fishing bounty to the men on the New England coast engaged in the deep-sea fisheries along that coast. As time passed and the character of the naval vessels of the world changed this necessity seemed to pass away and the law was repealed.

I can see, Mr. President, how the deep-sea fisheries may possibly be a useful school for the training of seamen, not only for the Navy, but also for the sailing fleet of the country. The sailing fleet of the country is very large proportionately with our steam tonnage; and I differ with those gentlemen who have expressed the opinion here that in only a very few years the sailing vessels of the world will pass away. Conditions are changing and the sailing vessel is becoming more and more the means for the transportation for long distances of the heavy products of the mine, of the field, and of the manufactory.

Articles of trade and commerce which are so bulky and weighty as to render it impracticable to transport them by rail from the Pacific to the Atlantic across our continent are now transported by sailing vessels to a large extent around Cape Horn, and it is found profitable by the owners of such vessels to engage in that trade. The construction of the Nicaragua Canal will shorten that voyage very materially; and the new device of building 4, 5, and 6 masted schooners of very great tonnage, which is being resorted to now by the shipbuilders of this country, will, I think, make that style of ship part of the commercial marine of the United States for a great many years, and it will be desirable that they should have a sufficiency of men to man them.

Therefore, Mr. President, while I do not think that the original reason for this fishing bounty exists to-day as potently as it did in years gone by, I do not antagonize it with the same feeling with which I antagonize the first and, particularly, the second title of this measure.

There are means by which the object sought to be gained by this bill can be attained. They can be attained without doing violence to the Constitution or straining in any way the sense of right or justice of any man of proper feeling in the land. We have but simply to follow the path marked out in the past by those who were first confronted with the necessity of building up the American merchant marine.

I do not admit, Mr. President, that there has been any evidence here of the necessity for Congress to take any action in that direction, but conceding for the sake of argument, that there is such necessity, a method is within our grasp that is constitutional, and one which in the past has been resorted to beneficially and appropriately. If the necessity is so great, if it is a fact that, leaving our merchant marine to itself, to build itself up by its

own inherent strength and the advantages which our position give us—if that is not sufficient, and it is absolutely essential that we should resort to legislation to build it up, a method has been prescribed. It is true the Senator from Maine said the other day that in order to resort to that method we would have to abrogate a certain number of treaties, I think he said some 31.

Mr. PERKINS. Twenty-one.

Mr. MALLORY. No; he said 31, I think.

Mr. TELLER. Afterwards he said 34.

Mr. MALLORY. Well, 34. I have it here, but I will not stop to look for it. But those treaties, Mr. President, are not absolutely beyond our power of abrogation. If I am not mistaken, every one of those treaties contains a provision whereby, after due notice—a year or two years, as the case may be—they can be abrogated.

There is no question, Mr. President, that we have the absolute right to impose a discriminating tariff for the purpose of building up the merchant marine. It is a right which is given to us by the Constitution, and if we choose to avail ourselves of it no one has any right to object to the exercise of that constitutional power. Even if our treaties did not contain the clause providing for their abrogation I would not hesitate—if the necessity were such as to require it—if I believed, as the Senator from Maine believes, that something in the way of legislation is immediately and absolutely necessary to build up our commercial marine, I would not hesitate I say, to favor their abrogation, without notice, and run the risk of retaliation on the part of the nations with whom those treaties were formed.

Certainly this idea is not a new one with me, and I think that there is high Republican authority for it. Only so late as 1896 the late President McKinley, in a letter accepting the nomination for the Presidency of the United States, referring to this subject, said:

The declaration of the Republican platform in favor of the upbuilding of our merchant marine has my hearty approval. The policy of discriminating duties in favor of our shipping, which prevailed in the early years of our history, should be again promptly adopted by Congress and vigorously supported until our prestige and supremacy on the seas are fully attained.

That, Mr. President, was the expression of view of a gentleman whose opinion in such matters certainly is entitled to great weight on the other side of the Chamber; and while I do not now contend that it is desirable that we should resort to discriminating duties for the purpose of building up the merchant marine, I do say that a resort to that constitutional method, which would not only do no violence to the Constitution, but would do no violence to the sentiment of right and justice of any fair-minded man, is far preferable to the method which is proposed by this bill, a method which certainly can not meet with the approval of a majority of the thoughtful, disinterested people of this country.

We can, Mr. President, if it is necessary, resort to other methods of building up the merchant marine, and I am perfectly willing to give the matter as careful consideration as it is in my power to give it, to consider whether or not it is advisable for us to pass any legislation at this time on this subject. Certainly, by the showing that is made by our Commissioner of Navigation, by the interest which is being demonstrated in the development of shipping, there appears to be no urgent necessity for any hasty action on the part of Congress in this matter.

The first part of this measure, relating to the postal subsidy, is brought in by the Senator from Maine; but the Senator from Maine has not furnished the Senate with anything from the Post-Office Department to indicate that there is in its judgment any urgent necessity for the establishment of the mail routes that have been outlined by the Senator from Maine as desirable. I am free to say, Mr. President, that I think that some of the routes which he proposes to establish, or at least which he thinks will be established, under this measure are desirable and will inure to the benefit of the country. If the measures came before Congress separately and on their own merits and Congress had an opportunity to consider their claims in each individual case, I do not think that such routes as are proposed between San Francisco and the Asiatic ports, touching at Honolulu, and from Puget Sound to Hongkong, via the Japanese ports, and communicating with Manila, would meet with any very serious objection.

But, Mr. President, this measure, acting upon the line indicated by the act of 1891, vests in the Postmaster-General absolute power to establish mail routes anywhere that in his judgment it is proper to do so, without reference to whether they may be absolutely desirable or not. I do not question the ability or the rectitude of motive of the Postmaster-General, and I doubt not that he would be able, probably, to determine those routes which are best to be established for the interests of the country more satisfactorily than I could, or possibly better than a good many others could, but I do not think it is good policy or good principle to delegate to that Cabinet officer a power which ought to be confined in Congress and in Congress alone.

As we have acquired new territory in the Pacific—the Hawaiian Islands, the Samoan Islands, and the Philippines—it is necessary,

undoubtedly, that we should establish mail communication, and regular mail communication, with those possessions, and for that reason I agree with the Senator from Maine in thinking it eminently desirable that some such mail routes should be established.

But, in addition to that, we are told there is to be immediately, or there ought to be established right away, another trans-Atlantic mail between New York and Southampton—a semiweekly mail. I am utterly ignorant as to the necessity for it. The Senate has received no information upon the subject. We have the aspiration expressed by the Senator from Maine that it will be done, and I have no doubt after this bill passes it will be done, and I have sufficient confidence in the judgment of the Senator from Maine to believe that if it is done on his advice or suggestion it will be because it is desirable; but, at the same time, that is not the way in which we should legislate. I am expected to vote upon this measure intelligently, and to vote intelligently upon it I should know something about the necessity which has suggested it. The Senate is without any information whatever.

But that, Mr. President, is only a side issue. My main objection to this measure is that it is an illustration of a principle which I regard as extremely vicious, but which is manifesting itself in the legislation of this country from year to year more and more, a principle which turns its back upon the constitutional limitations, which undertakes to treat the Constitution as the Declaration of Independence has been treated, as simply a text for a holiday oration, something that is not really practical or which applies to this great country under the conditions of an expanding trade and an expanding public policy.

We can not afford to give way to that tendency. There are some of us, at least, who believe that the Constitution is big enough and broad enough to meet all the exigencies of any conditions that may arise in the experience of this country; that within that Constitution will be found a reason for everything that may be found necessary to be legitimately done, and when invasions of it are attempted it is the duty of everyone who appreciates the fact that invasion is attempted to resist it. That is my purpose in devoting as much time as I have to the consideration of this measure.

I know the Senator from Maine is exceedingly anxious that this bill shall become a law, because, patriot as he is, he believes it will redound vastly to the welfare of the country in building up our commercial marine. I only wish, Mr. President, that I could agree with the Senator from Maine that that result would be accomplished by this measure; but even if I believed that the measure would accomplish the result for which he has strained for so many years, I could not, in view of what I believe to be my constitutional duty, what I believe to be an obligation which I owe to myself and to the constituency I have the honor to represent, favor a measure so replete with error and disregard of constitutional obligation.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice at this time that after the routine morning business to-morrow I will address the Senate very briefly on the pending measure.

Mr. DEPEW. I wish to give notice that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to-morrow I shall ask the consideration of the Senate for a brief period, in order that I may submit some remarks upon the pending bill.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask a question of the Senator who has this bill in charge, with his permission. I have no doubt he can furnish it. I desire to know what amount of tonnage owned by American citizens is now engaged in the foreign trade.

Mr. FRYE. I think it is about 600,000 tons.

Mr. TELLER. About 600,000?

Mr. FRYE. That is my impression.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to ask another question. I wish the Senator would tell us, if he can, what amount of tonnage is now being constructed in our American shipyards with reference to the foreign trade.

Mr. FRYE. There are two being constructed by the International Line—the American Line; there are six being constructed by the American Transport Company, of Baltimore; there are two just about ready to be launched for the Pacific Mail. I know of no others. Nearly all the others are for the coast or the lake trade.

Mr. TELLER. Has the Senator included the ships being built by Mr. Hill?

Mr. FRYE. Mr. Hill is building two at New London.

Mr. TELLER. What is the total tonnage?

Mr. FRYE. My impression is about 600,000 now afloat, engaged in the foreign trade.

Mr. TELLER. What is the total tonnage of those being built?

Mr. FRYE. Mr. Hill's vessels are said to be 40,000 tons—the two—and the six vessels of the American Transport Company, I think, average about 8,000 tons each. The American Line vessels,

my impression is, are 16-knot ships, of 10,000 tons. The Pacific Mail vessels, my impression is, are 10,000 tons each—two. I can not be exact about it, but that is my impression.

Mr. TELLER. I did not expect the Senator to be exact as to it. I wish to ask one other question—whether it would not be well to consider in this connection the wisdom of doing, with reference to American-owned tonnage now under some other flag, what we did ten years ago at the suggestion of the Senator with respect to the *Paris* and the *New York*; that is, to make some arrangement by which they could come into American registry on condition that their owners complete the same number of tons in American yards, as we did in that case?

Mr. FRYE. We had that provision in the bill under consideration during the last session of the last Congress.

Mr. TELLER. It does not seem to be in this.

Mr. FRYE. And it provoked very great opposition. It was left out by me in drafting this bill on account of the opposition which it provoked. There would be very serious trouble about admitting those ships, because Americans, known in the newspapers as the Morgan syndicate, have recently acquired, I think, about 800,000 tons of foreign-built ships.

Mr. BERRY. In addition to the 600,000 tons already owned? Is it 800,000 tons more?

Mr. FRYE. They have acquired, I understand, by the recent purchase of the Leyland Line and vessels of that sort, about 800,000 tons.

Mr. BERRY. That would make 1,400,000 tons altogether?

Mr. FRYE. The 600,000 are already under our registry.

Mr. BERRY. I understood the Senator to say that American capital was invested in 600,000 tons of foreign ships.

Mr. FRYE. No. There are 600,000 tons of our own ships.

Mr. TELLER. What I inquired, if the Senator will allow me, was how much tonnage under foreign flags is owned by United States citizens.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, I could not tell.

Mr. TELLER. That is what I asked.

Mr. FRYE. If that is the question, it is very much more than that, because the American Line has at least 12 ships under the Belgian flag, and the Morgan syndicate alone is said to have 800,000 tons by their recent purchase.

Mr. TELLER. Is there no way in which we can determine what that amount is?

Mr. FRYE. I think there is, on inquiry at the office of the Commissioner of Navigation. He probably has reports by which he knows how much it is.

I desire to make a little amendment to the pending bill.

The bill, on page 6, section 6, reads as follows:

SEC. 6. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1902, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, subject to the provisions of this title, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owner or owners of any vessel of the United States duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States.

It is claimed by some, although I do not admit myself that the claim is justified, that that would place under the provisions of this bill all these foreign-built ships if they should be admitted to American registry. It is not the intention of the bill to admit them under the subsidy at all. Therefore I move to amend by striking out, in lines 19 and 20, the words "of the United States" and inserting "hereafter built and registered in the United States or now."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALLAFERRO in the chair). Will the Senator from Maine please restate his amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. Will that cover exactly what the Senator wants?

Mr. FRYE. It will then read:

To the owner or owners of any vessel hereafter built and registered in the United States or now duly registered.

I do not require them to have been built in the United States, because when Hawaii was admitted there were quite a number of fine ships which were admitted with Hawaii itself, and there are two or three other ships. There are four or five transports, bought by the United States, which were admitted to American registry.

Mr. ALLISON. "Duly owned and registered." But they can not be registered without being owned by Americans?

Mr. FRYE. No; they can not be registered without being so owned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lines 19 and 20, page 6, it is proposed to strike out the words "of the United States" where they occur and insert "hereafter built and registered in the United States or now."

Mr. FRYE. That is the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish the Senator, if he can, would give us an estimate—he may have done so before, when I had not the



opportunity to hear him—of the amount that will be paid annually from the public Treasury under the provisions of the first title.

Mr. FRYE. I gave that in the speech I made the other day. Of course it depends entirely upon whether or not the rules which have been mentioned in the report shall be established by the Postmaster-General. If they are established by the Postmaster-General, within the next five years the amount would be \$4,700,000. That amount would be reached in the course of five years. There is not a single vessel of this speed to-day that I know of which could be used by the Postmaster-General. Vessels with a speed of from 16 knots, including 16 knots up to 20 or 21 knots, will necessarily have to be built after the Postmaster-General makes a contract. It takes from a year to a year and a half and two years to build one of those vessels.

Mr. ALLISON. Therefore the Senator is of the opinion that very little will be required during the next five years?

Mr. FRYE. Next year there will be none required, or about—

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me a moment? I understood the Senator to say in his speech the other day that he very much hoped the Postmaster-General would make a contract with the International Company for a semiweekly service from New York to Southampton. If that is done more will be required, and it will be required at once.

Mr. FRYE. It would not.

Mr. BERRY. Why not?

Mr. FRYE. From the fact that the American Line has but four ships. Nobody would ever dream of establishing a mail line from New York to Southampton short of 10,000-ton 20-knot ships, and there are only four in existence in the United States now. Those four are owned by the American Line. If the service should be doubled, it would not only require four more ships, but it would require two in reserve all the time, which would make six more, and these six would necessarily have to be built in the future, and they could not be built in the next three years.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. One moment.

Mr. DEPEW. I merely wish to ask a question.

Mr. ALLISON. I wanted to ask a question for information, but I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. DEPEW. I think the Senator from Maine, in stating at \$4,700,000 the aggregate which would be reached if all these routes were furnished with ships, neglected to state what would be the deductions in the earnings of mail service.

Mr. FRYE. That would be at least \$3,000,000, because we would receive \$3,000,000 annually from the mail itself. So that the balance would be only \$1,700,000.

It has been stated here that Great Britain does not pay any subsidies for commercial purposes. That is an entire mistake. That has been discussed in Parliament over and over again. This last year it was discussed in the English Board of Trade. There was not a single member of the English Parliament or of the Board of Trade who did not admit that the postal subsidies were for commercial purposes; and it must be remembered, too, that every year Great Britain falls back over \$2,000,000; she does not meet her postal subsidies by \$2,000,000 by the pay for her letters and papers, etc.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to discuss the question respecting new lines, but it has seemed to me that the necessity for new lines is so apparent that we ought here to provide for them if we intend to have them. As I read the bill there is no provision whereby the Postmaster-General can compel any vessel to enter upon the carrying of the mail. It is entirely optional with any vessel owner to make such a contract. The Postmaster-General, in his discretion, may not make such contracts as we here believe ought to be made as respects new routes and new lines of commerce. I should be perfectly willing at any time to vote for a liberal subsidy to establish a route between North and South America. I see nothing here that assures that.

Mr. FRYE. The bill directs the Postmaster-General to advertise for bids, and establish routes for the carrying of the United States mail. He is obliged to do so under this measure. Under the old law he was only empowered.

Mr. SPOONER. But nobody is obliged to bid?

Mr. FRYE. Nobody is obliged to bid, but the American citizen is ready to bid almost any time.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Iowa will pardon me for a moment—

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the subsidy of itself warrant any company in bidding?

Mr. FRYE. My judgment is it will, above 14 knots.

Mr. SPOONER. But not below?

Mr. FRYE. Below the subsidy is ample, because already the contracts made under the old law have been made for less than the amount named in the law as it stands. There is competition

always on the sea, and on the short 2,000-mile route there is already competition enough to reduce the price, and they are ready to put on their ships under the old law.

Mr. ALLISON. Can the Senator make an estimate of what is likely to be paid out under title 2?

Mr. FRYE. Under title 2 the Commissioner of Navigation, under my instructions, took all of the United States ships engaged in the foreign trade and duplicated their voyages, and then found what amount of subsidy under this bill they would have received, and he made it about \$1,000,000. But those same vessels, where we have no mail lines and will not be likely to have mail lines—a number of short routes—carried \$213,000 worth of mail. Under title 2 they are obliged to carry the mail for nothing. So he deducted from the \$1,000,000 the \$230,000, for it is estimated by the Postmaster-General that it will require \$230,000 next year. That deduction left \$800,000.

Now, suppose that should be correct, and it is nearly as correct as it can be arrived at, anyway. Go one step further. Suppose under this bill in a year there should be built, under title 2, 40,000 tons of sailing ships. No optimist would think of going any further than that—40,000 tons in a year. That would require under title 2 a subsidy of \$100,000, increasing the \$300,000 and making it \$900,000. Suppose there should be 200,000 tons of steamships built in a year in the United States.

It is well understood how many miles a ship can make in a year. Fifty thousand miles is all she can make. She has to be laid up at dock and at wharves and all that sort of thing. We will take an average of 50,000 miles for any ship. The average of the sailing ship is 20,000 miles. Suppose you built in a single year 200,000 tons of steamships. You can tell exactly what, under this subsidy, it will amount to—\$1,300,000; and in building those 200,000 tons of ships you would be building in American shipyards in the neighborhood of fifteen or sixteen million dollars' worth of ships.

Suppose next year you build 200,000 tons more, then it would be increased by \$1,300,000 more, making \$2,600,000 in the three years, provided you did it. You could not do it unless you nearly doubled the capacity of the present shipyards in the first instance. But suppose you did it. It would be one of the most signal successes of law that ever was attained. There is no doubt about that.

If this bill becomes law and that shall be done under it, it would mean the expenditure of twenty or thirty million dollars immediately, and that alone would put us ahead of Germany.

It was stated by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] the other day that I said that under the postal-subsidy act we would have a larger merchant marine within a certain length of time than Great Britain had. I never said anything of the kind. I would not, on any account, interrupt the Senator from Missouri while he was making his speech, because I have the profoundest possible respect for him, and I did not wish to disturb him. What I said was this: If the mail lines, which I referred to, to be established under this bill were established, then we would have an auxiliary navy on those lines equal to that of Great Britain and superior to that of Germany. That is what I said. And it is true. We should have.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, under title 2, as I understand it, all vessels now in the United States, whether steam or sail, can receive the subsidy.

Mr. FRYE. Above 1,000 tons.

Mr. ALLISON. Above 1,000 tons?

Mr. FRYE. Yes; above 1,000 tons.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like the Senator to point out that provision to me.

Mr. FRYE. It is in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I know there is a provision on page 7 which reads as follows:

On each entry, not exceeding 15 entries in any one fiscal year, and for a period of five years from the date of registration of a vessel of over 1,000 gross registered tons, which shall be completed and registered.

But I can find no limitation as to the value or size of either a sail vessel or a steam vessel that are now owned in the United States.

Mr. FRYE. I will find it for the Senator when I have a few moments. It is there.

Mr. ALLISON. If it is there, then the point of my question is answered.

Mr. FRYE. In 1891 we had a general bounty bill something like this, only providing for 3 cents a mile instead of 1. That passed the Senate, and under that bill all vessels above 500 tons were included. It was increased in this instance to a thousand tons, because it was not regarded as prudent to encourage the building of ships smaller than 1,000 tons under any circumstances on account of the rates of freight.

Mr. ALLISON. I notice another thing. As we are having some explanations, and have a little time, I should be glad to have

the Senator answer a suggestion or two. On page 7 there is this language:

(b) On each entry, not exceeding 16 entries in any one fiscal year, and for a period of five years from the date of registration of a vessel of over 1,000 gross registered tons, which shall be completed and registered after the passage of this act, one-fourth of 1 cent per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed, in addition to the compensation provided in paragraph (a).

That, of course, is an inducement for new vessels to be constructed.

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. I observe, in looking over the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, a great many steam vessels and a great many sailing vessels as well which would come under this provision, some of them ten, some of them fifteen years old. They are of various ages.

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest whether it would not be wise in some way—I do not know that it would be, but it seems to me it would—to diminish the subsidy to vessels which have been registered, say, for fifteen years or more. I notice also, and I think the Senator made that statement, that 5 per cent of any vessel owned by any company is charged off annually for deterioration. We will assume that a vessel at the end of twenty years is charged to profit and loss. It is not quite the proper thing, it seems to me, to allow a vessel fifteen years old, whether steam or sail, to receive the same bounty that a newer and better vessel would receive. In other words, it seems to me there will not be an incentive to the renewal of vessels.

I observe that the French act, which I had the opportunity of looking at the other day, passed by the French Assembly, provides that no subsidy shall be given to a vessel that has been registered more than seven years. Should there not be some provision here which would make it certain that the ships which we have now and to which we are going to pay this subsidy—and I am glad to know it is no larger than the Senator indicates—shall give place in our commercial marine to other vessels newer, perhaps, and in many respects improved vessels?

Mr. FRYE. My reply to that is that the bill requires that these ships shall be A1 in all of the registers.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; but—

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator will pardon me, an A1 ship is first class in every single respect, and if she is not an A1 ship she can not receive a dollar.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand it. But I understand that there are many ships that are ten years old which are A1.

Mr. FRYE. Yes; because they keep them in splendid shape. They are at work on them all the while.

Mr. ALLISON. Then, there must have been some other reason why the French Government in making this universal subsidy, which we have followed here, have provided that there should be a diminution of the subsidy dependent upon the age of the ship. I see that we followed a part of their suggestion by increasing it for new ships, but we have made no suggestion that looks to a diminution of the subsidy as the ships grow old and feeble, although they may be in the register A No. 1.

Mr. FRYE. If they are in the register A No. 1 they are in every respect first-class vessels. They can not get in there—

Mr. ALLISON. No vessel can sail on the ocean that is not practically A No. 1?

Mr. FRYE. Oh, yes; lots of them.

Mr. PERKINS. If the Senator will permit me, I will state that one of the safeguards of this bill is the classification. It provides not only for the American bureau class, but for the English Lloyds and other well-known classification bureaus that classify ships.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand the classification.

Mr. PERKINS. They must be placed on the dry dock every year in order to be examined to see if they maintain their class. The life of the boiler in an ordinary steamship is not more than eight years; and frequently, owing to galvanic action or where the water has been full of lime, the life of a boiler may not be longer than five years. The boilers are renewed. A ship may have an ordinary engine and they convert it into a compound engine, a triple-expansion engine, a quadruple engine. The surveyor representing the British Lloyds or whatever classification the ship is in inspects the vessel and she is virtually new, so to speak. Every time when the life of a boiler ends the ship is virtually new.

Mr. ALLISON. I know the bill provides for an inspection and that the vessel shall be A No. 1 when it is entered, but shall it continue A No. 1 during all the period of the subsidy? That is the question.

Mr. PERKINS. If the boiler is made to carry 160 pounds of steam to the square inch it must maintain that pressure while it is in existence, or else the vessel can not maintain her advance and the steam is cut down on the boiler.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to my nautical friends here. Of course they understand the subject perfectly well. What I know about the vessels I derive from books chiefly, and from occasionally having an opportunity of getting on board one of these sea-going vessels and listening to the Senator from Maine and the Senator from California.

Mr. FRYE. I am glad the Senator has listened.

Mr. ALLISON. But what I am interested in is to know what are the safeguards thrown around this bill that will enable us to protect the Government in making this expenditure as respects details?

Mr. PERKINS. I can not better illustrate than by an object lesson the criticism of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] who is to speak upon the bill and who was here a few moments ago. Take the amount of money expended upon the United States transports, which were foreign vessels purchased for the use of the Government. Since we purchased those vessels in some instances we have expended more money in repairs than the vessels cost, in order to keep them up to their classification, or what not. Engineering men would say that the expenditure was a proper one to be made.

Mr. ALLISON. As some of us know, that not only applies to transports, but it applies to naval vessels.

Mr. FRYE. Does it not apply to the insurance companies? They insist upon it.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to put a question which might possibly, although I know infinitely less than the Senator from Iowa on this subject, be a test question in regard to an estimate of the value of a ship. Would the vessel described by the Senator from California, kept up and inspected in this way, sell for as much in the market or would she recover as much of the insurance if she were lost if she were ten years old as when she was one year old?

Mr. ALLISON. Now, that is a very pertinent and valuable question, and I will leave the Senator from California to answer it.

Mr. PERKINS. I will state that the insurance companies base their insurance risk upon the vessel upon her classification.

Mr. HOAR. Without regard to the question whether the vessel is new or old?

Mr. PERKINS. That is, as to her condition; as to what corrosion may have taken place.

Mr. HOAR. But my question is, whether new or old, independent of examination.

Mr. DEPEW. Age does not govern the insurance.

Mr. PERKINS. Age does not govern the insurance.

Mr. ALLISON. Let me elucidate the valuable suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts. If he, the Senator from California, was in the market to buy a ship, and saw a new one just off the stocks, would he prefer to buy the new one or to buy one fifteen years old at the same price?

Mr. PERKINS. It would depend on how she was built. If both were built the same, I would certainly prefer the new ship. I wish to say, parenthetically, that I have seen and sailed on board a wooden ship that was only five years old that was condemned on the next voyage, and I have seen a Dutch galliot, a wooden ship, that was one hundred years old and she was as sound as the day she was built. I have seen an iron ship, where I have been in the forepeak with a hammer, and because she had not been properly scaled or kept in condition the hammer striking those scales have scaled them off until if I had continued thirty or fifty strokes more of the hammer it would have gone through the vessel. I have seen other vessels that were twenty years old that were in perfect condition, because their interior had been cemented and properly cared for from time to time.

Mr. ALLISON. I am glad to know that a ship never grows old.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator will allow me, it does grow old. Let me take an illustration. Take the *City of Paris*, now the *Philadelphia*. She ran on the rocks, and has been practically repaired. The *Philadelphia* is worth more to-day than the *Paris* was when they bought her.

Mr. ALLISON. Very likely, because the *Philadelphia* was rebuilt after it went out of the service of the Government.

Mr. FRYE. It was repaired after it went out of the service of the Government. After that it went onto the rocks and has since been repaired, and of course in repairing they have taken advantage of all the modern machinery and of every improvement that has been made, and the *Philadelphia* is worth more to-day than the *Paris* was.

Mr. ALLISON. It has been a very well cared for and a very tender child. I have no doubt it is a valuable ship now.

I am asking these questions, of course, for information and for nothing else.

Now, I find some other things here that I want to inquire about, as we seem to have an opportunity and no one desires to take the floor. I notice here on page 8 certain exceptions under title 2 of

which one is exception f, "a foreign-built vessel, hereafter admitted to American registry pursuant to the provisions of section 4136 of the Revised Statutes."

Section 4136 of the Revised Statutes simply applies to a vessel wrecked on our coast. I wondered why it was that was inserted. It occurred to me that it might be well to simply say a "foreign-built vessel hereafter admitted to American registry," and leave the question as to whether it should be in f or out of it to be settled when we give an American registry to a foreign ship.

Mr. FRYE. The bill provides now, since the amendment was adopted, and I understand it was adopted as I proposed—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been adopted.

Mr. FRYE. That no foreign vessel can be admitted to American registry and receive a subsidy. The reason of that provision is that these wrecks are bought all the way from \$1,000 to \$1,500 and \$2,000, and sometimes \$10,000, and they are then repaired in our American shipyards at \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000, and \$50,000, and when the ship is completed it has not cost more than half that it would cost if built here, and exception f will come in so as not to encourage the placing of a wrecked ship in our merchant marine.

Mr. ALLISON. That is absolutely true; but I understood the general scope of the bill to eliminate foreign-built ships, and therefore I thought, apparently, that it would be sufficient to say "a foreign-built vessel hereafter admitted to American registry." If they are now prohibited, of course—

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator will allow me, the law assumes under that wrecking legislation that they are practically American-built ships, because it requires three-fourths of the value of the ship to be expended in American shipyards; and that is the theory on which they are admitted to American registry at all.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President, I wish to make another suggestion, because these suggestions had better be made now; it will save time later. I understand note g to be an exception of "a vessel while employed in the coasting trade." To me that is rather indefinite. I will illustrate the point I have had some doubt about. Suppose one of these foreign ships shall start upon its voyage to any South American port and on its way it stops at Fortress Monroe.

Mr. SPOONER. You mean a ship engaged in the foreign trade?

Mr. ALLISON. Any ship engaged in the foreign trade. It stops at Fortress Monroe, Charleston, Savannah, and so on along the coast, and during that period it is employed in the coasting trade.

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. Under the clause would it not receive a subsidy?

Mr. FRYE. No.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, what I should like to know is whether that is fair. To give an illustration, this coasting trade of ours is like a special train of cars. Nobody can get on board that train except those having authority. In other words, no foreign ship can engage in our coasting trade. That is an absolute trade of our own and we make it exclusive. But we now go further in this bill, if I am not mistaken, and provide that any vessel in the coasting trade, whether a sailing vessel or a steamship, can step out of that trade and enter the foreign trade.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLISON. Is not that so?

Mr. FRYE. Oh, no. The language is, "while employed in the coasting trade."

Mr. ALLISON. I understand; but have coastwise vessels no opportunity of registering for the foreign trade under this bill?

Mr. FRYE. Undoubtedly; and the very case which the Senator states will illustrate it. Suppose she takes a cargo from New York to Savannah.

Mr. ALLISON. Being a coastwise vessel?

Mr. FRYE. Well, she could not take it unless she was a coastwise vessel. That is coastwise trade. She takes it from New York to Savannah. At Savannah she loads with coal for Brazil. She gets a registry at Savannah and is no longer engaged in the coastwise trade. She simply is excluded from the benefits of this bill from New York to Savannah because she is perfectly protected. Then she gets her registry and proceeds on her voyage to Brazil and gets the subsidy from Savannah to Brazil instead of from New York to Brazil.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. Then a coastwise vessel not only has the exclusive benefit of the coastwise trade, but she also has the benefit of the foreign trade with the exception of that portion of her voyage wherein she is on our own coast?

Mr. FRYE. She does.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, there is another point that troubles me about these vessels. The bill provides that—

If during the voyage the vessel shall enter at two or more foreign ports or ports in the Philippine Islands, the distance by the direct customary route

between such ports shall also be included in the mileage upon which compensation shall be paid under this title.

Now, can not the vessel, under this provision of two or more ports, make a clearance from New York to Hongkong, if you please, or some very distant port, and stop along the line of her voyage, wherever she chooses to stop, and take on and unload cargo at each stopping place, whether going or returning, and receive this bounty of 1 cent per gross registered ton? I only want to know whether that is the understanding or not.

Mr. FRYE. In the first place, no ship would go rollicking around in that way at sea.

Mr. ALLISON. I am inapt, of course, in my illustration; but can not a ship on any voyage stop at any intervening port under this bill between the outlying port to which she is destined and the port of the United States where she expects to land?

Mr. FRYE. I think she can take a cargo for Manila and sail from Manila with another half of a cargo to Hongkong and receive under the terms of the bill a subsidy.

Mr. ALLISON. Then could she not take a cargo or a part of a cargo at Hongkong and come back to Nagasaki and take another part of a cargo and come along and take other cargoes and still receive the subsidy wherever she goes on either the outgoing or returning voyage?

Mr. FRYE. I do not think myself that that is a practical question.

Mr. ALLISON. It says "two or more foreign ports or ports in the Philippine Islands."

Mr. FRYE. That is true; but where the demurrage is worth anywhere from \$300 to \$500 a day a ship is not going to be coasting around in a dozen different ports to reach her destination at Shanghai or Nagasaki. She would not do it at all. If she stopped at Hawaii she would not get any subsidy from here to Hawaii.

Mr. ALLISON. That is another point which I wanted to understand.

Mr. FRYE. She would not get any subsidy. She would have to register at Hawaii for foreign trade.

Mr. PERKINS. Hawaii is under the coasting provision.

Mr. ALLISON. So I know. If a ship starts from San Francisco for Manila, if you please, and stops at Hawaii—

Mr. PERKINS. Honolulu is the port.

Mr. ALLISON. She stops at Honolulu. The subsidy begins at Honolulu?

Mr. FRYE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. And not before, because she is in the coasting trade?

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. That comes to another question which I wanted to ask, because I desire to know about these things. We passed a tax bill the other day in which we provided (rather against my judgment, but still I yielded to it, and I do not know but that it was the wisest and best thing to do) that our coasting trade shall be extended to the Philippine Islands on the 1st of July, 1904?

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I see here that the Philippine Islands are included. I think it occurs twice. Should we not provide that the Philippine Islands shall be excluded until the 1st of July, 1904?

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Iowa has gotten something now.

Mr. ALLISON. I think so. I expected to strike it sooner or later. Is it the intention and the purpose that we shall not only have the coasting trade to the Philippine Islands but that we shall also have the foreign provisions as respects subsidy?

Mr. FRYE. I think if the Senator offers an amendment to that section he had better not limit it to 1904, because there is a possibility that that time may be extended. We may not have ships enough then. It is understood that the reason was because we did not have ships to do the business of the coastwise trade and were obliged to employ foreign ships. I think it would be safer to make that amendment up to such time as the Philippine Archipelago becomes coastwise, or something of that kind.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator will observe that I have not offered any amendment to this bill. I am trying to get an interpretation of the provisions which were a little blind to me. The Senator, I think, will pardon these questions.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. The moment the Philippine Archipelago becomes coastwise that moment, under this bill, no American vessel between the United States and the archipelago will receive any subsidy, because she would be engaged in the coastwise trade with the Philippines. I take it that if a vessel started the next day after July 1, 1904, from New York and sailed for the Philippine Archipelago, and that day the Philippine Archipelago was coastwise, under the decision of the court that vessel could not receive pay, because she would be engaged in the coasting trade of the United States, and she would not be entitled to a subsidy, although

it might be just as well to express it in the bill itself. I noticed that myself on looking the bill over this morning. I had not noticed it before.

Mr. ALLISON. My attention was called to it in reading over the bill hastily and hurriedly. There are one or two other points that I had in mind and to which I wanted to call attention, but I will refer to them at another time.

Mr. FRYE. A catechism is an awful thing.

Mr. ALLISON. It is; but here we have a curious way of debating these bills. A Senator rises in his place and debates it two or three hours, and then somebody moves to go into executive session. The next day we have two or three hours or more again, and then the hour of 3 o'clock on Monday next arrives. Those of us who want to get information about the bill seem to have no other opportunity of ascertaining what we want to know about it. So I think I am excusable—

Mr. FRYE. I think you are.

Mr. ALLISON. I think I am excusable in undertaking at this early period to get some information upon points I was in doubt about.

Mr. FRYE. I knew, of course, what the Senator meant.

Mr. DEPEW. Does the Senator mean to say that these four or five hour speeches do not give any information?

Mr. ALLISON. I mean to say that they have given information, but it is information upon a wider range. I have been intensely interested in the address to-day made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], in which he analyzed the whole question of subsidy, the constitutional power, and various other points; but the little points which have been troubling me now and then were not alluded to by the Senator from Florida and perhaps will not be alluded to by other Senators who will speak upon the subject.

Even the chairman of this committee, who elucidated the bill most graphically the other day in his opening observations, I think did not allude to one of the points that I have referred to. They were not regarded as of sufficient importance to elicit the attention of gentlemen who are engaged in debating these great questions. They only come up in the minds of those of us who are in the habit now and then of looking rather carefully at phraseology and language and seeing how far it is that the Congress of the United States abdicates its power. I have satisfied myself that the subsequent proceedings as respects this bill will interest us no more here.

Although I can ask the Senator from Maine what the cost will be this year of these three classes of subsidy, and I can make some estimate of what it will cost next year, that will be of no interest to us except as philosophers or in studying current history after this bill passes, because it goes into the maelstrom of executive power and one department draws a warrant upon another department and until the end of time the process goes on, unless this law is repealed. It is without limitation. It lasts as long as the Republic lasts.

Therefore, I have gone into the subject somewhat with a view of seeing if we shall spend hours and hours in the study of the question whether the head of a department shall have another clerk and whether it shall be a \$1,400 clerk or a \$1,600 clerk, because we can not trust the Secretary to expend money enough to carry on the necessary clerical operations of the Department, and then we shall come in and open wide this gate of expenditure without having any accurate knowledge of the number of ships that are to be benefited.

I am very glad to have the Senator from Maine say that the Commissioner of Navigation has given him a list of these vessels. I hope that list will be produced by to-morrow morning, and printed in the RECORD if it be not too long.

Mr. TELLER. Why not have it done to-night?

Mr. ALLISON. I hope it contains a statement giving the tonnage of the vessels. I want also to ascertain the number of steam vessels that are in the class known as A1 and the number of sailing vessels that are included; whether they are square-rigged or what may be their particular character, and whether they are of 1,000 tons or 3,000 tons or 200 tons or 500 tons.

This is information to which we are entitled, and the Senate is not in any condition, at least I am not, to have it intimated that it is embarrassing to be asking questions about this bill.

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator did not understand me as objecting to being catechised. I was only reflecting upon myself, because I remember when I was a boy it was pretty hard work to be catechised.

Mr. ALLISON. I know the Senator did not mean to object to being catechised.

Mr. FRYE. No; not in the slightest degree.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, this is a technical subject to me, and I want to address a single inquiry to the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. What is the comparison of these subsidies fixed under title 1 as to steamships provided for in this bill with the subsidies provided for vessels of the same description in the

bill which we considered at the last session; are they the same, or are they more or less?

Mr. FRYE. They are less than in the bill of last session.

Mr. SPOONER. How much less?

Mr. FRYE. I can not tell you exactly how much, but they are less than those provided in the bill of last session, because under that bill I have no doubt the limitation of \$9,000,000 would have been reached in three or four years, but it will not be reached under this bill for a long time. The rates are a little less than they were in the bill which passed the Senate in 1891; on the highest class of vessels a little more than they are in the existing law; on the lower class of vessels less than in the existing law, under the postal subsidy. Under the second title they are less than in the last bill, because that was a cent and a half for the first 1,500 miles and a cent after that. This is 1 cent for the entire voyage.

Mr. SPOONER. Take steamships of the first class, 2.7 cents. Is that less than the same steamship would have received under the bill which we considered at the last session; and if so, how much less?

Mr. FRYE. I can not tell you without looking at the figures.

Mr. MALLORY. The rates under the present bill are decidedly less than in the previous bill for steamships of 20 and 22 knots.

Mr. SPOONER. How much less?

Mr. MALLORY. About 1 cent.

Mr. SPOONER. How about steamships of the second class?

Mr. MALLORY. The rates vary; but this bill is less than the other all the way through.

Mr. SPOONER. The amount received per voyage would be frequently less?

Mr. MALLORY. There is a decided difference so far as the 20-knot and 22-knot steamers are concerned. The bill of last year provided for a larger payment than the pending bill, there being a difference of about 1 cent per ton per 100 miles in the case of the 20 and 22 knot vessels.

Mr. SPOONER. What would it amount to in the aggregate?

Mr. MALLORY. That would have to be figured out carefully.

Mr. FRYE. I can not give the amount, but there is no question that it is less than in the bill of last year.

Mr. SPOONER. Is it 25 per cent less?

Mr. FRYE. I do not dare to say.

Mr. SPOONER. Who can inform us—the Commissioner of Navigation?

Mr. FRYE. Very likely he has the figures. We have had to send to him for figures before.

Mr. SPOONER. I think that is important to know.

Mr. FRYE. I know it is less than in the prior bill, but how much less it is impossible for me now to say.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, we are engaged in rather an informal manner on this bill, and I should like to ask the Senator from Maine, with his permission, a question in reference to one provision in it. I do so for information.

I note on page 6, title 2, this language under the head of "General subsidy:"

That from and after the 1st day of July, 1902, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, subject to the provisions of this title, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owner or owners of any vessel of the United States 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).

Stating first that, according to my reading of it, that would entitle to subsidy any foreign ship which by act of Congress is allowed American registry; in other words, if I am correct in my understanding of that provision, any foreign ship—a ship not built in this country—if it shall come under American registry or secure the right to registry will be entitled to subsidy. I want to ask the Senator from Maine whether or not I am correct in that, or whether the expression "any vessel of the United States" is intended to limit it to ships built in the United States?

Mr. SPOONER. We cured that by an amendment to-day.

Mr. BACON. I beg pardon.

Mr. FRYE. I did not cure it, because I thought it was absolutely unnecessary, for my construction of the law is different from that of the Senator from Georgia. I believe that "duly registered" means American-built ships duly registered; but, in order to save any question regarding it, I offered an amendment to-day, which was adopted, which makes the intent perfectly clear.

Mr. BACON. And confines it to American-built ships?

Mr. FRYE. To American-built ships.

Mr. BACON. I did not know of that amendment. I beg pardon of the Senator for making the inquiry.

#### IMITATION DAIRY PRODUCTS.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that after the bill (S. 3653) for the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes, is disposed of, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 552,

being House bill 9206, known as the oleomargarine bill, and will ask that it be made the unfinished business.

JOHN GLASS—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 1258, entitled "An act to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of John Glass."

There can be no graver crime than the crime of desertion from the Army or Navy, especially during war; it is then high treason to the nation and is justly punishable by death. No man should be relieved from such a crime, especially when nearly forty years have passed since it occurred, save on the clearest possible proof of his real innocence. In this case the statement made by the affiant before the committee does not in all points agree with his statement made to the Secretary of the Navy. In any event it is incomprehensible to me that he should not have made effective effort to get back into the Navy.

He had served but little more than a month when he deserted, and the war lasted for over a year afterwards, yet he made no effort whatever to get back into the war. Under such circumstances it seems to me that to remove the charge of desertion from the Navy and give him an honorable discharge would be to falsify the records and do an injustice to his gallant and worthy comrades who fought the war to a finish. The names of the veterans who fought in the civil war make the honor list of the Republic, and I am not willing to put upon it the name of a man unworthy of the high position.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, March 11, 1902.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, from which that bill was reported, I desire to put in the RECORD with the veto message the report made by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT] on this bill. A similar bill was reported during the Fifty-sixth Congress, and the report then made was as follows:

It appears from the papers before your committee that the said John Glass enlisted in the Navy January 25, 1864, as a first-class boy, for one year; served on board the U. S. S. *Moose*, and is recorded as having deserted from the service March 4, 1864. His age at the time of enlistment was 16 years.

It further appears from the papers before your committee that the said John Glass, having been a witness to circumstances of a compromising nature affecting the second officer of the vessel on which he was serving on March 3, 1864, was taken by the said second officer ashore on the following day, presented with money to purchase a civilian suit, and told not to report back to his ship for duty. The said John Glass, being very young at the time, and supposing it to be his duty to obey the injunctions of his superior officers, failed to report back for duty, in consequence of which he was recorded as a deserter. There is no evidence tending to show intentional desertion, and it is the opinion of your committee that the relief intended to be afforded by the accompanying bill should be granted.

I simply desired that this should go in the RECORD in connection with the veto message.

Mr. SPOONER. The man deserted under orders?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, you can judge of that for yourself. He was a 16-year-old boy.

I move that the message of the President be referred with the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

RAILROADS IN CUBA.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I want to make an inquiry. On the 13th of February, about a month since, the Senate passed a resolution in these words:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to inform the Senate what railroads, if any, are now being built in the island of Cuba, by whom, and under what authority of law.

Also what permission, if any, has been given by the military authorities of the United States in the island of Cuba for the building of any railroad, public or private, and under what provisions of law such permission has been granted.

I rise to inquire whether there has been any answer to that resolution? I suppose the Presiding Officer can inform us.

Mr. FRYE. I think the RECORD will show whether it has been answered or not.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator remember?

Mr. FRYE. No, I do not remember, but the RECORD will show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Chair is informed that a reply has not been received.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 11, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

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

EXTRA CLERKS FOR ASSESSOR OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to ask immediate consideration of a joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The joint resolution (S. R. 65) to provide for the employment

of extra clerical force in the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc.*, That the sum of \$1,000 is hereby appropriated for the compensation of extra clerical force in the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia to assist in the additional work incident to carrying out the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 15, 1902, permitting the payment of arrears of taxes in the District of Columbia at the rate of 6 per cent per annum; one-half of said sum to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Is this reported from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. McCLEARY. It is.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It has been considered by them?

Mr. McCLEARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Unanimously reported from that committee?

Mr. McCLEARY. Yes, sir.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LOUD. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 11354—the Post-Office appropriation bill.

DUTIES ON SUGAR.

Mr. THAYER. I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THAYER. It is a question of the highest privilege, affecting, it seems to me, the dignity of this House and the safety of every member of it. I can briefly state the substance of this question by reading a resolution which I have prepared. With the permission of the Chair, I would like to state it briefly in this form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed to state his question of privilege.

Mr. THAYER (reading):

Whereas it has been currently reported in many reputable newspapers, and by many Republican members of this House, that in the event of a reduction of the duty on sugar imported from Cuba the American Sugar Refinery, commonly known as the "sugar trust," will be the chief beneficiary; and

Whereas it has been currently reported from reliable sources that the entire crop of Cuban sugar has already been purchased from the Cubans at ruinously low prices by the said sugar trust, and is only awaiting shipment until a reduction of the duty on the same can be secured through the action of Congress, and that any concessions intended to be for the alleviation of the deplorable condition of the Cubans by admitting their sugar this year at reduced rates of duty will serve only to benefit the sugar trust, and that the Cubans will receive no benefit whatever from it; and

Whereas it has been currently alleged by many reputable newspapers that the American Sugar Refinery Company (commonly known as the "sugar trust") has, by subsidizing the press, establishing literary bureaus, and by spending large sums of money, and in other ways, attempted to create a public sentiment in favor of a radical reduction of the tariff on sugar imported from Cuba; and

Whereas it is due to the dignity of this House that the truth or falsity of these charges should be clearly established before the House proceeds to a consideration of the question of reducing the duty on sugar imported from Cuba, as recommended by the President of the United States in his annual message to Congress: Therefore,

*Be it resolved*, That a special committee of seven members of this House be appointed by the Speaker to investigate the subject-matter of this resolution—

Mr. LOUD (interrupting). I rise to a point of order—that this is not a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER] will suspend. The gentleman from California makes the point of order that this is not a question of privilege. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. THAYER. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to lay that appeal on the table.

Mr. THAYER. Upon that question I demand the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, there were yeas 48.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, there is a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, we are called upon to vote to sustain or not to sustain the Speaker's ruling. I can not intelligently vote upon the question without knowing precisely what it is.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the situation again. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER] rose to a question of personal privilege, reading a certain document. The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] made the point of order

that it was not privileged matter. The Chair sustained the point of order. From that ruling the gentleman from Massachusetts takes an appeal to the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves to lay that appeal on the table, and the vote is now about to be taken upon the question, Shall the appeal be laid on the table? The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THAYER. Allow me a word. I did not claim that this was a question of personal privilege, as I understood the Chair to state.

The SPEAKER. It is neither a question of personal privilege nor a question of privilege in any form. The Chair sustained the point of order.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 125, nays 87, answered "present" 18, not voting 125; as follows:

YEAS—125.

Adams,	Esch,	Littlefield,	Schirm,
Alexander,	Evans,	Long,	Scott,
Allen, Me.	Fleming,	Loud,	Shattuc,
Aplin.	Fletcher,	Lovering,	Shelden,
Bartholdt,	Foerderer,	McCleary,	Sherman,
Bates,	Fordney,	McClellan,	Showalter,
Bishop,	Gardner, Mich.	McLachlan,	Sibley,
Boutell,	Gardner, N. J.	Marshall,	Skiles,
Brick,	Gillet, N. Y.	Martin,	Smith, Ill.
Bromwell,	Gillett, Mass.	Mercer,	Smith, H. C.
Brown,	Graham,	Miller,	Smith, S. W.
Brownlow,	Grosvenor,	Minor,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Burke, S. Dak.	Grow,	Mondell,	Southard,
Burton,	Hamilton,	Moody, Mass.	Sperry,
Calderhead,	Hanbury,	Moody, N. C.	Stevens, Minn.
Cannon,	Haskins,	Moody, Oreg.	Stewart, N. J.
Capron,	Haugen,	Morris,	Storm,
Cassel,	Hedge,	Mudd,	Sutherland,
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	Needham,	Tawney,
Conner,	Hepburn,	Otjen,	Thomas, Iowa
Corliss,	Hill,	Overstreet,	Tirrell,
Cousins,	Hitt,	Parker,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Crumpacker,	Holliday,	Payne,	Tompkins, Ohio
Curtis,	Howell,	Pearre,	Van Voorhis,
Cushman,	Jackson, Md.	Perkins,	Wachter,
Dalzell,	Jones, Wash.	Powers, Me.	Wadsworth,
Deemer,	Knox,	Powers, Mass.	Warner,
Dick,	Kyle,	Prince,	Warnock,
Douglas,	Lacey,	Ray, N. Y.	Woods.
Draper,	Lawrence,	Reeves,	
Driscoll,	Lessler,	Rumple,	
Emerson,	Lewis, Pa.	Russell,	

NAYS—87.

Allen, Ky.	Gaines, Tenn.	Little,	Ruppert,
Ball, Tex.	Gilbert,	Livingston,	Ryan,
Bartlett,	Goldfogle,	Lloyd,	Selby,
Brantley,	Gordon,	McCulloch,	Sims,
Brundidge,	Griffith,	McLain,	Slayden,
Burleson,	Griggs,	Maddox,	Small,
Caldwell,	Hay,	Mahony,	Smith, Ky.
Candler,	Hooker,	Moon,	Spight,
Cassingham,	Jackson, Kans.	Mutchler,	Stark,
Clayton,	Johnson,	Naphen,	Sulzer,
Cochran,	Jones, Va.	Neville,	Swanson,
Conry,	Kehoe,	Padgett,	Taylor, Ala.
Cowherd,	Kern,	Patterson, Tenn.	Thayer,
Creamer,	Kitchin, Claude	Randell, Tex.	Thomas, N. C.
De Armond,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rhea, Ky.	Thompson,
De Graffenreid,	Kleberg,	Rhea, Va.	Underwood,
Dinsmore,	Kluttz,	Richardson, Ala.	White,
Dougherty,	Lamb,	Richardson, Tenn.	Wiley,
Edwards,	Lanham,	Rixey,	Williams, Ill.
Finley,	Latimer,	Robb,	Wilson,
Fitzgerald,	Lever,	Robinson, Ind.	Zenor.
Fox,	Lindsay,	Rucker,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—18.

Adamson,	Foster, Vt.	Jett,	Trimble,
Bell,	Green, Pa.	Ketcham,	Wright,
Burkett,	Heatwole,	McRae,	Young.
Coombs,	Irwin,	Metcalf,	
Crowley,	Jenkins,	Otey,	

NOT VOTING—125.

Acheson,	Dahle,	Kahn,	Robertson, La.
Babcock,	Darragh,	Knapp,	Robinson, Nebr.
Ball, Del.	Davey, La.	Landis,	Salmon,
Bankhead,	Davidson,	Lassiter,	Scarborough,
Barney,	Davis, Fla.	Lester,	Shackleford,
Beidler,	Dayton,	Lewis, Ga.	Shafroth,
Bellamy,	Dovener,	Littauer,	Shallenberger,
Belmont,	Eddy,	Loudenslager,	Sheppard,
Benton,	Elliott,	McAndrews,	Smith, Iowa
Bingham,	Feely,	McCall,	Snodgrass,
Blackburn,	Flood,	McDermott,	Snook,
Blakeney,	Foss,	Mahon,	Southwick,
Boreing,	Foster, Ill.	Mann,	Sparkman,
Bowersock,	Fowler,	Maynard,	Steele,
Bowie,	Gaines, W. Va.	Meyer, La.	Stephens, Tex.
Breazeale,	Gibson,	Mickey,	Stewart, N. Y.
Bristow,	Gill,	Miers, Ind.	Sulloway,
Broussard,	Glenn,	Morgan,	Talbert,
Bull,	Gooch,	Morrell,	Tate,
Burgess,	Graff,	Nevin,	Taylor, Ohio
Burk, Pa.	Greene, Mass.	Newlands,	Tongue,
Burleigh,	Hall,	Norton,	Vandiver,
Burnett,	Hemenway,	Olmsted,	Vreeland,
Butler, Mo.	Henry, Miss.	Palmer,	Wanger,
Butler, Pa.	Henry, Tex.	Patterson, Pa.	Watson,
Clark,	Hildebrandt,	Pierce,	Weeks,
Cooney,	Hopkins,	Pou,	Wheeler,
Cooper, Tex.	Howard,	Pugsley,	Williams, Miss.
Cooper, Wis.	Hughes,	Ransdell, La.	Wooten.
Cromer,	Hull,	Reeder,	
Cummings,	Jack,	Reid,	
Currier,	Joy,	Roberts,	

So the appeal from the decision of the Chair was laid on the table.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER.  
 Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.  
 Mr. KAHN with Mr. BELMONT.  
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.  
 Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.  
 Mr. BULL with Mr. CROWLEY.  
 Mr. COOMBS with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.  
 Mr. MAHON with Mr. OTEY.  
 Mr. BOREING with Mr. TRIMBLE.  
 Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

Until further notice:

Mr. CROMER with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.  
 Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.  
 Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. SALMON.  
 Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. WOOTEN.  
 Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. REID.  
 Mr. IRWIN with Mr. GOOCH.  
 Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. LINDSAY.  
 Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. SNODGRASS.  
 Mr. HULL with Mr. COONEY.  
 Mr. LANDIS with Mr. CLARK.  
 Mr. BURKETT with Mr. SHALLENBERGER.  
 Mr. EDDY with Mr. SHEPPARD.  
 Mr. HITT with Mr. DINSMORE.  
 Mr. BARNEY with Mr. MCRAE.  
 Mr. DOUGLAS with Mr. VANDIVER.  
 Mr. JENKINS with Mr. ELLIOTT.  
 Mr. HEMENWAY with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

For this day:

Mr. WATSON with Mr. TALBERT.  
 Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. SHAFROTH.  
 Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. SCARBOROUGH.  
 Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska.  
 Mr. MORGAN with Mr. NORTON.  
 Mr. HUGHES with Mr. MICKEY.  
 Mr. GIBSON with Mr. MAYNARD.  
 Mr. NEVIN with Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 Mr. DAHLE with Mr. LASSITER.  
 Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. HOWARD.  
 Mr. CURRIER with Mr. HENRY of Texas.  
 Mr. GAINES of West Virginia with Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.  
 Mr. FOWLER with Mr. GLENN.  
 Mr. MCCALL with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.  
 Mr. GILL with Mr. FEELY.  
 Mr. JACK with Mr. FLOOD.  
 Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.  
 Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. DAVIS of Florida.  
 Mr. HILDEBRANDT with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.  
 Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 Mr. FOSS with Mr. McANDREWS.  
 Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. COOPER of Texas.  
 Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. PUGSLEY.  
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. NEWLANDS.  
 Mr. DOVENER with Mr. SPARKMAN.  
 Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania with Mr. BURGESS.  
 Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. BROUSSARD.  
 Mr. BRISTOW with Mr. BREAZEALE.  
 Mr. BOWERSOCK with Mr. BOWIE.  
 Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. BELLAMY.  
 Mr. YOUNG with Mr. BENTON.  
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

For this vote:

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. LESTER.  
 Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. BURNETT.  
 Mr. VREELAND with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.  
 Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.  
 Mr. JOY with Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BANKHEAD.  
 Mr. KNAPP with Mr. PIERCE.  
 Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.

For one week:

Mr. BALL of Delaware with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.  
 The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.  
 The SPEAKER. The question now is upon the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.  
 The motion was agreed to.  
 The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Maine in the chair, for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11354.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to take but a few moments in a general explanation of the provisions of this bill.

The estimates of the Post-Office Department for the support of the postal service for the fiscal year 1903 are \$134,731,576. The bill, as you will observe, recommends an appropriation of \$137,916,598.75, or \$3,185,022.75 more than the estimates. For a committee to recommend an amount of money in excess of the amount recommended by the Department would under ordinary circumstances seem strange, to say the least. Yet the committee have only recommended such an amount of money as they believe is necessary to support the postal service.

Some portion of the increase over the estimates comes from the fact that the Department for some items does not estimate the amount of money that it absolutely knows will be necessary to continue the service. The policy grew up—I do not know when, but before I became a member of this body—of cutting down certain appropriations that were continuous, where the service had to be performed whether we appropriated the money or not, and to come in later for a deficiency appropriation.

Some four or five years ago the Post-Office Committee inaugurated the policy of endeavoring to report, so far as they could find out, the amount of money that they knew was necessary to support the service. The policy had been to cut off a million and a half from the item of railway-mail pay, because the accounts were not presented until after the end of the fiscal year, and the railroad companies could wait until Congress convened, when the deficiency would be made up. On the item of the pay of postmasters, the postmasters pay themselves, substantially, and whether Congress appropriated the money or not the post-offices went on and they continued to pay themselves just the same, it being a mere matter of bookkeeping; and you will find in looking at this bill that in that one item alone we have appropriated a million dollars more than the estimate of the Post-Office Department, that being for the pay of postmasters, and the Department quite freely acknowledged that they had not estimated the amount of money that was necessary to pay the postmasters for that fiscal year.

The committee have recommended an appropriation of \$17,139,800 for clerks in post-offices, this sum being \$811,600 more than the amount submitted in the Book of Estimates. I will say that for the larger portion of this money, after the estimates had been submitted, the Post-Office Department found that the business was increasing to such an enormous extent throughout the country that in January they were quite positive it would require a large sum in addition to the amount they had estimated, and there were 600 additional clerks provided on this subsequent estimate, to bring the service down as nearly as possible to the basis of eight hours' work, etc. This increase in clerk hire carried by this bill is \$2,776,100, an amount of money that almost staggers the average person when he contemplates the increase.

This is the fourth year—and I think the last year—in which the Post-Office Committee have undertaken in the appropriation bill and within the law, by a segregation that we have, gradually to increase the salaries of the post-office clerks until they were brought to a basis that we thought was just to those clerks. When we undertook this gradual promotion the average salary of the post-office clerk was a little less than \$700 a year. When this bill is passed the average salary of the post-office clerk will be as nearly \$900 a year as it can be figured—that is, from \$890 to \$900—so that after this year the committee do not believe it will be necessary to make as large an increase in the clerk-hire account as we have in this bill. Later on, however, I propose to submit to the committee some comparisons that I have made, showing where the enormous increases come from in the postal service, and I think I will be able to show the committee and the country that the large increase that comes in the appropriation bill comes substantially from salaries, while in the other great branch of our service, which involves the expenditure of more than one-half the money, the increase is hardly normal. In that portion of the bill that provides salaries the increase has been abnormal.

Your committee recommend an appropriation of \$11,222,540 for pay of railway mail clerks, which is \$184,044 more than the estimates, and \$907,840 more than the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

I have no criticism to make, generally, of the increase of salaries under the supervision of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General's department. I have been a member of the Post-Office Committee for a great many years, and I can say this of that department, that they seem to estimate with all the care that a man could possibly estimate if he had to pay the money out of his own pocket. The \$184,044 above the amount estimated comes

from a slight increase of the salaries of the railway mail clerks, which proposition we took up in this House two years ago. Up to two years ago it had been the policy to appropriate a lump sum of money for the pay of railway mail clerks, the law fixing the maximum salary which they might receive.

That is, the maximum class of \$1,400; and then there are the classes of \$1,200, \$1,000, \$900, and \$800. In 1885 Congress did not appropriate a sufficient amount of money for the maximum classes of \$1,400 and \$1,200, and the Post-Office Department, instead of creating a deficiency, cut the salaries of the railway mail clerks of the \$1,400 class to \$1,300 and of the \$1,200 class to \$1,100. Two years ago we made a segregation in the bill and restored the \$1,400 class and the \$1,200 class. This year your committee have recommended the establishment of a \$1,300 class and a \$1,100 class, and \$184,000 is provided for these new clerks of these two classes—that is, we have taken in the segregation 491, I believe, of that class out of the \$1,200 class and put them into a \$1,300 class and some 800 from the \$1,000 class and put them into a new class we have created of \$1,100.

The committee believed that a \$200 advance was a greater advance than should be made. We believe this system of equal advantage to the clerks themselves, in that they will get an advance to \$1,300 and \$1,100 each one, two, three, or possibly five years before they would get an advance to \$1,400 or \$1,200, and will just as soon get into the classes of \$1,200 and \$1,400. In arriving at that we take into consideration the different character of work performed by the clerks. The Second Assistant's department have certain ironclad rules. One of them is that no clerk on an apartment car shall receive more than a thousand dollars.

Well, now, we found the same wide divergence of duty and service of clerks in charge of apartment cars that the committee found in relation to rural-delivery carriers, and we did not believe that an ironclad rule could be laid down that an apartment-car clerk should receive a thousand dollars, traveling a certain number of miles, because as a matter of fact some apartment cars are of equal importance with full cars. You can readily see the absurdity of a clerk having charge of a 30-foot apartment car at a thousand dollars a year, and when perchance the railroad company has provided a full car 40 feet long he can receive under their regulations \$1,200, so that, many other inequalities existing, we suggest to the Second Assistant's department that they make a division and submit to us the number of men who should be promoted, taking into consideration the class and character of work they perform rather than the number of feet that the car might be.

The committee have recommended an increase of free-delivery service, \$1,349,550. I will make no comment upon it. The increase is large—larger than I believe it should be—and the question can readily be asked, and perhaps will be asked, why we recommend an amount in excess of that our best judgment would dictate. The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads I think quite understand the sentiment of Congress, after it has been impressed upon them three or four times, at least. They have discovered this about the free-delivery service, that no matter whatever amount of money we may appropriate, that department will use such an amount of money as it sees fit to use. We have but to call to your mind the act of this House within the last five years when a deficiency was created in the free-delivery service.

I will not attempt to say but what there should have been an additional amount of money expended in excess of what we recommended; but I believe that any officer that deliberately creates a deficiency in an item of this character ought to be impeached and punished. But we have got a powerful Department to deal with, and when we deal with the postal employees we are dealing with people that come very close to everybody. I call to mind that occasion. Allow me to say to you that December and January passed with this House in session, and no intimation was made that a deficiency would be needed. They did not come to Congress and suggest that the service would suffer unless they had an additional appropriation; but they created a deficiency, and did not even do Congress the honor to consult it. Now, when the deficiency came in some members of this House called the attention of this body to the danger of the position which confronted us. I was one of those unfortunate individuals.

The press of the country, under the suggestion of the department, immediately began its attack upon this body. Now, what did the Department do on this occasion? They had appointed more carriers than they should have appointed, because their first duty was to keep within the law. They let this matter run until March, when they began to create a deficiency in September, and they replied to Congress: "We will let this service run until about the 15th of June, and unless you appropriate the deficiency we will stop the service." Now, imagine the condition of that Department saying to Congress, "We have created a deficiency; we have hired more help than we should have employed; we will not cut off the additional help that we have hired, but if you do not give us this deficiency we will stop the service."

Mr. BURNETT. What particular service was that?

Mr. LOUD. The free-delivery service.

Mr. McCLEARY. The rural free delivery?

Mr. LOUD. No; that was before we had the rural free delivery. I do not think there is any doubt but what Congress would have appropriated that money if they had come to the Committee on Appropriations in the first instance and suggested that the necessities of the service demanded that they have this deficiency, but they did not do that. Congress, without the censure of more than three members on the floor of the House by voice, bowed their heads in obedience to the Department, and we have now very nearly approached the position where the necessity for appropriation committees has almost ceased. If the Department can create a deficiency on subjects of this character, then why not allow them to simply submit to Congress such an amount of money as they desire, and have them become the law of the land without the scrutiny of a single individual? Because in this instance we substantially said to them, "Hereafter you may use what amount of money you see fit regardless of what Congress may give you."

Now, the Post-Office Committee finds itself in that position. In those days they tried to give to the House their best judgment. Where we thought the appropriations for clerk hire were too large we cut them down.

Mr. BURKETT. May I ask the gentleman how these deficiencies were created—were they carried as due bills against the service? The money was not paid out, was it?

Mr. LOUD. I will say that the actual deficiency had not been created when the matter was presented to Congress. We will say that we appropriated twelve millions for free-delivery service, and that would have employed so many carriers. They had put enough carriers on the roll on the 1st day of December to demand an appropriation of twelve million three or four hundred thousand dollars.

That is, they had a service already in operation which would demand a larger appropriation than Congress had provided for. The service would have run, as they said, until about the 15th of June, and then they said to us, as they said to the country—and the country very quickly responded, because they could not afford to have the delivery service shut off from the 15th of June to the 1st of July—you must give us this deficiency or we will stop the service. Congress quickly responded, without condemnation of those who had created it, and appropriated the money. Since that time deficiencies of that kind have not been infrequent. They will continue to become more frequent until Congress asserts its proper and just authority; and the longer Congress continues to submit its neck the lower it must necessarily become, not alone in the contempt of the country, but in the contempt of ourselves.

I submit these few remarks to show that while I think the Post-Office Committee believes that the increased appropriation for clerk hire and—I refer to carriers, etc.—is too large, yet we dare not make it less. I would much prefer to give them too much than to run the chance of having them more frequently defy the will of Congress and expend such an amount of money as they see fit and then come to Congress.

I will append to my remarks some tables to which I have referred. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that for clerk hire there was appropriated in 1885 \$4,875,000. The appropriation for the fiscal year of 1903 is \$17,139,800. You will see that it has increased more than three and one-half times. Take the item of "necessary and miscellaneous items." In 1885 it was \$87,000; in 1903, \$250,000. These are expenditures over which we have substantially no control under the existing conditions.

The expenditures of the Post-Office Department in 1885 were \$50,462,350, and in the fiscal year of 1901, which is the last year that we can get at, they were \$115,554,920, a little more than double. That is, the expenditures in the Post-Office Department have a little more than doubled since 1885, and the expenditure for clerk hire is more than three and one-half times as great.

A person might naturally say, "Why is there not a greater deficiency?" Because there is more than \$60,000,000 expended in some other way; an amount of money sufficient to keep this end from toppling the whole establishment over. Every portion of the postal business which is done by contract—and that refers to all of its supplies, every character of supplies furnished the Department is furnished under contract, and I do not think that any man would criticise that—the increased expenditure there has been hardly anything by reason of the fact that supplies do not cost as much to-day as they did in 1885.

Take the stationery for the postal service. In 1890 it was \$51,000,000; in 1903, \$70,000,000. Take the wrapping twine. In 1890 it was \$78,033; in 1903 it is \$125,000. So you will see that I have not taken all the service, but just enough to illustrate that where there is competition, and where the bidding to the Post-Office Department is done upon a business basis, then the increase hardly meets the increase of the service.

Take the star-route service, which I know our friends are roundly condemning, yet I do not believe there are ten men on the floor of this House that are agonizing to put the star-route system under a salary system. Of course, the argument sounded well to us last week; but yet I do not believe there is a man who is anxious to put the star-route service, with its 37,000 contractors and probably 100,000 employees, on a salary basis.

Let us see about that service. In 1885 the appropriation was \$5,403,259; in 1903 it was \$5,580,000. So competition—natural competition, too—has kept that character of service substantially the same, notwithstanding the increase in the mileage of the star-route service.

In connection with that I want to say that for the fiscal year 1903 the estimate is \$6,715,000. You see there a very marked increase, and that increase has been discussed upon this floor when we were not cool; but now we can look at the situation from a business standpoint, because nothing is depending upon it.

Now, the increase of thirteen or fourteen hundred thousand dollars arises from various causes, all, I think, perfectly legitimate. Three or four hundred thousand dollars of this increase comes from an increased service in Alaska—a most expensive service. A part of the increase may arise, and probably does arise, from the new regulations adopted by the Post-Office Department compelling the contractor to personally supervise at least the service and to live within the limits of the route served. How much that may amount to no one can tell; but the greatest amount of increase, in my opinion, arises from the fact that in every new contract let in the first section of the country, which, as gentlemen know, embraces New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the Virginias, and the fourth section, which has just been let, comprising substantially all the States west of the Missouri River—in every new contract the contractor has entered into an agreement to deliver the mail to every resident along his route.

I know some people will say that these contractors do not deliver to everybody along the route; but that being the provision in his contract, the contractor in making his bid naturally makes the bid upon the assumption that he has to deliver the mail to everybody and will be compelled to do so if so desired. Now, from these various causes comes the increase in the appropriation bill this year.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman spoke a few minutes ago about the question of competition which possibly reduces the cost of the service. Does that competition come from the new star-route service having to compete with the rural service?

Mr. LOUD. I do not know that I understand the purport of the gentleman's question.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman says that we have an old star-route service and a new star-route service and a rural-delivery service. Does the competition which it appears has reduced the cost of transportation arise from the fact that the new star-route service competes with the rural service?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, no. I thought I had dwelt at considerable length upon the condition that confronts us—that the star-route service during the last year has increased, not decreased.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The new service according to the report of the Postmaster-General has cost more, the increase being, I believe, about 13 per cent.

Mr. LOUD. If the gentleman had only paid attention to me without concentrating his mind upon the question he had to ask, he would have heard as plain an explanation of that as I am able to make to the House. If I have failed to make the gentleman from Tennessee understand—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from California is always interesting to me, and I try to hear him as well as I can. But the gentleman knows the difficulty we have in hearing every word that a member on the floor utters.

Mr. LOUD. You have been standing right there.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have heard everything the gentleman said since I have been standing here. I left my seat, 20 feet away, for the purpose of hearing the gentleman.

As I was remarking, the gentleman said a few minutes ago that he did not know how much the increased cost of the new star-route service was.

Mr. LOUD. Oh, I can give the exact figures if he wants them. I said it was about \$1,300,000.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The per cent is about 13 per cent. I did not at first hear those figures, and that is the reason I am trying to get an explanation from the gentleman.

Mr. LOUD. I have given the figures substantially. It is immaterial whether the exact amount was \$1,300,000 or \$1,400,000 or \$1,350,000. I said that the increase in this appropriation bill was much greater than it ever had been before. I stated that the appropriation had been substantially the same from 1885 to the fiscal year 1903; that it then took a sudden jump because of certain



new conditions which I sought to explain—the condition in Alaska, the condition imposed upon the contractors to deliver the mail to every resident on the route—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose.

Mr. LOUD. If the gentleman—provided he wants to find out the facts—will just pay attention to what I am saying and will not be too anxious to puncture my remarks with an interjection—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am not trying to puncture, but to listen; go ahead.

Mr. LOUD. Much of this increase comes from the service in Alaska. Much of it comes from the provision in the contracts compelling the contractor to deliver the mail to every person who lives along the route.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has not the mail service in Hawaii and Porto Rico helped to cause the increase?

Mr. LOUD. A very small part of the increase—probably not exceeding \$40,000; I do not think so much—has arisen from that cause.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much has been paid out during the last two years in those two Territories?

Mr. LOUD. For the star-route service?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. For the mail service.

Mr. LOUD. I should say not exceeding \$40,000. My impression is that it does not exceed \$20,000.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. In each of those Territories?

Mr. LOUD. No, both. It is a very small sum. I should say that \$40,000 is the extreme limit. There is not much star-route service in those islands. Now, you take inland mail transportation by steamboat routes, where we do business on a business basis. You will find that the expenditures in 1896 were \$389,854.18. Follow the years up until you get to 1900, and there you have an expenditure of \$497,938.04, and in 1901 \$508,444.48. There is where we feel the effect of the annexation of Porto Rico and Hawaii, because all of the service between those islands and the mainland is under the head of steamboat service. The line of segregation between steamboat service and ocean mail service is that ocean mail service is a foreign service, but all domestic service upon the water is known and graded under the head of inland mail transportation by steamboat routes.

Take the item of mail-messenger service. The expenditures in 1896 were \$1,175,741.11; in 1901, \$973,471.98; and if the gentlemen will follow it back through the years it will be found a constantly increasing service in mileage and the number of post-offices, with a very slight increase in the expenditures therefor. I thought it my duty, at least it was a pleasure to me, to submit, not so much to the House but to the country, certain thoughts that are in my mind regarding the increased expenditures of the Post-Office Department, which carry out, to my mind, the thought I have expressed many times before, that if the Post-Office Department was managed upon business principles we would have a very large surplus. That is all I have to suggest.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not read the bill, but I would like to know whether there is any provision made for pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. LOUD. I will say to the gentleman there is no such provision in the bill. Such a provision clearly, without proper legislation to guard it, would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman inform the committee whether his committee proposes to consider the question of appropriating by another bill for pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. LOUD. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that the committee have been considering that question, and after this bill is out of the way—you know we have been pretty busy the last week or ten days—we will immediately resume the consideration of that subject, which is before us in the shape of a bill.

Mr. BURKETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. BURKETT. I notice on page 15 of the bill and at the top of page 16 there is something about the carriers being hired by contract. Is not that the same matter that we have been discussing for a week?

Mr. LOUD. I would say to the gentleman that was reported in the Post-Office appropriation bill, and if I did not tell the House I think I ought to tell the House now how that was put upon the appropriation. I think I went over this question on another subject some time ago. Early in the session the Post-Office Committee realized, as we realized last winter, that legislation was necessary for the rural free-delivery service. We consulted such members, as the gentleman knows, without referring to them directly, as to what was best to do—to legislate on a bill by itself, that would have to go to the Senate and receive the signature of the President before it became a law, or to put the legislation on the appropriation bill with an appropriation of money.

In view of the fact that we had to legislate, that is, assuming

that we had a rural free-delivery service at all—because in the condition it was the objection of one gentleman on the floor could throw it out—we had the assurance and had the right to believe when this bill was reported that this legislation would be considered upon this appropriation bill; but lo and behold, when it was reported some opposition was made to giving a rule to consider it in this way; so you see it is here. It was immaterial whether we considered this on the appropriation bill or whether we considered it in a separate bill. Where it should have been considered was where the money is appropriated for the service. But possibly some acute gentleman thought that if on the reporting of this bill to the House the word would be sent, and permit me to say it was sent, over the country that the Committee on Rules, our leaders—not yours—our leaders, Republicans who mark out the course that we shall pursue in legislation, had turned the committee down and had refused to give us a rule, some benefit might come to the opponents of that measure. If they did not benefit from that, permit me to say they benefited in this, that they gained nearly a month's time until this great machine of the Government got to work.

Mr. BURKETT. What I want to know is what it is doing in here, and if it is the same matter.

Mr. LOUD. Why, it was there and we could not take it out until we got to it. It was there because of promises made and assurances given that a rule would be reported to consider it.

Mr. BURKETT. It is the intention to take it out after the decision on this point that was made yesterday?

Mr. LOUD. I will say, so far as the chairman of the Post-Office Committee is concerned, that he proposes to keep absolute faith with this House, and not to support any provision in this measure here that was not supported by the House yesterday.

Legislation makes very little difference to me personally. I, as chairman of the committee, and the members of the Post-Office Committee, give the House the benefit of our best judgment. It is our business to do that. If you refuse to take our judgment, we are at the service of the House, and we take your judgment when our judgment is turned down. I am speaking now for myself. I can not afford, and neither can any other man afford in any way to attempt to deceive this House. If he ever does it once he does not deserve and can not again command the confidence of the most humble member of this House.

Mr. BELLAMY. I see this bill calls for an appropriation of \$138,000,000, in round numbers, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Mr. BELLAMY. What increase is that over the appropriation for 1902? I see for 1901 it was \$115,000,000, according to the report, but I do not see the amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Mr. LOUD. The appropriation for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June next, commonly spoken of as the appropriation for the fiscal year 1902, is \$123,782,688.75.

Mr. BELLAMY. And the increase for 1903 is about \$15,000,000.

Mr. LOUD. Very nearly; \$14,133,000 and some odd.

Mr. BELLAMY. What is that increase for? There is only \$1,000,000 increase for the rural free-delivery service, is there?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, the appropriation for rural delivery service this year is nearly eight million dollars. For the current year the appropriation was three and a half million dollars, so you will see that there is an increase of nearly four and one-half million dollars for the rural-delivery service. This bill carries \$7,000,000 for the pay of rural carriers alone, and for the supervisory force there is an appropriation of about \$850,000, \$375,000 of which, however, is in the legislative appropriation bill. So, as I say, there is an increase of nearly four and a half million for rural delivery service, an increase of a million dollars for postmasters, an increase of \$2,700,000 for post-office clerks, an increase of a million dollars for railway-mail clerks, and those items pretty nearly make up the increase. There are, of course, increases in the item for the payment of railroads, and for other branches of the service.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. Will the gentleman explain a paragraph in the bill?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, I desire to yield the floor.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. On page 17, paragraph 4, appears the following:

For pay of letter carriers of rural free-delivery service, \$7,000,000. In all, for rural free-delivery service, \$7,529,400.

Then this is the language which I desire to have the gentleman explain:

Provided, That hereafter all mail service on rural free-delivery mail routes shall be performed by carriers designated pursuant to an advertisement inviting competitive bidding, except as herein otherwise provided:

First, That before any person shall be designated to carry the mail on any mail rural free-delivery route, the Postmaster-General shall cause an advertisement to be posted for not less than ten days, in a conspicuous place accessible to the public, in the post-office from which the mail is to be carried, inviting proposals, in such form as he may prescribe, for the service to be performed. The service shall be awarded to the lowest bidder.

Is not that practically the same provision that we voted upon and defeated yesterday in the House?

Mr. LOUD. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have just completed as full an explanation of that as it would be possible, I think, for even the gentleman from Tennessee to have given if he had the floor. I do not like to go over it again.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I did not hear one word of what he said.

Mr. LOUD. Why did not you come over and hear it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not wish to offend the gentleman.

Mr. LOUD. Let me say to the gentleman that he can not offend me. While lots of people make the statement here that LOUD is cross and is mad, and all that kind of business—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think the gentleman might have given me an answer before this if he had undertaken to do so.

Mr. LOUD (continuing). Nobody can offend me; but I have just completed an explanation of that very thing. That paragraph appears in the bill, I will say to the gentleman, because it was there when the bill was reported.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then it does refer to the contract system?

Mr. LOUD. Why, certainly it does; I have explained that fully already. Substantially the same provision is included in the appropriation bill that was in the bill that we disposed of yesterday. Remember that the appropriation bill was reported before that bill was even introduced, upon the assurance that a rule would be given to consider it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for explaining the paragraph. I did not understand it.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I will insert the following tables for the information of the House, and reserve the balance of my time, if I have any:

*Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, 1885 to 1901.*

COMPENSATION TO CLERKS IN POST-OFFICES, INCLUDING SUBSTITUTES, TEMPORARY CLERKS AND SEPARATING MAIL, AND ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS.

1885	\$4,878,568
1886	4,982,345
1887	5,391,620
1888	5,510,035
1889	5,926,840
1890	6,527,934
1891	7,361,983
1892	7,919,890
1893	8,338,651
1894	8,768,748
1895	9,414,135
1896	9,972,496
1897	10,374,568
1898	10,589,039
1899	11,095,554
1900	12,400,393
1901, including assistant postmasters	14,180,072
1901, assistant postmasters	1,359,333
1902, appropriation, including assistant postmasters	15,923,000
1902, appropriation, assistant postmasters	1,559,300
1903, estimated, including assistant postmasters	18,841,300
1903, estimated, assistant postmasters	1,701,500

RENT, LIGHT, AND FUEL

First and second classes:	
1885	\$464,464
1886	471,184
1887	476,819
1888	508,297
1889	544,704
1890	597,033
1891	645,083
1892	691,491
1893	738,717
Third class:	
1889	353,086
1890	424,925
1891	464,300
1892	514,635
1893	543,164
First, second, and third classes:	
1894	1,294,000
1895	1,424,000
1896	1,450,000
1897	1,506,000
1898	1,581,649
1899	1,695,596
1900	1,801,994
1901	1,942,692
Appropriation for 1902	2,100,000
Estimate for 1903	2,350,000

NECESSARY AND MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS, FIRST AND SECOND CLASS OFFICES.

1889	\$87,299
1890	109,342
1891	111,226
1892	119,784
1893	108,406
1894	113,758
1895	119,644
1896	142,489
1897	149,651
1898	146,531
1899	175,131
1900	196,109

1901	\$221,709
Appropriation for 1902	250,000
Estimated for 1903	250,000

*Expenditures of Post-Office Department, 1885 to 1901, inclusive.*

1885	\$50,046,235
1886	51,004,743
1887	53,006,194
1888	55,408,315
1889	62,317,119
1890	66,259,547
1891	73,059,519
1892	76,980,846
1893	81,581,681
1894	84,994,111
1895	87,170,551
1896	90,922,609
1897	94,077,242
1898	98,033,523
1899	101,632,160
1900	107,740,287
1901	115,554,920

*Stationery for the postal service.*

1890	\$51,971
1891	51,938
1892	53,019
1893	56,026
1894	32,488
1895	53,302
1896	49,902
1897	49,887
1898	54,915
1899	54,881
1900	64,991
1901	69,695
Appropriation for 1902	70,000
Estimate for 1903	70,000

*Wrapping twine.*

1890	\$78,033
1891	79,303
1892	84,783
1893	108,952
1894	81,603
1895	79,989
1896	79,936
1897	79,971
1898	84,990
1899	89,999
1900	100,000
1901	159,622
Appropriation for 1902	165,000
Estimate for 1903	125,000

*Star-route service.*

1885	\$5,403,250
1886	5,452,456
1890	5,320,732
1891	5,390,000
1892	5,534,957
1893	5,680,572
1894	5,596,855
1895	5,753,579
1896	5,596,221
1897	5,313,300
1898	5,286,614
1899	4,999,280
1900	5,041,338
1901	5,143,211
Appropriation for 1902	5,580,000
Estimate for 1903	6,715,000

*Inland mail transportation by steamboat routes.*

The appropriations for a series of years have been—

1896	\$420,000.00
1897	402,515.32
1898	424,000.00
1899	450,000.00
1900	515,000.00
1901	545,000.00
1902	586,000.00

The expenditures have been—

1896	389,854.18
1897	402,505.91
1898	418,635.14
1899	424,200.98
1900	497,938.04
1901	508,444.48

*Mail-messenger service.*

The appropriations for a series of years have been as follows:

1896	\$1,285,000.00
1897	1,130,000.00
1898	1,000,000.00
1899	950,000.00
1900	950,000.00
1901	950,000.00
1902	1,038,000.00

The expenditures have been—

1896	1,175,741.11
1897	950,886.63
1898	987,163.91
1899	907,698.25
1900	515,186.10
1901	973,471.98

*Mail bags, cord fasteners, etc.*

For a series of years the appropriations have been—

1897	\$345,000.00
1898	320,000.00
1899	275,000.00
1900	275,000.00
1901	275,000.00
1902	275,000.00

The expenditures have been—

1896	269,847.10
1897	341,965.16
1898	314,867.33
1899	274,624.42
1900	268,224.12
1901	265,477.86

Mr. GRIGGS. I yield one hour to my colleague [Mr. BRANTLEY].

Mr. BRANTLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no phase of the Cuban question but what presents a topic of interest and concern to the American people, but there is one phase of it that to-day overshadows all others in our concern, and that is the one presented by the problem of furnishing relief to that long-time unhappy island from the distressing economic condition in which we are assured it is about to become involved, and will be involved, unless relief is furnished. I do not question the existence of a condition in Cuba that calls for relief, nor do I question the duty of this Congress to furnish the relief needed, but, in what I shall say on this subject, I do not assume to speak for any member of this body other than myself.

I believe that the problems presented by Cuba's pressing need call for a free and honest discussion among us, in order that they may be wisely and justly solved, and so believing I enter upon this discussion to contribute what little, if anything, I can to that much to be desired end.

In my judgment, whatever the American Congress is going to do upon this important subject should be speedily done. If we are going to grant relief, it should be granted now, for it is needed now. If we are not going to grant it, then it is due to Cuba to let her know that fact, so that she may cease feeding upon an unfounded hope. It is also due to our own sugar producers and the commercial interests connected therewith to have the question of relief or no relief to Cuba speedily determined. The atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty, into which the agitation for a reduction plunges the sugar trade, does and will do more harm than can possibly be done by any reduction of the tariff on Cuban sugar that is at all likely to be made.

Let us, therefore, proceed to this discussion, and let us reach a determination of it with all reasonable and proper dispatch. I would venture to suggest, too, that in considering the question we should ever keep in mind the great principles of justice and equity in their comprehensive sense as applied to us as a nation dealing with Cuba, and also as applied to us as a Government dealing with matters affecting its own people, and having regard for the greatest good to the greatest number.

#### THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF OUR OFFICIALS.

In reaching our conclusions, if we purpose being influenced by the opinions of those officers of our Government charged with the duty and responsibility of studying and knowing, as well as caring for the needs of Cuba, we have ample authority from them for granting the relief that is prayed for.

President McKinley, in his message to us of December 5, 1899, said:

This nation has assumed before the world a grave responsibility for the future good government of Cuba. We have accepted a trust, the fulfillment of which calls for the sternest integrity of purpose and the exercise of the highest wisdom. The new Cuba yet to arise from the ashes of the past must needs be bound to us by ties of singular intimacy and strength if its enduring welfare is to be assured. Whether those ties shall be organic, or conventional, the destinies of Cuba are in some rightful form and manner irrevocably linked with our own, but how far, is for the future to determine in the ripeness of events.

President Roosevelt, in his annual message to us last December, said:

Elsewhere I have discussed the question of reciprocity. In the case of Cuba, however, there are weighty reasons of morality and of national interest why the policy should be held to have a peculiar application, and I most earnestly ask your attention to the wisdom, indeed to the vital need, of providing for a substantial reduction in the tariff duties on Cuban imports into the United States. Cuba has in her constitution affirmed what we desired—that she should stand in international matters in closer and more friendly relations with us than with any other power—and we are bound by every consideration of honor and expediency to pass commercial measures in the interest of her material well-being.

The Secretary of War, in his annual report for 1901, said:

Our present duty to Cuba can be performed by the making of such reciprocal tariff arrangements with her as President McKinley urged in his last words to his countrymen at Buffalo on the 5th of September. A reasonable reduction in our duties upon Cuban sugar and tobacco in exchange for fairly compensatory reductions of Cuban duties upon American products will answer the purpose, and I strongly urge that such an arrangement be promptly made.

And again:

Aside from the moral obligation to which we committed ourselves when we drove Spain out of Cuba, and aside from the ordinary considerations of

commercial advantage involved in a reciprocity treaty, there are the weightiest reasons of American public policy pointing in the same direction; for the peace of Cuba is necessary to the peace of the United States; the health of Cuba is necessary to the health of the United States; the independence of Cuba is necessary to the safety of the United States. The same considerations that led to the war with Spain now require that a commercial arrangement be made under which Cuba can live. The condition of the sugar and tobacco industries in Cuba is already such that the earliest possible action by Congress upon this subject is desirable.

Major-General Wood, military governor of Cuba, in an authorized statement recently published, said:

On the other hand, unless action is taken, and taken promptly, on the question of tariff reduction, Cuba will be a monument, not to the good effects of our intervention, but to the ruin which has followed the destruction of her great industry.

We may disagree among ourselves or with all these high officials as to the proper measure of relief that the Congress should grant to Cuba, or as to whether Congress should grant any relief whatever, but it does not seem to me that we can disagree, after reading the statements accompanying these recommendations, to the proposition that Cuba needs, and needs urgently and immediately, relief of some kind and from some source, and, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to say that I do not see how we can disassociate ourselves from an interest in the results to come to Cuba if relief be not granted her.

#### THE CONDITION AND NEEDS OF CUBA.

What Cuba wants and needs is a market for her products, and her chief want is a market for her sugar. Her sugar crop for 1901-2, it is estimated, will amount to something like 850,000 tons, and practically all of it raw sugar, as she refines but little of it. This crop must soon be put on the market, and it is now worth in New York only about 3½ cents per pound, out of which must come transportation and insurance charges, while the tariff on it is about 1.685 cents per pound, leaving only about 1.46 cents per pound with which to defray the expenses of cultivation, manufacturing, and all the charges incident to the business of making and selling sugar.

The marketing of it at this price means a great loss, the paralyzing effect of which will go into every avenue of life and trade in the island. Cuba, in her present condition, can not stand such a loss. She has neither resources or credit with which to meet it. In our 1899 census report of the island we find given "as an indication of the financial distress prevailing in the island" the figures showing that approximately 58 per cent of the rural real estate of the island is under mortgage and approximately 79 per cent of the city real estate is likewise mortgaged, in addition to an amount equal to 10 to 14 per cent of the entire value of all the real estate due as quitrents (censos).

This same report also says:

While the ten years' war was not without disastrous effects on the economic development of Cuba, they were trifling as compared with the war of 1895-1898, which resulted in a large decrease of population and of the wealth-producing power of the country. It may be said in general on a conservative estimate that the population of the island decreased 12 per cent and its wealth two-thirds.

Having no means, therefore, with which to meet the great loss that selling her sugar at less than the cost of production would entail upon her, having no way to counteract the fearfully devastating and demoralizing effect of this loss, and having no power to increase the market price of her sugar, she appeals to us to make such reduction of our tariff rate on her sugar as will enable her to avert the loss, and, if possible, give some profit to her people, so long famished and impoverished by her destructive wars.

#### THE EFFECT OF THE PLATT AMENDMENT.

Among those who oppose making the reduction in the tariff asked for, it is said—and with my knowledge I would say justly so—that the United States has always been Cuba's chief market for her sugar, and that there is now no discrimination in our tariff against her. Upon this statement the argument is made that if before our war with Spain she could pay our tariff, competing with other foreign countries, and live, she can do so now. I join issue on this argument, although I take no issue with the proposition that the United States, when it engaged in the glorious work of freeing Cuba from the oppression of Spain and when it completed that work by hauling down from Morro Castle the Spanish flag, never there to be unfurled again, did not thereby obligate itself to furnish alms to Cuba, to furnish her sustenance, or to furnish bread upon which her people might live.

Whatever obligation arose from the beneficent and humane acts of our Government in driving out of Cuba her Spanish oppressors were not obligations due from the United States. Our Government, however, whether wisely or unwisely, was not content with its great work of dethroning the power of Spain in Cuba. It went further, and as a condition precedent to finally bestowing the freedom and independence upon that unhappy island for which it had so long been struggling, required that there should be incorporated into the organic law of the island certain provisions

contained in what is known as the Platt amendment. Those provisions were as follows:

*Provided further*, That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution, which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

## I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization, or for military or naval purposes, or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

## II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

## III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

## IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

## V.

That the government of Cuba will execute and, as far as necessary, extend the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba as well as to the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

## VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

## VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

## VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

Now, whatever may be said for or against these provisions, they expressed the desire upon the part of our Government, to use the language of President Roosevelt, that Cuba "should stand in international matters in closer and more friendly relations with us than with any other power." She has acceded to our desire and has incorporated these provisions into the constitution that she has framed. No other country in the world has done so, and none other has been asked to do so. We therefore bear a different relation to Cuba from that borne by us to any other country in the world. We bear a different relation for many other reasons. Cuba is at our door. Any internal disturbance there affects us. Should an internecine war among her people occur, there would be the same reason for us to interfere that prompted us to end her war with Spain.

Should pestilence stalk abroad in her cities, there would be every reason for us to want to check and hold it there and keep it from our shores. Should any European power seek to invade her territory, or to wrest from her one single foot of her soil, we could not submit to it. We are interested, too, in having the work of freedom and independence, so well begun by us, carried to its full fruition. Of what avail would be the blood and treasure given with lavish hand by us for Cuba's cause if the end must be a weak and bankrupt government, a poverty-stricken people, and a dismantled, torn, and divided Cuba?

A happy and a prosperous people and a strong and efficient government must exist in Cuba before our war in her behalf will have accomplished the end for which it was waged and before we can expect her to live up to the obligations she assumed to us "to establish a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing international obligations."

It is idle to say that she can make commercial treaties of mutual concession with other countries and thereby acquire a market or markets for her products. Whatever country might be disposed to treat with her would be confronted with the knowledge that it could not enforce any demand against her without the consent of the United States. It would be confronted with the knowledge of the indissoluble union between her and the United States. It could not treat with her as a full, free, and independent sovereign, for, in the language of the Secretary of War, "Cuba has acquiesced in our right to say that she shall not put

herself in the hands of any other power, whatever her necessities." Under the first clause of the Platt amendment, no foreign power can, for any purpose—the collection of a just demand, the enforcement of a treaty obligation, or for any other pretext or cause—obtain lodgment in or control, permanently or temporarily, over any portion of the island.

The limitation that we put upon her power to contract a public indebtedness, the right given us to intervene in her affairs, and the other conditions imposed in the Platt amendment all detract from her sovereignty. I am not discussing the wisdom or unwisdom of these conditions, so far as the ultimate good of Cuba is concerned, but I am discussing them as affecting her efforts now to make treaty regulations with other countries in which she must promise something in order to receive something. I therefore return to my original proposition that it is idle to talk about her going to some other country to obtain the relief that she is now asking from us, even though we could close our eyes to the events of the last four years and feel justified in our own hearts in closing our doors and turning our backs upon her and sending her out in the world to ask and receive alms wherever she might.

## THE SUGAR OF THE WORLD.

Eliminating, however, the question as to whether or not, under the Platt amendment, Cuba remains free and untrammelled to negotiate treaties and enter into contractual relations with other countries, and assuming, if you please, that she is free as the air to go where she pleases and contract where she pleases, we find that, with or without the Platt amendment, there is no place in all the wide world, except to us, that she can go to sell her sugar. We are bound to get her sugar. We are bound to use her sugar. She can not refuse it to us, if she would, and the question is, Shall we pay her a price for it at which she can live, or will we take it at a price at which she must starve? She can not compel us. She can not coerce us. The power is in our hands, absolute and complete, to make or destroy her, and the only thing to determine is, How shall we use our power?

When we examine into the present situation, we find that when our present tariff laws were first imposed and before Cuba could pay the rate of duty we exacted from her, but she can not do so now. The trouble is easily stated. There is in the world to-day an immense overproduction of sugar. It is estimated that for this year the overproduction will not be less than 1,500,000 tons. This overproduction has of necessity depressed the price, and to-day the price is abnormally low. The whole sugar world feels the depression, but Cuba feels it more, and the depression is more disastrous to her than to almost any other part of the world. It is patent that she is in a worse condition than are the sugar producers of the United States, for they do not have to pay the 1.685 cents duty which she has to pay and which in itself is more money than Cuba receives net for her sugar.

She must sell in the United States and at the same price as our own producers sell, and out of this price must pay this enormous duty. What is said of our own producers applies also to the producers in the Hawaiian Islands and Porto Rico, whose sugar comes in free of duty. It takes no argument, therefore, to demonstrate that, so far as any of these producers are concerned, in the present low state of the market Cuba is in infinitely worse condition than they are. So far as the rest of the sugar-producing world is concerned her condition is no better, for when she undertakes to compete with the beet-sugar producers of Germany, Austria, France, Russia, and other countries across the water she finds them protected by a system of bounties and cartels under which they are enabled to sell sugar in foreign countries at a price far below the actual cost of making it.

How can Cuba, impoverished by a long war, with a new government just being established, with no funds, protect her producers in any such way? In order to compete with these bounty countries she would have to resort to bounties, and this is of course an impossibility now for her to do, and I for one hope, however able she may become, that she will never resort to them. She can not sell sugar to the beet-sugar producing countries, for, with their bounties and cartels and their tariffs, they have effectively shut her out. They have with equal effectiveness shut her out of the nonsugar-producing countries.

If she goes to England, she finds the Englishman eating German sugar at 2 cents per pound, the same sugar that the German consumer in his own country must pay 8 cents per pound for. This is what the bounty and the cartel has done for the German consumer. It has taxed him with taxes upon taxes, in order that the German producer of sugar and the German refiner might flourish and might carry their goods into all the countries of the world. The end of this unrighteous and unjust system of taxation has not yet come, but already the mutterings of the people against it are being heard, already its destroying effects are being felt, already the trouble and disaster that must result from it are beginning to appear, and some day, soon or late, I know not when, the German people and all other bounty-ridden people are going

to revolt. The prospect of their revolt, however, does not help Cuba. Her trouble is now, and the relief she wants is not in the future, but in the present.

It is interesting to note, in connection with bounties, the rapid growth in the production of sugar throughout the world, and the comparison between the growth of cane sugar and beet sugar. Going back to the year 1853-54, we find a total production of 1,277,000 tons of cane sugar and 304,000 tons of beet sugar, or more than four times as much cane sugar as beet sugar. From that date on the total production has increased year by year, but year by year the percentage of increase of beet sugar has been greater than that of cane sugar, until, coming down to the year 1901-2, we find the estimates to be 3,850,000 tons of cane sugar as against 6,860,000 tons of beet sugar, an increase in the production of cane sugar during the forty-eight years of 201 per cent and in beet sugar of 3,263 per cent, and a total increase of all sugar of 637 per cent.

We find, too, that while Cuba in one year, 1894, produced slightly more than 1,000,000 tons of sugar—the highest production in her history—yet that in the depression and disturbances caused by her last war her production decreased, and in one year, 1899, she only produced 308,000 tons. We note, however, that during the period in which her production was less, and the sum total of cane sugar produced was thereby decreased, that the production of beet sugar throughout the world was steadily increasing, so that when Cuba comes this year with a crop of sugar, estimated at about 850,000 tons, she finds no place to market it. She finds enough sugar to feed the world and 650,000 tons to spare. Her sugar is not only not needed for consumption anywhere, but, in addition to her 850,000 tons not needed, she finds 650,000 other tons that the consuming world has no use for, and she also finds that by means of bounties and tariffs the markets of the world, overburdened as they are, are completely closed to her.

#### CUBA'S FINANCIAL CONDITION AND OUR DUTY TO HER.

This statement, however, does not complete the statement of her deplorable condition. Her total exports for the year 1899 were \$49,967,188, and of this amount her sugar exports represented \$19,330,847. In 1900, out of total exports amounting to \$51,391,095, her sugar furnished \$17,528,815 of it, and in 1901 she exported \$32,033,830 worth of sugar, while her total exports amounted to only \$86,505,491. It will be remembered that these three years represent the period of her lowest sugar production, so that we can well understand how, under conditions approaching the normal, sugar represents half, if not more, of her total exports. With one-half, then, of her total output now to be sold at a loss, her condition could not be anything but deplorable.

The figures speak more eloquently of her needs than words and phrases, however well selected or however skillfully put together, could possibly speak. There are still other figures that appeal for her, for in these same three years she imported and was compelled to import goods in excess of what she exported to an amount in the three years exceeding the sum of \$40,000,000. The balance of trade was against her to that extent. She bought and was compelled to buy, in excess of what she sold, more than \$40,000,000.

In the face of all these figures, in the face of conditions that I have endeavored to describe, can anyone question the sincerity, the righteousness, or the justice of the recommendations for concessions to Cuba that have come to us from the President and from our officers beneath him who have been charged by us with the duty of safeguarding Cuba? In the face of these facts, can any one doubt the honesty of the Cuban appeal?

With her condition fully pictured to and understood by us, and with the glorious record of the great achievements in her behalf that the American people, in humanity's name, have already performed, can we stop now and turn the other way? Must we not go on until the means to live and the means to work have been placed in her hands? What greater mockery than gaunt and hungry Freedom, than weak and starving Liberty? The crimson is yet upon San Juan Hill, the smoke of battle still lingers over Santiago Bay—the deeds there done live in reality and have not yet reached the age of memory. They command us that the liberty for which they were wrought shall take the form of the goddess we love, and not be left a hideous deformity.

#### THE OBJECTION TO HELPING CUBA, AND THE TARIFF.

What objection is there to heeding Cuba's appeal? What objection is there to adopting the urgent recommendation of the President? Who, in all this broad, rich land denies the need of Cuba, or our duty to relieve that need? Does the objection come from the body of the great American people? Does it come from the same generous, patriotic hearts that four years ago offered to do and to die that Cuba might be free? Be it said to the everlasting credit of the American heart, No! many times No! I would not assail the patriotism, the generosity, or the American manhood of those who make the objection. I recognize in them a valuable, necessary, and patriotic part of our citizenry. I believe

they are prompted to their objection—some of them, at least—by an honest apprehension of serious injury to their business—the making of sugar.

Some of them—I do not know how many—may be prompted by greed alone. This spirit of greed—perhaps self-interest would be a more polite term—is not confined to our sugar producers alone. I do not know of one single tariff-fed, tariff-protected class in all our land—I care not how high the tariff or how rich the protected class—but what would rise in arms—and they would be strong arms, too—to protest against any, even the slightest, reduction of that tariff. I know, too, the potent influence of that protest. I see protected classes to-day using the tariff to sell to American consumers at higher prices than they sell to foreign consumers, using the principle of the German cartel that we condemn; and there are none to say them nay.

I saw them restrain an American Congress from doing that which one high in authority said was its "plain duty" to do. I saw their representatives swarm before our highest judicial tribunal when the "insular cases" were being argued. I noted what was said of their presence by the Chief Justice in his great dissenting opinion. He said: "Briefs have been presented at this bar purporting to be on behalf of certain industries and eloquently setting forth the desirability that our Government should possess the power to impose a tariff on the products of newly acquired territories so as to diminish or remove competition." I noted also the revolutionary opinion of the court in these historic cases, revolutionary certainly in overturning the long-settled policy of our Government, if not, as many of us believe, in changing the plain meaning of the Constitution.

Who can blame the sugar producers from traveling along the path that they and so many others have so successfully trod in the past? I am not here to criticize them, for it is the system and not those who make use of it that merit most our condemnation.

The charm, the fascination, and the profit of protection to those who have it none can gainsay. A taste of it but whets the appetite for more, and the recipient of it, however brief the period, becomes a veteran in its defense. Witness the Hawaiian Islands ever since we gave them free trade, and even little Porto Rico, only recently favored by us, protesting against any concession to Cuban sugar. The leaven of protection has worked speedily and well, and now, with these possessions, the one great duty of the American Government is to feed them out of the protection spoon. Sympathy and tears they may have for Cuba, but Cuban sugar must not compete with their sugar. Their isolation and their suffering are all things of the past. The memory of them has gone. They only know that their market has been found—let other people find one the best they can.

#### A REDUCTION WILL NOT INJURE OUR SUGAR PRODUCERS.

But the time is not opportune to discuss the doctrine of protection, except as an incident. For the purpose of my contention and my argument to-day I am content that it be admitted that our beet-sugar producers and our cane-sugar producers are entitled to protection, and even to the extent that they now receive it. My position is that the fears of Cuban sugar, by those of them who are honest in that fear, is unfounded, and upon the others I have neither time nor patience to waste. I maintain that a reasonable concession on Cuban sugar, enough to grant the needed relief to Cuba, will not and can not affect them. The situation is simple and easily understood.

The total consumption of sugar in the United States for the year 1901 was 2,372,316 pounds. The average annual increase of consumption for the past twenty years is nearly 7 per cent, so that the consumption for 1902 will be in excess of that for 1901, probably less than 7 per cent, but some considerable increase. Now, the total yield of sugar in the United States for the present year is estimated to be, from cane sugar, about 300,000 tons; from beet sugar, about 150,000 tons; or a total of 450,000 tons. From the Hawaiian Islands it is estimated that we will get about 300,000 and from Porto Rico about 100,000 tons, making all told about 850,000 tons, or only about one-third of our actual consumption; so that if all the Cuban sugar made this year, amounting to about 850,000 tons, comes in, we will still have to buy from other sugar-producing countries 700,000 to 800,000 additional tons.

We have duties against all sugars and duties and countervailing duties against all bounty sugars. Then how are our domestic producers to be hurt by a concession to Cuban sugar? So long as we get no more sugar from Cuba than, added to our domestic production, we can consume, how is anyone to be injuriously affected?

#### THE FEARS OF OUR SUGAR PRODUCERS.

Our friends, the domestic producers, realize the force of this answer, given from the protectionist standpoint to their objections, and how do they meet it? They procure experts who, upon hypothetical data and assumptions, figure out that an increased price to Cuba for her sugar will so stimulate its production that

ten years from now she will produce more than 2,000,000 tons, and twenty years hence a great deal more than that, and it is against this estimated increased production that the domestic producer now asks, ten and twenty years in advance, that he be protected.

I would like to know what we have to do to-day with the production of sugar in Cuba ten or twenty years from now. We are dealing with the Cuba of to-day and the immediate future. We want to help her now. Ten years from now she, in all probability, will not need the help of our tariff. If we reduce our tariff to her to-day, does that mean that it must stay perpetually reduced? No tariff law was ever made for time and eternity. The McKinley tariff, giving free trade and bounties to sugar, came into life in 1890 and died in 1894. The Wilson tariff, with its 40 per cent ad valorem duty on sugar, only lived from 1894 to 1897.

The Dingley tariff, established in 1897, is already showing signs of decay. Only a few days ago we witnessed in this House the spectacle of its autocratic rulers forcing the passage of a bill repealing the war taxes under a rule that prohibited the offering of a single amendment or even a motion to recommit, and all because they feared that under a less strenuous rule the Dingley tariff would be butchered in the house of its friends. The conditions that may exist in Cuba two, four, or ten years from now or that may exist in our country at that time will be taken care of as they arise. We can not evade our duty of to-day through fear of future conditions any more than we can legislate to-day to meet those future conditions.

When we come to consider further the fears of the domestic producer, it will be well to remember that his fear is easily aroused and has become chronic. Away back in 1876, when it was first proposed to admit Hawaiian sugar free of duty, our cane-sugar producers feared that such action by our Government would stamp out their industry and wipe them out of existence, a fear that was as silly as it was unfounded. When the framers of the McKinley tariff proposed to let in free all sugar below a certain grade, and to pay a bounty of 2 cents to our sugar producers, a distinguished gentleman (Governor Warmoth), representing the cane-sugar interests of Louisiana, said this action would destroy the cane-sugar industry.

His fear was that a direct bounty would not be long continued, and that its effect would be to disclose the fact that a protective tariff was but a bounty and the people would protest against that tariff and destroy it. How poorly founded his fear was is shown in the enormous duty that seven years later the Dingley tariff gave him. The fears of the sugar people are close to the surface, and any suggestion of a change in the tariff quickly brings them to view. But as their fears of Hawaiian sugar and their fears of the bounty alike proved groundless, so will their fears of the pending proposition prove equally groundless. They have not only survived their past fears, but they survived the 40 per cent ad valorem duty under the Wilson bill, and yet to-day they seek to excite our interest upon the expressed alarm that any concession to Cuba, even a 10 per cent reduction, would destroy them root and branch.

#### THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

Examination into the status of the beet-sugar industry shows 41 factories in operation in our country and 9 getting ready for next year's crop, according to the report of Mr. Saylor, the special agent of the Department of Agriculture to investigate the beet-sugar industry. He furnishes also a list of 100 additional factories in contemplation, or as reasonable possibilities in the near future, and claims that they represent a proposed investment of capital amounting to \$49,000,000.

A further examination shows us that each new factory to be organized always issues a bright and glowing prospectus, showing ample returns assured to investors in the stock. One is privileged to believe, from the capital already invested in beet-sugar manufacturing and from the new capital going into it and the invitation to still more capital to enter, that it has been found to be a profitable industry, and yet if we listen now to the tales of woe and distress as to the condition of that business, when it is proposed to make some concession to Cuba, the marvel is that anyone is engaged in it at all. The fears of the sugar people seem centered in and around and about the tariff, and the higher the tariff the keener and more sensitive the fear at any suggestion of reducing it.

The wonder of the age is that \$49,000,000 additional capital is preparing to enter the manufacture of beet sugar if it be true, as claimed by some of those in the business, that any concession to Cuba, even a 10 per cent reduction, would wipe the industry off the face of the earth. I had not been taught to believe that capital was prone to enter upon such an uninviting and uncertain field. The sugar producers also, while telling us that reducing the duty on Cuban sugar will lower the price of sugar in the United States and thereby injure them, tell us at the same time that the price of sugar the world over is made by the price of

beet sugar at Hamburg. It seems to me, if this latter statement be true—and I assume that it is—that when the Hamburg market fixes the price it takes into consideration the quantity of Cuban sugar in existence, and whether that sugar comes into the United States at one rate or at another can have but little effect in fixing the price.

#### THE SUGAR TRUST.

Our sugar producer has not exhausted his arguments when he denies that Cuba needs relief and claims that any proposed relief will ruin him. He goes further and charges that any reduction in the tariff, ostensibly for Cuba, will not benefit Cuba, but will all go to swell the coffers of the American sugar refiners, known as the sugar trust. If this claim be true, then I assume—I trust it is not a violent assumption—that no member of this body would vote for the reduction.

If it be true, then pitiable indeed is our condition and that of the American people. If it be true that the American Congress is so impotent and helpless, is so encompassed and surrounded by the trust, that it has not the power to respond to the generous impulse in humanity's name of the great people whom it represents, then, bad as is the condition of Cuba, infinitely worse is ours. If this be our condition, the quicker we know it the better. If this Congress, acting from high and lofty motives, grants the relief prayed for to Cuba, and that relief is diverted from Cuba into the pockets of the trust and Cuba left to starve, then I believe that deed will mark the beginning of the final overthrow of the trust. There is a limit, beyond which the trust can not go, and that limit will be reached, when, with ghoulish greed, it robs the starving of the sustenance offered by a generous people.

For my part, I am willing to vote a reduction in the tariff to Cuba, in the belief that the benefit will go where it is intended.

I know it is suggested that if the reduction is made on raw sugar—and that is practically the only kind of sugar that Cuba has—that the sugar refiners here composing the trust, and being the only purchasers for it, will get the benefit of the reduction, because they will play the producers of other countries against the Cuban producers and thereby force Cuba, in order to sell at all, to concede the amount of the tariff reduction in the price that she will get.

I have heard it also vaguely suggested that the sugar trust has already bought the present crop of Cuban sugar, and for that reason that any reduction made in the tariff will go entirely to it. It seems to me, however, that in order to believe these things we must charge either gross ignorance or excessive bad faith, not only to the various commercial bodies and leading men in Cuba's official and business life who are daily urging the reduction, but as well to our own trusted officials in the highest stations at home and in Cuba, who urge it and recommend it for and on behalf of the Cubans.

I am not ready to accept the claim of ignorance or the charge of bad faith that is thus implied. In this connection, but a few days ago—on the 1st instant—there appeared in the public press a letter written from Cuba by Bishop Warren A. Candler, of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, one of the ablest men and closest observers and clearest thinkers in or out of his church. He is now in Cuba, and in that letter he said:

If the well-nigh unanimous judgment of all intelligent observers in the island may be accepted as correct, the situation in Cuba urgently requires immediate relief by the reduction of the duties now imposed upon Cuban products imported into the United States. If there is anybody who dissents from this view, I have not met him since coming here, although I have talked with men of all classes, foreign and native, from Habana to Cienfuegos.

This statement is very far from disclosing that the sugar trust owns all the sugar in Cuba and that the people there have no interest in its price. I beg to quote the bishop further as to only one of the results to follow a failure upon our part to grant relief to Cuba:

Under the military government over \$2,000,000 are annually spent on public education. When Cuba's own government is set up it will be difficult to maintain the schools now in existence, even under the most favorable conditions. But if the present tariff rates are to be maintained by our Government these schools must die outright for lack of funds to sustain them.

As to where the benefit of the reduction will go, I am very much inclined to trust to the faith of those in Cuba who implore us to grant it. If the people in Cuba who have spent their lives making and selling sugar have any knowledge of anything it is a knowledge of tariffs. They have made and sold sugar to us under all our tariffs, and they have been as diligent students of our tariff laws, although from a different standpoint, as have our own producers. They ask for the reduction in the confident belief that they will be benefited by it, and I am willing to be guided by their faith in this regard, until it has been proven to be unfounded.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON. As a Democrat, would the gentleman be in favor of removing all duty from raw sugar from Cuba?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I will state to the gentleman that so far as I am concerned, if I had an opportunity to vote a reduction all along the line, so that I could vote to our sugar producer a reduction upon the things he has to buy as well as upon what he has to sell, I would make the reduction much lower than I might make it now.

Mr. HAMILTON. Would the gentleman remove the duty entirely from Cuban raw sugar?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I am not in favor of reducing the duty on raw sugar any further at this time than is necessary to give relief to Cuba.

Mr. HAMILTON. How much would the gentleman estimate would be necessary?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I should say that it ought to be reduced not less than 33½ per cent at this time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Are there any other Cuban products from which the gentleman would remove the duty?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I would remove it on all, from 33½ to 50 per cent.

Mr. HAMILTON. How about the duty on German sugar?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will just pause a moment, I was coming to the question of refined sugar; and, if he will pardon me, I will get to that.

Mr. HAMILTON. Then the gentleman does not believe in absolute free trade, but simply to reduce the duty about 33½ per cent?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I am not a free trader any more than I am a protectionist. I believe in a duty for revenue; and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that so long as we maintain the high Dingley tariff upon every article that the sugar producer in this country has to buy it would be unjust to him if the duty upon his product is put too low. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman will pardon me the interruption. I simply wanted to get his views.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I was perfectly willing to yield to the gentleman. If he will allow me, I will now state what I was about to say about refined sugar.

It seems to me that the only way by which the refiners could profit by reducing the price of raw sugar purchased from the Cubans, after the reduction in the tariff is made, would be by maintaining the price of refined sugar to their customers. In other words, if simultaneously with the reduction of the price on raw sugar a similar reduction is made in the price of refined sugar, the refiner has not profited at all by the reduction. If, however, the price of the raw sugar is reduced and the price of refined sugar is not, then by whatever the reduction in the price of raw sugar amounts to the refiner has profited.

The question, therefore, as to whether or not the refiners will get the benefit of a reduction to Cuba of the tariff on her raw sugar all hinges upon their ability to maintain the price of refined sugar; and as to whether or not they can maintain the price of refined sugar, I submit, is entirely in the hands of the Congress. It is perfectly clear that the only way for the refiners to maintain the price of refined sugar is through and by the tariff fixed by Congress on refined sugar. Congress, it appears, has always been good to the sugar refiner. In framing the sugar schedules of our tariff laws, care has always been taken to let the raw sugar in and keep the refined sugar out.

The result has been that the American market has been secured to the American refiners to the practical exclusion of the foreign refiners, and this in turn has resulted in the sugar trust. The trust, therefore, is the direct creature of the sugar tariff, and whether this trust shall live or die, or whether it shall rob Cuba of that which we intend to give her, can be determined at any time by the Congress. Should the reduction to Cuba be made, and should it appear that the trust and not Cuba was getting the benefit of it, the remedy is in our hands. We have but to reduce the tariff on refined sugar and open the trust to the competition of the foreign refiners and the deed is done. With such a power in the hands of Congress, why should Congress fear the trust? The beet-sugar producers have not suggested the use of this power in order to help Cuba, and I apprehend that they have not because they happen to be refiners of sugar themselves. The power exists, however, and appears to be ample to prevent any perversion of justice in the matter we are considering.

#### REDUCTION SHOULD ONLY BE ENOUGH TO RELIEVE CUBA.

I think the reduction of our tariff to Cuba should be made, and from all the evidence accessible to me I do not think we will accomplish what we seek to accomplish by a less reduction than 33½ per cent, and I believe that 50 per cent would be better. A reduction of 33½ per cent at the present price of sugar would give the Cuban producer net for his sugar about 2.02 cents per pound, barely amounting to, if it really does amount to, the actual cost of production, while a reduction of 50 per cent would cause his sugar to net him about 2.3 cents per pound, giving him probably a small amount of profit. So far as I am concerned, I have no

disposition to agitate at this time for any further reduction than is necessary to supply Cuba with the needful funds to enable her to develop her resources and perform her obligations to us and to the world. Beyond this I do not feel any duty at this time compelling me to go.

I have no desire to injure any class of our people, or even to seem to do so, and I believe that before we throw any of our producers into competition, on equal terms, with the producers of Cuba or the world we should first take down the bars of our tariff that operate to increase the price of the material and supplies necessary for them to buy. To-day we have no opportunity to reduce the tariff on anything that our sugar people have to buy, and, therefore, I am content to go no farther in reduction than is necessary to accomplish the stated ends we have in view, and I am firm in the belief that we can go this far with great benefit to all and without injury to anyone, as I purpose hereafter to demonstrate.

#### NO REASON TO RESTRICT CUBA'S IMMIGRATION.

Nor do I see any reason in making this reduction to require Cuba at this time to adopt our immigration laws. The only reason assigned for requiring her to do so of which I am aware is the fear that in her haste to develop her sugar industry to large proportions she will import an undesirable class of cheap labor, against which the labor of this country ought not to be required to compete. To my mind, so long as Cuba does not send to us enough sugar when added to our own production to supply our own consumption, it is immaterial to us with what kind of labor she makes that which she does send, and when she sends enough sugar that, added to our own production, will more than supply our own consumption, then I apprehend our sugar producers will complain, regardless of the kind of labor with which she produces it; so that at the present time, at least, I fail to see why we should disturb ourselves about her immigration laws.

Indeed, I think that, so far from making new exactions of Cuba, it is time to call a halt in dictating to her the kind of laws that she must enact about anything, and least of all do I think we should dictate to her about her citizenship. The problem of her citizenship is one of great moment to her. Her population is now reduced and she must necessarily devise ways and means to augment it. With a population of only a million and a half, where she can easily maintain a population of ten to twelve millions or more, the time is not opportune to forestall her efforts to rise to the occasion and necessities that confront her by placing a still further limitation upon the power of her government to think and act for the people subject to it.

If Cuba is ever to have the stable and independent government that we planned for her, then at some time something must be left to the wisdom and the patriotism and the statesmanship of the island. In this particular matter the record of Cuba does not show that we have anything to fear, at this time at least, from her citizenship.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman says he would make a reduction on the imports from Cuba for the relief of Cuba or the people of Cuba.

Mr. BRANTLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman not know from the statements made to the Committee on Ways and Means that labor is scarce in Cuba; that the wages have never been so high before; that there is now a most bountiful crop, and that there is no suffering in existence to-day in Cuba?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I have read all the evidence submitted to the Ways and Means Committee, and if my friend had done the same he would not have asked me that question—

Mr. FORDNEY. I have done the same.

Mr. BRANTLEY (continuing). Because the situation in Cuba that confronts us is not so much what exists to-day, but what must exist when she puts her present crop of 850,000 tons of sugar on the market.

Mr. FORDNEY. Did not the testimony show that the crop will be marketed and out of the way by the 15th of March?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I know that crop is being held back in the hope of getting something for it, so that these people can get some of the money out of it that they have put into it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman know whether that will affect the cane raiser and sugar producer?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I can not tell, Mr. Chairman, how many people it will affect; but I do know, and perhaps know as much about it as my friend does, that these people will be plunged into distress whenever their 850,000 tons of sugar are sold at the enormous loss that they will have to be sold at if sold at the present market price.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to make one correction. I do not pretend to know all about it. I

am taking it from the testimony of Mr. Atkins, who claimed to be the owner of a plantation that yielded 12,000 tons, and president of another concern that produced 15,000 tons, and it was stated in his statement that unless the relief was given by the 15th day of March it would not do the producers of the present crop any good.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I will refer my friend to the calendar and let him see whether or not the 15th of March has arrived.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON. By whom is the cane-growing land in Cuba mostly owned, natives or foreigners?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wants to discuss that question, I am perfectly willing that he give his understanding of it in his own time.

Mr. HAMILTON. I ask for information.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I have some little knowledge of that, not only from the testimony, but from personal observation on the island, and among other things I know that there are a great many small planters on the islands who raise cane and send their cane to those people who own the mills. I can not give the number. I can not even give an approximate estimate.

Mr. HAMILTON. Can the gentleman give the proportion of acreage owned by native Cubans as compared with foreigners?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I can not give those figures. The Secretary of War was asked some little time ago, by a resolution of this House, to give them, and if he has furnished them I have not seen them.

Mr. HAMILTON. Is it not a fact that five-eighths of the sugar produced is on land owned by American planters, as shown by the testimony?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Not that I know of, sir.

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman will pardon the interruption.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I have no objection to the interruption.

Mr. Chairman, I was discussing the question of immigration. The report on her census for 1899, prepared by our War Department, says:

The native whites constituted 57.8 per cent or considerably more than one-half of the population of Cuba. The foreign whites constituted but 9 per cent; the colored, including the negro and mixed element, amounted only to 32 per cent, or less than one-third, while the proportion of Chinese was trifling, being less than 1 per cent.

The report also says:

While the statistics of Cuba show a larger proportion of colored than white criminals, the colored population is in some respects superior to the colored population of the Southern States, being more self-reliant, temperate, frugal, and intelligent, and since the abolition of slavery showing a strong desire to own their homes, to educate their children, and to improve their condition.

The history of Cuba also shows that she has in the past experimented with Chinese labor, and presumably without profit, as the quotation made above shows that the Chinese have practically disappeared from the island.

In the face, then, of this record and of existing conditions I see no reason now, even if we were charged with a duty in the premises, to fear that Cuba will fill up with an undesirable citizenship, and nothing to justify us in adding a new limitation to her sovereignty or in expressing a new distrust of the ability and patriotism of her statesmen to legislate wisely for her people.

#### AMERICANS IN CUBA.

I also fail to see any argument against making the reduction asked for because certain American citizens may have become interested in making sugar in Cuba. The fact of their citizenship here is scarcely a reason for their own Government to refuse to do justice to them, and we must realize that every dollar invested by them in Cuba helps to develop the island. Cuba needs immigrants, but more than immigrants she needs capital, and, in my judgment, we have not only no moral right to interpose a bar to capital going there, but we should take down a few of the bars that already exist, and to that extent help on the day that will see Cuba a prosperous country, regulated and controlled by its own "stable and independent" government.

#### REBATES.

The most effective way to remove some of the bars and to bring the now needed relief, and, in my judgment, the only way, is by a reduction in our duties. No system of rebates that has so far been suggested can accomplish the desired end. I do not desire to enter upon any discussion of this phase of the matter further than to suggest that our Constitution, in Article I, section 8, limits the power of Congress to lay taxes, duties, and excises to three specific objects—to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, and to call attention to my belief that laying a duty on Cuban sugar, collecting it, and then donating any part of the amount so collected either to the Cuban government or to the Cuban planters would not be the laying of a duty either to pay the debts or to provide for the

common defense or for the general welfare of the United States, however much it might be for the welfare of Cuba.

I want to suggest also that no equitable plan could possibly be devised by us by which the money we might so donate would be fairly distributed among the Cuban planters, and, further, that any system of rebates is lacking in the elements of mutual concession that constitute true reciprocity.

#### RECIPROCAL DUTIES BY CUBA.

The one condition that I think we should add to our reduction of the tariff is the condition requiring a reciprocal reduction by Cuba in her tariff rates to us, so that in exchange for our furnishing a market to her she shall open her market to us. This condition she is not only willing to accede to, but it is her own proposition, and I desire now to speak briefly of this condition.

So far my discussion has been from the standpoint of our duty as a nation, from the standpoint of Cuba, and from the standpoint of our own sugar producers. I have endeavored to demonstrate that from the standpoint of duty—moral duty—our course is plain, and that we ought to make the concession. I have endeavored to demonstrate that such a concession would not for the present, at least, injure our sugar producers. The question, however, is susceptible of a much broader treatment than I have as yet given it. I have so far only considered the rights of our sugar producers and of the Cubans. I have ignored all of our other producers and all of our consumers.

When we consider that less than 1 per cent of the people of the United States are interested in the cultivation of sugar—probably considerably less than one-half of 1 per cent are interested—we not only have the right but it is our duty to inquire into the rights of the remaining more than 99 per cent of our people in any proposition affecting the commercial relations of the United States with a foreign country. When we consider, too, that our entire population are sugar consumers, have not the consumers some rights, even as to sugar, as against the less than 1 per cent of producers? The question grows more interesting when we find that the per capita consumption of sugar in the United States last year was 68.4 pounds, while in Germany it was only 33.9 pounds, in France 36.9 pounds, in Holland 32.4 pounds, and in Russia only 14 pounds.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON. If the gentleman had to decide in a commercial matter affecting his own State of Georgia and affecting Cuba, in favor of which would he decide?

Mr. BRANTLEY. In favor of Georgia. But I will say to the gentleman I am not confronted by any such condition; neither is my friend from Michigan in his own State.

Mr. HAMILTON. I would not interrupt the gentleman except that his position—

Mr. BRANTLEY. I do not object to the interruption. Of course, it is only my opinion that it does not affect the gentleman's State.

Mr. HAMILTON. I am much interested in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BRANTLEY. We are the greatest sugar consumers in the world and only produce about one-third of what we consume, including that which comes to us from our island possessions; while Germany produces three times as much as she consumes and exports two-thirds of it, and France, Russia, Austria, Belgium, and other countries are all exporters of sugar. This statement, I think, clearly reveals a substantial interest on the part of our sugar consumers in this question.

#### THE ADVANTAGES OF RECIPROACITY.

Now, Cuba has not come to us seeking alms, she has not come as a supplicant at our door begging bread, she has not come beseeching us to perform a duty to her for which she is to give nothing in return. Upon the contrary, she comes with plentiful acknowledgment of all that she owes us, and while she asks us for a market for her products, she proffers to give us dollar for dollar for all that this market means to her. It is not for alms, but for reciprocity that she pleads. She asks a concession in our tariff to her, and she will give a concession in her tariff to us.

The reciprocity she wants has been a cardinal principle in the Democratic faith from the day of Jefferson, and it was for reciprocity that our late lamented President plead in his last public address. A reciprocity that has its beginning and its ending in the action of the President and the Senate, without reference to the House, is not, in my judgment, in consonance with the true functions of the House or in keeping with the true theory of a representative government; but a reciprocity in which the Congress and the President concur should be the aim of all who seek enlarged markets, increased trade, and the growth and extension of our commerce with the world.

But, returning to reciprocity with Cuba, an extended market for all our producers, an enlarged trade for all our country, is a



question of far greater importance than the market and the trade of one small class of our citizens. Let us see, then, what Cuba has to offer us and what she does offer us in the way of trade in exchange for the concessions that she asks. Her total imports for the year ending June 30, 1901, were \$65,050,141, and of this the United States furnished \$28,078,702, leaving approximately \$37,000,000 imported by Cuba from other countries.

All this, or the major part of it, she proposes giving us by a discriminating tariff in our favor, in exchange for a discriminating tariff by us in her favor; and if our own sugar producers are even partially correct as to the strides that Cuban commerce will make under an increased price for its largest commodity, and if the Cubans have not many, many times overstated what their commerce can do under more favorable conditions, then these figures of \$37,000,000 of increased commerce to come to us represent but a part of the commerce that is to come in the future.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. His idea is that reciprocity is to find a market for some American products in Cuba. Does he know of an industry in the United States that is suffering for a better trade in Cuba?

Mr. BRANTLEY. If my friend will be patient, I am going to discuss that question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Very well; after answering that, will the gentleman state if it is not true that Cuba is suffering to get into our market one of her products that would come in direct competition with one of our products?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I have endeavored to show that it will not come into injurious competition with our products.

Mr. HAMILTON. I want to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of the Republican policy of reciprocity?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I am in favor of the reciprocity that Thomas Jefferson declared for, which has been the cardinal creed of the Democratic party ever since I belonged to it, which has been all my life.

Mr. HAMILTON. What is it?

Mr. BRANTLEY. It is reciprocity. [Laughter.] I am not in favor of the kind of reciprocity that the Republican party has been practicing by building a high tariff wall around our country.

Mr. HAMILTON. Is the gentleman in favor of the James G. Blaine policy of reciprocity?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I am in favor of that kind that gives us an extended market for our products.

Mr. HAMILTON. Well, that is good. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEEKS. If the gentleman from Georgia will yield to me, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the gentleman think that an exchange of the products of sugar manufactured in our own country with the sugar manufactured in Cuba, the same product, comes within the definition of reciprocity? Do you think that is reciprocity?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I will let my friend wrestle with that problem himself. I am not proposing to swap sugar with Cuba. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEEKS. What product are you proposing to swap?

Mr. BRANTLEY. If the gentleman will be patient, I am going to state the products, and I hope I will satisfy my friend before I get through.

Mr. HAMILTON. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman again, but I would like to ask him if he has considered what effect the reduction of duty on Cuban raw sugar will have upon the Louisiana sugar growers, and if he will discuss that somewhat in this connection?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I will state that I have already discussed the question as to the effect of a 33½ per cent and a 50 per cent reduction of our duty, and stated in my opinion that such reductions can not affect the sugar producers of Louisiana or the beet-sugar producers, because with us the beet-sugar and the cane-sugar producers are protected by duties and countervailing duties against the rest of the world, and with protection against Cuba amounting to almost a cent a pound, which they would have under a 50 per cent reduction, and with the demand for sugar in this country unsatisfied by one-third when all the Cuban sugar comes in, such a reduction could not affect the Louisiana sugar producer or the beet-sugar producer.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will my friend permit me to read in this connection a telegram from C. A. Farwell, president of the American Cane Growers' Association of the United States?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I would prefer that the gentleman should read that in his own time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Certainly; but it describes—

Mr. BRANTLEY. I am aware that it satisfies my friend that his position is correct; and with that acknowledgment on my part I think he should be satisfied.

Mr. HAMILTON. Certainly; I wish to be entirely courteous.

Mr. BRANTLEY. Cuba last year bought over \$6,000,000 worth of cotton goods, of which we supplied less than \$500,000; nearly

\$700,000 worth of woolen goods, of which we supplied less than \$22,000; over \$2,000,000 worth of vegetables and vegetable fibers, of which we supplied but \$171,000; over \$2,700,000 worth of wines, of which we supplied but \$329,000; nearly \$2,598,000 of oils, etc., of which we supplied but \$713,000; \$1,053,000 worth of chemicals, drugs, etc., of which we supplied but \$422,000; \$8,000,000 worth of animals and animal products, of which we supplied but \$1,994,000; \$1,638,000 of manufactures of leather, of which we supplied but \$405,000; \$3,335,000 worth of rice, of which we supplied but \$3,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Always, to my friend.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I would state to the gentleman that the character of rice imported into Cuba comes in so cheaply that it is impossible for us ever to supply Cuba with rice.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I thank my friend for the statement, although I am not prepared now to accept the accuracy of his information. We sold to Cuba last year goods to a greater amount than we bought sugar from her—

Mr. BROUSSARD. If the Cuban people are under this great obligation to the American people, why have they not bought these goods from American producers instead of getting them from some other countries?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised that my friend particularly should ask the question as to why any country has not sometimes bought from us, when we have had the great high Dingley tariff wall between them and us.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Did the tariff wall prevent their purchasing in this country the goods they wanted?

Mr. BRANTLEY. They were probably able to buy the goods cheaper elsewhere.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let me make this suggestion to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. When the people of any country ship a cargo out, it is desirable that they should buy from the country to which the ship goes rather than bring home an empty vessel. After carrying out a cargo it is cheaper for the vessel to come back loaded than to come back empty.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The gentleman from Georgia is arguing that there is no market for their sugar in Europe and yet they buy the majority of their goods from the European markets. The argument of the gentleman from Alabama does not hold. Now, I ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRANTLEY] this question: If, as he is arguing here to-day, the Cuban people are under an everlasting obligation to the American people, and the tariff laws of this country do not affect their purchases for their own consumption, why have they not given the preference to the American producer instead of purchasing the goods in other markets, and how will the reduction of the tariff on sugar give the people of this country the market among those people, unless they propose to buy, with or without the reduction, from the American producer?

Mr. BRANTLEY. My friend must know that so far as trade is concerned it is not a matter of sentiment, but a matter of dollars and cents. It is a question of making the best trade that can be made. Commerce is but an interchange of products; and I presume that our people—and in fact our tariff laws show it—have not made the effort to take the trade of the Cuban people. I presume the Cubans have gone where they were accustomed to go when they belonged to Spain because the inducement was not given them to come here. But it is proposed now to gain control of their markets, not alone by giving them a concession upon their sugar and other products, but by their giving us a concession by which they will discriminate in their tariff in our favor against the balance of the world, so that trade would then come to us as a matter of business and not as a matter of sentiment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman kindly state on which side is the balance of trade since the Spanish war as between Cuba and the United States, and how much. Will he state when at any time Spain took 5 per cent of Cuba's sugar, and when at any time the United States took less than 75 per cent of Cuba's sugar.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I have discussed all that question as to why Cuban sugar comes here and has always come here—the most of it. I do not care to go back and repeat that statement. I am sorry I have not the figures with me as to the trade last year; but I have just ceased making the statement that we sold to Cuba last year goods to a greater amount than we bought sugar from her.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you will permit me, I will give them to you. For the past three years the balance of trade between the United States and Cuba is more than \$32,000,000 against the United States.

Mr. BRANTLEY. Well, I do not know whether that is correct or not. I presume my friend has looked into the matter.

Mr. FORDNEY. They are the official figures.

Mr. BRANTLEY. They but emphasize the point I am discussing now.

We sold to Cuba last year goods to a greater amount than we bought sugar from her, and now it is proposed by her to more than double her purchases from us if we will but enable her to sell her sugar at a price that will give her the means with which to buy. Surely this is a proposal in which no alms are asked. It is the tender of more than is asked for. It is a business proposition and should be treated as such. Our country is to-day slaughtering the brown man and the white man, and expending millions upon millions of dollars in the far-off Philippine Islands, seeking, among other things, to find there and elsewhere in the Orient a market for our surplus products. Here is a proposition to open up a market for \$37,000,000 of this surplus without the sacrifice of a single life, and yet we hesitate and delay about accepting it.

Our people to-day are paying \$85,000,000 per year, in our sugar-tariff taxes, as a bounty, in the interest of our sugar producers, and yet when it is suggested to reduce this enormous bounty, not more than \$10,000,000, by a 50 per cent concession to Cuba, in order that our other producers might find a market for \$37,000,000 of their products and that our Government might perform a national duty, objection is made by our sugar producers.

In the section of the country from which I come, and I can speak more authoritatively for that than for any other, the stimulus that would come from opening the Cuban market to it would be felt in every branch of trade and industry. The velvet bean and cassava, recently introduced there, would multiply many times over, and stock raising would be a large and profitable industry; our immense rice fields would take on new life, and a languishing industry would thrive; our cotton planters and cotton factories would feel the benefit of a new market, and so it would be in all the other lines of our industry. And what is true of one section would be true of other sections of our country; and, whether the benefit to some of them would be large or small, it would be something, and, whatever it would be, they are entitled to it at our hands.

#### OBJECTION TO DONATING MONEY TO CUBA.

Gentlemen representing our sugar producers say, "Don't help the Cubans at our expense." They say, "If you must do something for them, do it as a nation to a nation. Vote some money to the Cuban Government, and let all our people help pay it." This is a narrow and restricted view to take of this important matter. It does not begin to comprehend the scope or breadth of purpose of what is being proposed to be done.

A sum of money voted to the Cubans would be but a donation of alms, and that they do not ask. And it would be, moreover, of the briefest temporary relief. The Cubans ask not money, but the opportunity, out of their own soil, with their own labor, and under their own bright sunshine, to make money. It is not charity they want, but an opportunity to work. Should we give them money and keep our markets closed to them, and should the present low price of sugar continue, they would soon be in a worse condition than they were before the money was given. Should we pursue such a course we not only would not help the Cubans but would impose a never-ending and ever-increasing burden upon ourselves. Should we pursue such a course we would place Cuba where she could not maintain the "stable" government that we have enjoined upon her, and would, I fear, bring about the same "intolerable" conditions in the island that forced our intervention in 1898.

Again, those who advocate a donation of money to Cuba lose sight of the reciprocal arrangement proposed and of the advantages to come to us. The question involved is but half stated when only help to Cuba is mentioned. Help to all our producers and all our consumers is involved. While helping Cuba, it is our intention, and also the intention of Cuba, that we shall at the same time help ourselves.

#### THE PROTECTION TO US FROM PESTILENCE.

There is another consideration about this matter and a most important one that is lost sight of by those proposing a money donation. In the Platt amendment that we forced Cuba to adopt, the fifth provision thereof is:

That the government of Cuba will execute and, as far as necessary, extend the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

This provision, in its letter and spirit, Cuba must live up to. We must and will demand of her that she do it; but before we can demand it we must see to it that she is provided with a government of sufficient means to do it. Laying aside every other condition that we have exacted from her and looking solely to this one, we can not afford in the beginning of her government to paralyze her chief industry and thus strip her of the resources necessary to enable her to comply with this condition.

It means too much to the people it was designed to protect,

namely: The people of the Southern ports of the United States. A successful compliance with its conditions by Cuba will be worth to us many times over all that our war to free her people cost. No man familiar with the destruction to life and commerce wrought by yellow fever in some of the Southern States can doubt this statement. The present sanitary condition of Habana is the best in her history, and it must at all hazards be maintained. The work of our medical officers there has been well-nigh phenomenal, and too much praise can not be bestowed upon them for what they have done.

In their work we people of the South see the dawning of the day when the gaunt specter of yellow fever will no more arise to alarm and destroy us, and we wish for that work an ever-increasing and successful progress. Realizing, as I do, the vast importance of this work to the South, I shall cast my vote to give Cuba the means to live up to what she has undertaken in this regard, and if I err in this, I know that I will err on the side of the safety and interest of my people. I feel that I could commit no greater act of recreancy to the trust committed to me by my constituents than to aid by my vote in the destruction of the power of Cuba to protect the lives and commerce of the South from the frightful pestilence of yellow fever. My vote can not be cast that way.

#### BUT SCANTY JUSTICE TO CUBA.

In my judgment this consideration alone justifies us in yielding to Cuba's appeal. The advantages to us in this one regard will more than compensate us for all that the reduction costs. When we add to it the increased trade to come to our people it will appear that the great preponderance of the benefits to flow from the reduction will come to us. A retrospective view of our tariff laws shows that our average duties against all countries on dutiable articles have been as follows:

	Per cent.
Under the tariff-commission law in 1883 .....	42½
Under the McKinley law in 1891.....	46
Under the Wilson law in 1895.....	41½
Under the Dingley law in 1899.....	52½

An examination of the Dingley law to-day shows that, at the present market prices, it imposes a duty against Cuba amounting to from 100 to 115 per cent. That is to say, as against the world our duties average about 50 per cent, but as against Cuba, the country more closely bound to us than any other, the country to which we have promised the most and from which we have demanded the most, we exact a duty of 100 per cent. Years before the Hawaiian Islands were annexed, and when we owed them nothing, and when they had practically nothing to give us in exchange, we gave them absolute free trade with us. In the face of this precedent, why should we hesitate to make a slight concession to Cuba, to whom we owe a duty, and who offers us a substantial trade in return for the concession?

Surely it is but scanty justice to Cuba, viewing the matter from whatever standpoint we may, to put her in her trade relations with us somewhat nearer on an equality with the other countries of the world than she now is, and that is all that a reduction of the duty to her will do.

We can count ourselves fortunate, too, that we can do this justice, confer the great benefit that goes with it, not only to Cuba, but to ourselves, and at the same time not injure any fractional part of our people. But even should some little injury come to some, can we not afford—nay, ought we not—to reduce a little the protection now given to one bounty-fed class, if thereby we can benefit all classes here and in Cuba and be assured the protection from yellow fever of the lives and commerce of all our South Atlantic and Gulf coast cities?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman yield a moment for a question?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I will.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Was not the trade concession given to the Hawaiian Islands on account of the fact that they gave us the right to Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands? Was not that the basis of the agreement that was made?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not recall for the moment all that took place at that time, but undoubtedly the record shows. My statement here, however, is strictly accurate, that we gave her free trade when we owed her nothing and when she had no trade to give us in exchange.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that Pearl Harbor was considered as the great place for a naval station in the Pacific.

Mr. BRANTLEY. We are taking all the harbors and ports that Cuba has now.

Mr. HAMILTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BRANTLEY. We are taking all we want; there is no limit.

Mr. HAMILTON. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I mean that under the Platt amendment we are entitled to such coaling stations and ports as we select and determine upon by agreement and treaty.

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes; by treaty—by treaty. We do not take all we want, do we?

Mr. BRANTLEY. But we would require the treaty, if my friend will allow me, from Cuba in the same way that we required the Platt amendment to be put into her constitution. She had no voice in the matter.

Mr. HAMILTON. But it must be ratified by treaty.

Mr. BRANTLEY. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes.

Mr. BRANTLEY. And our Platt amendment had to be put into her constitution, not because she wanted it, but she put it there because she could not help it.

Mr. HAMILTON. As American citizens, permit me to suggest, we ought to be fair to ourselves. Will the gentleman not concede that we have done all that equity and good conscience could require of us hitherto for Cuba; that we have done as much as any nation has done hitherto for any other nation? Will the gentleman not concede that?

Mr. BRANTLEY. If the gentleman has followed the trend of my remarks—

Mr. HAMILTON. Let us be fair to ourselves as American citizens.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I have stated what we have done, and I have stated the value that Cuba was to us after what we have done. We have done a great work there, but I maintain that we have still a further duty to perform, and I have been endeavoring to demonstrate that. Now, so far as my friend suggests, as to Pearl Harbor, in the Hawaiian Islands—

Mr. MADDOX. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt with a question?

Mr. BRANTLEY. In a moment, when I have answered the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]. We purpose to get from Cuba, not only all the advantages in the way of harbors that we got from the Hawaiian Islands, but, in addition, we purpose getting a trade that we did not get from the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Did we not, in consideration of these concessions that we expect to get from Cuba, give her millions of dollars with which to gain her freedom, and is not that the compensation as against us? Whereas the contract between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands as to Pearl Harbor was directly to give free sugar to the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I think my friend knows that we gave millions, not to, but for Cuba, and that the United States has a substantial interest in the welfare of Cuba at all times, and we have done what we thought was our duty to do, not only to Cuba, but to ourselves; but we still have a duty to perform.

Does my colleague from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] wish to ask a question?

Mr. MADDOX. Is it not true that we somewhat trespassed our original declaration of war when we forced on Cuba this Platt amendment? Did we not agree not to do that very thing?

Mr. BRANTLEY. I will state to my friend that I took that view of it and voted against the Platt amendment, but in my argument to-day I have not discussed that question at all. I have simply discussed the Platt amendment as being an existing fact and as to what it imposed upon and required of Cuba. Now, I hope, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I have already consumed so much time, that I may be allowed to conclude.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. BRANTLEY. If my friend insists upon it, I will.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman will remember that France came to our relief and helped us gain our independence from England. Did we go to her and ask her to insure business prosperity in our country after that?

Mr. BRANTLEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, my friend may not be able to appreciate the difference between the United States and Cuba, but I am—

Mr. FORDNEY. I think I do.

Mr. BRANTLEY. I think a knowledge of the difference answers the gentleman's question.

#### THE FUTURE OF SUGAR PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

It has been suggested and urged that if Congress will but keep up the present high tariff on sugar for a few years longer our sugar development will be so great that we can produce all the sugar that we can consume. Upon what this faith is builded I do not know. If we look to the statistics, we see that Louisiana and other Southern States in the year 1853-54 produced more sugar than they did last year, and yet we find a tariff on sugar since 1792. All the friends of sugar do not agree as to the development of the production of sugar by means of a tariff. In 1890 one of the speakers in this House, Mr. O'Donnell, in urging the sugar-bounty feature of the McKinley bill, said:

We have essayed for a century to develop our sugar industry in the Southern States. The people reluctantly conclude that sugar is no longer entitled to protection by the system of import duties. The reason is apparent. After

all these decades of attempted stimulation, at such a cost, the cane does not give us one-ninth of the needed supply. Under such circumstances the longer continuance of sugar duties is indefensible.

How much more defensible is it to-day, nearly twelve years later, when our cane and beet-sugar production combined, aside from that produced in our island possessions, does not furnish one-fifth of what we consume?

A bounty system of 2 cents per pound was resorted to in the McKinley law for the avowed purpose of stimulating the growth of our beet-sugar production, and yet with four years of bounties and five years of high protection under the Dingley law our output of beet sugar it is hoped this year will reach the magnificent proportions of 150,000 tons! At this rate of increase in the production of beet sugar, with no increase of cane sugar in forty years, who can figure when our combined beet and cane sugar production will reach the 2,300,000 tons that we now consume?

I wish that we could produce all the sugar that we consume, but we can not do it now, we never have done it, and there is no prospect that we can do it in either the early or the remote future, and we should deal with the situation as it actually exists.

If it be important, as has been claimed, that we should provide ourselves with our own sugar, as against the day of war, when we might be cut off from our supply, then is it not the part of wisdom, without detracting from our present efforts to make sugar at home, for us to lay hold of Cuba, taking her into our trade, binding her still closer to us, cementing the union of law with the cement of mutual interest, and thus insure ourselves, now and always, against the machinations and devices of war and trade, a bounteous supply of the sugar we need?

Gentlemen tell us, if Cuba can not make sugar against our tariff, let her make rice, let her raise fruit, let her raise other things, while we make sugar; and yet these same gentlemen tell us that the God of nature has smiled so benignantly on Cuba that all the labor necessary to grow her cane is to stick a hole in the ground, put in a joint of cane, and the work is done, and that from that simple process of labor crops are gathered without more planting from five to twenty years.

The proposition is to take the juicy cane from the sun-kissed isle of Cuba, from the home builded and fashioned for it by the Great Architect of the Universe, from the home so richly and lavishly provided with its every need, and transport it to a less-favored land, to a far inferior home, where the aid of science and of law must be invoked to protect its existence and to do the work of nature and where the difference is all the difference between the real and the artificial. Such a proposition, it seems to me, insults nature, outrages good judgment, and lays the foundation for a wealth of useless extravagance. If American sugar we must have, it would be cheaper for us to make Cuba a part of America.

#### ONE THING TO REMEMBER.

There is one thing, if we will but remember it, that frees this question of all difficulties: Cuba is not seeking to compete with our sugar. She asks not to be put on an equality with it. She will be glad to come here, paying 50 per cent of our duty. She is willing thus to be discriminated against in favor of our sugar to the amount of nearly 1 cent per pound. All she can bring will not supply our needs. Surely, then, our producers, with our market free to them, with our demand greater than they and Cuba combined can supply, and with a discriminating duty in their favor against Cuba of nearly 1 cent per pound, can not be hurt by making the reduction asked for to Cuba.

What Cuba asks and what she needs is protection, not against our producers, but against the producers of the bounty-fed countries of Europe. She comes to our Government as her one friend and ally, as one claiming and having a protective power over her, and asks that she be admitted just a little way within the circle of the protection that we have set up against the bounties of Europe, and in exchange for this partial protection, which in itself can not harm us, she tenders value for value, and more.

#### CUBAN CIGARS AND TOBACCO.

I have not sought in this discussion to consider the question of a reduction of our tariff on any of Cuba's products except on her sugar, for I regard the lowering of the duty on her sugar as of paramount importance. So far as her tobacco and other products are concerned, the same principles that I have endeavored to apply to sugar apply to them, though perhaps with far less urgency. We now buy for consumption or for export 90 to 95 per cent of Cuba's total export of cigars, and these constitute only about three-fourths of 1 per cent of American cigar consumption, and as her leaf tobacco is distinctly adapted for use as cigars, and really has no competitor in our country, it offers no competition with our plug-tobacco people and the competition with our cigar people is too small to be seriously considered.

While the world's market for cigars, tobacco, and other Cuban products is not in the overcrowded condition that the world's sugar market is, and therefore Cuba's need for our market for these things is not so great as is her need for our sugar market, the need

nevertheless exists, and supplying it to her means much to her while promising no considerable, if any, detriment to any of our people. Cuba's great crops are sugar and tobacco, and whatever her capability for other productions may be remains yet to be determined. She grows other things that some of our people grow, but with our producers protected by a duty of 50 per cent of that now existing there is nothing that Cuba has that promises or suggests any injurious competition with them, and nothing that should delay or prevent the discharge of our duty to her and to ourselves in this important matter.

It seems to me that our duty is plain and that every reason exists for us to give Cuba our every market, asking hers in return for all that we have.

#### CUBA AS A PART OF THE UNITED STATES.

I trust there is no one who would, by a denial of our market to Cuba, hope to bring about such distress and destitution among her people that they would, against their pride and wishes, be forced to ask us, in pity's name, to make them a part of the American Republic. Such an appeal from Cuba, if granted, could not bring about a union that would carry with it any pride, respect, or love for the American name. It would be a union in name, but not in heart, for there would be no loyalty to our starry flag or to our blood-bought institutions, or to any of the priceless principles that we revere.

Such a union, too, coming at this time, would bring upon our own sugar people the complete realization of whatever it is that they fear or affect to fear now from even a slight concession to Cuban sugar. The time is not yet opportune to take Cuba into our Republic, but some day, in the fullness of God's appointed time, she will be a part of our system. The question of incorporating her into our Union is not a new one. It is almost as old as the Republic itself. It was discussed as far back as 1825, when John Quincy Adams was President. During the Administration of President Polk Spain was offered \$100,000,000 to relinquish to the United States her sovereignty to Cuba. President Pierce endeavored to bring about a similar transfer. President Buchanan recommended it, and at least two national Democratic conventions have declared for it.

We have already seized upon the advantages of her strategical position, and from her ports and her magnificent harbors we already propose to control the entrance to the Gulf and the approaches to our great isthmian canal when we build it. The relations we have already established with her are close, and destiny says they must be closer still, for her interest and ours will demand it.

When the time comes, however, to bring to full completion our union with her, let us hope that it will be accomplished through the free and voluntary act of both her people and ours. Let our treatment of her be such that it can be accomplished in that way, when accomplished it must be. Let us hope that the day is passed forever when the American people will again attempt by force and power to subdue and "assimilate" an alien race.

The president-elect of the Cuban republic, Mr. Palma, has said of our country, in speaking for the Cubans:

The only country that we care for, the only country that can befriend us, the only country that we look to for a market.

The sentiment he expresses, the faith he feels, and the hope he utters merit and should receive a quick and sympathetic response at our hands. It is not much that Cuba asks, but what she asks means everything to her. Let us befriend her now, in the hour of her economic need, and by this deed add tenfold and more to the blessings that we have already given her and earn for ourselves now and always the gratitude, love, and admiration of our friends, the Cubans.

#### CUBA'S FUTURE.

If we but perform the duty of to-day—the duty to conscience and to Cuba, the duty to our own people—the man does not live who can foresee or foretell the possible results that from this small beginning may eventually come. It is more than probable that when the dream of "Cuba libre" is transformed into a reality; when groans and blood and suffering are supplanted by smiles and blossoms and ease; when poverty gives way to wealth; when anarchy is driven from every corner, and law and order sit in supreme command; when oppression and undue exactions are finally and completely succeeded by freedom and liberty and justice, that there will come as if by magic a new and a regenerated Cuba.

As the new Cuba unfolds to the world, its beauty and its richness will dazzle the most high. Favored by sun and soil, blessed by wind and climate, endowed with all the gifts that a bountiful and generous nature can bestow, Cuba needs but the revivifying touch of just laws and stable government to bloom and thrive and grow as no country has ever done before. No man can measure her possibilities and none foresee the heights to which she may climb. For four hundred years she has been the prey of Spanish plunderers and the victim of cruelty, treachery, and crime. Her

hills and valleys are rich in the bones of her martyred sons who have died to throw off the hated yoke.

Amid the ravages of war and pestilence and oppression her riches have been obscured and her beauties trampled under foot, but they have not been destroyed. They but await the summons to come forth, increased, enhanced, and glorified by the baptism of blood and tears through which they have passed. Four hundred years of darkness, of despair, of hopeless struggle, and then freedom! Who can paint the picture?

From glorious America came the freedom that to-day illumines the blood-stained island and throws into the background the long, dark night, and from the same glorious America must come the help by which the means can be had to use and enjoy the priceless freedom she gave. Our duty leads us on until we have fulfilled our high mission—until the means have been given to enable Cuba, "the gem of the Antilles," to come into her inheritance and to stand forth in the plenitude of her long-denied glory and power.

When we have done this we must ever exult and be glad at the excellence of our handiwork, for if she be a part of us, she will be a rich and incomparable part, and if she be but a sister republic, nestling close beside us, we will be proud to call her our friend and ally. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, on the 13th of January the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures reported, by unanimous vote of the Republican members of that committee, a bill which now stands at the head of the Union Calendar. No action has been taken upon it thus far; but while Congress is hesitating a waiting country is beginning to speak, and I hold in my hand the report of the largest commercial body in the world, signed by a committee, the names of the members of which will command respect in any deliberative body or in any council of any nation in the world. The first name is that of John Harsen Rhoades, the president of the Associated Savings Banks of the State of New York, representing more than a billion of dollars of deposits, and more than 2,000,000 depositors. The second name is that of Henry W. Cannon, president of the Second National Bank. The third is that of Edward H. Perkins, jr., president of the Importers and Traders' National Bank.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SULZER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to inquire as to who has the floor, the gentleman from Connecticut or the gentleman from Ohio?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut has the floor. The committee will please be in order. Conversation will be suspended. Members of the House will please be seated. Those desiring to converse will retire to the rear. The committee is now in order. The gentleman from Connecticut. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HILL. The fourth name is one which will be promptly recognized in this House, August Belmont, and the fifth, George G. Williams, president of the Chemical National Bank. I desire to have read as a part of my remarks the report upon this measure.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] played a very active and a very successful part yesterday in fighting for the farmers of the country. Now, up to this time the gentleman has not given us the name of any farmer who is in favor of this coinage bill, nor has he in his great speech heretofore.

Mr. HILL. It was farmers' day yesterday.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will you please give me the names of some farmers who favor this bill?

Mr. HILL. Oh, I have not time for such questions. I will hand the report to the Clerk, and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report of the committee on finance and currency of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on the following measure pending in Congress: A bill to maintain the legal-tender silver dollar at parity with gold, and to increase the subsidiary silver coinage. Adopted by the chamber March 6, 1902.

#### REPORT.

To the Chamber of Commerce:

At the last meeting of the chamber there was referred to the committee on finance and currency the following bill for their consideration and report:

A bill reported from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures in the House, called "A bill to maintain the legal-tender silver dollar at parity with gold, and to increase the subsidiary silver coinage," as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury, purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into such denominations of subsidiary silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements, and thereafter, as public necessities may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin; and so much of any act as fixes a limit to the aggregate of subsidiary silver coin outstanding, and so much of any act as directs the coinage of any portion of the bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, is hereby repealed.

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to maintain at all times at parity with gold the legal-tender silver dollars remaining outstanding;

and to that end he is hereby directed to exchange gold for legal-tender silver dollars when presented to the Treasury in the sum of \$5 or any multiple thereof; and all provisions of law for the use or maintenance of the reserve fund in the Treasury relating to United States notes are, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, hereby made applicable to the exchange of legal-tender silver dollars."

They now beg to report as follows:

The bill reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures is accompanied by a report from the majority of that committee, so full, exhaustive, and, in the judgment of your committee, so convincing in favor of the proposed legislation that little remains to be added in the way of argument.

It is a fact that Congress, on March 14, 1900, did declare for the gold standard in the United States, and made the dollar, consisting of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, the standard unit of value. It is true that it did not, aside from providing for the redemption of United States notes in gold, prescribe any method by which such parity should be maintained; and it is true that the purpose of this legislation is to remedy that defect.

From the report made it is evident that there is need for an increase in the volume of subsidiary coin in circulation to meet the needs of commerce, and in the judgment of your committee no wiser use can be made of the stock of bullion on hand than to turn it into subsidiary coinage as needed, giving the Secretary of the Treasury a free hand in reducing from time to time the volume of silver certificates or silver dollars now in circulation or lying idle in the vaults of the Treasury.

It seems to your committee that it is the part of good judgment and wise procedure, having on hand a large and burdensome stock of silver bullion, to utilize it in such forms as will keep it in circulation either in coin or small bills represented by bullion deposited, for in this way, at least, it can be made of some use, and through small coinage the risk of its return to the Treasury in volume at unseasonable and perilous periods is largely reduced. The rapid growth of the country in trade and population will enable it to absorb and keep in circulation a much larger per capita volume of silver coinage than now exists, while the enormous increase in our stock of gold, which will probably continue, will be adding an ample gold reserve to offset the issue of silver coinage.

But the vital essence of the bill in question is to make the legal-tender silver dollars remaining outstanding exchangeable at all times into gold when presented in sums of \$5 or multiples thereof. If the act of March 14, 1900, really means what it says, that the standard dollar of issue shall be the gold dollar, then every dollar issued other than gold should be exchangeable into gold, for the maintenance of parity, as the committee truly say, "is not only a moral obligation resting upon the nation, but it is one which the Government cannot evade, for, whether exchangeable or not, they must be accepted by the Treasury for all Government dues in lieu of gold."

The minority report of the Congressional committee on this bill gives as one reason why this legislation should not be enacted that it will put upon the \$150,000,000 of gold held in reserve to maintain the gold standard the additional strain of redeeming silver certificates in gold, and that this strain will be too heavy, and, in consequence, a continuance of gold payments at all times might be imperiled. By this course of argument they practically admit that a danger exists, and the fear which they express would, in our judgment, under existing conditions, create a similar fear in the minds of the public when the strain comes upon the Treasury to maintain gold payments, which fear, if it exists, will only intensify the danger of financial disaster to the country. Remove the fear and the danger ceases to exist.

"The way to resume is to resume," was once said by a distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. The way to maintain a gold standard and gold payments at all times is to declare openly and frankly that every dollar of circulation issued by the Government shall, at the will of the holder, be redeemable at all times into a gold dollar. If this is done, the danger ceases, and the credit of the nation, at one bound, is placed on a parity in strength with that of the most favored nations of the earth; and not until this nation has so declared itself will its credit so rank in the judgment of the civilized world.

For the government of no civilized nation can permanently enjoy the best of credit when it issues over five hundred millions of currency for circulation based upon a metal not the standard unit of value, compels the people to accept such issues at their face value in gold, and refuses to commit itself to a pledge to pay gold for such issues when payment is demanded by the holder thereof. They may think their credit is of the best, but their own people will not so regard it, and the world at large will not so regard it. When the strain is put upon the system, when gold is needed and silver certificates in large volume pour into the Treasury of the nation, while gold is being hoarded, then confidence grows weak, and the system becomes a rope of sand.

In our judgment nothing now prevents silver dollars from going to a discount except the abiding faith of the people that the Government will, at all times, keep them worth their face value in gold; and if it is the intention of the Government to do this, as is undoubtedly the case, then why should not the Government prove their intention by their act, and by declaring silver dollars exchangeable into gold at the will of the holder forever end all doubt, even if the strain upon the gold reserve proves to be too great and a larger reserve is needed. Even now, if the strain does come—and come it will—gold must be bought to maintain the parity, or the parity will cease to exist.

The members of this chamber have repeatedly declared themselves in favor of the gold standard and of a reform in the banking system of the country so as to make it adequate to the demands of trade and commerce, and capable of resisting the strain of commercial disaster which is sure to follow a period of unexampled prosperity in a country developing as we are with enormous rapidity. The first stone in the foundation of the structure of national credit is the inviolate character of its unit of value, by which all its mercantile transactions are measured, and now is the time to complete the act of March 14, 1900. Therefore your committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, That the members of this Chamber are in favor of the legislation embodied in a bill known as "A bill to maintain the legal-tender silver dollar at parity with gold, and to increase the subsidiary silver coinage," which bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures on January 13, 1902.

*Resolved*, That we are in accord with the majority report as presented by that committee and accompanying the bill, and heartily indorse the reasons given by them why the bill should be adopted; and we respectfully urge upon the members of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled prompt and favorable action upon the same, believing that the commercial interests of the country require such action on their part.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN HARSEN RHOADES,  
HENRY W. CANNON,  
EDWARD H. PERKINS, JR.,  
AUGUST BELMONT,  
GEORGE G. WILLIAMS,  
Committee on Finance and Currency.

NEW YORK, March 5, 1902.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will ask you whether at the National Bankers' Convention which met at Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin, a resolution was even introduced recommending this bill.

Mr. HILL. I do not know.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the gentleman that I have read the whole of the proceedings and there is not a single resolution of that kind introduced.

Mr. HILL. There was no such resolution introduced in the congress of the Daughters of the Revolution that met here a few weeks ago, and I do not think it has anything to do with it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I suppose the gentleman will concede that the bankers' conventions discuss financial questions more than any other body.

Mr. HILL. Some of them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And it was composed not only of New York bankers, but bankers from the whole country.

Mr. HILL. The Indianapolis monetary convention heard, approved, and heartily indorsed and recommended it. I do not see that that has anything to do with this particular question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no. When everybody approves it, that is something; but when somebody does not approve it, that is nothing.

Mr. HILL. I am glad that the gentleman admits it is something.

Mr. McCLEARY. Did the body disapprove?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that the convention had under consideration various currency measures, among which was the asset currency. The matter was discussed by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, and there was no reference whatever made to this bill, although this bill was reported last session of Congress and must have been fresh in the minds of the gentlemen who were present.

Mr. HILL. Has the gentleman any other question? I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. BURLERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I was much pleased to read in this morning's daily newspapers another of the characteristic letters of regret, which have now become "the looked for" letters from my Lord Kitchener, announcing another glorious Boer victory. As is well known to us all, the British Empire at this time is engaged in an effort to destroy the last vestige of republican government upon the Dark Continent.

In their efforts to crush the South African Republics and in attempting to carry into effect this policy, the war office of the British Empire has been driven to the adoption of concentration of noncombatant Boer women and children in detention camps; and, as a result of this policy, there has been a degree of mortality there among those children and women that is without parallel in history, not even excepting the horrible scenes which were enacted prior to the Spanish-American war in Cuba.

The charitable people of the great State of Illinois, moved by impulses of humanity, have recently raised a large fund for the purpose of sending it to South Africa to be expended for the relief of those noncombatant Boer women and children. An effort has recently been made to secure a passport or permit for the gentleman who was to undertake the intelligent disbursement of this fund. I now send to the desk, for the purpose of having read, in order that the House may understand its end and purpose, a resolution relating to efforts made in this direction, which resolution I introduced a few days ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the following allegations are made in an editorial printed in The Public, a publication printed in Chicago, Ill.:

"It is hard to believe that the 'understanding between statesmen,' to which the British minister, Mr. Chamberlain, referred a year or so ago, has gone as far as Secretary Hay implied when refusing to ask for passports for Mr. and Mrs. Thomas to enable them to succor the reconcentrado prisoners in South Africa.

"A committee organized by Governor Yates, of Illinois, has raised funds for the relief of these hapless noncombatant prisoners, and in order to secure its fair distribution had asked the Rev. Hiram W. Thomas, a well-loved clergyman of Chicago, and his wife, to go to the South African camps and superintend the distributing work. Mr. and Mrs. Thomas consented.

"But passports from the British Government being necessary, Secretary Hay was duly requested to apply for them to the British ambassador, Lord Pauncefote. Mr. Hay refused to do so, giving as his reason that President Roosevelt would object. To such a laudable application it would seem that the British Government itself should have been left to make the objection. Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Hay was required to act as a 'buffer.' But our Government, evidently, wished to avoid placing the tory Government of Great Britain in an embarrassing position.

"Had Mr. Roosevelt requested the passports, and there is no legitimate reason why he should not have done so, but abundant reasons why he should, the British Government would have been obliged either to grant the request or to disclose a cruel churlishness which it prefers to conceal. From this

alternative President Roosevelt saves it. These 'understandings between statesmen,' with their little side courtesies in connection with coronations, are curious developments in imperial diplomacy."

Therefore, be it  
*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the House of Representatives whether he declined to comply with the request of the said Rev. Hiram W. Thomas to ask the British Government for passports for the said Rev. Dr. Thomas and his wife to visit South African military camps for the purpose of distributing funds raised in the United States for the relief of noncombatant prisoners.

Mr. BURLESON. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to know whether the statements embodied in the article which appeared in *The Public* are true or not. The purpose of this resolution introduced by me was to ascertain whether the official representing the American people in the Secretary of State's office had declined to lend his good offices to aid in accomplishing this worthy and charitable purpose. And bearing upon that issue, I now send to the desk a communication which I received yesterday afternoon, and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,  
*House of Representatives, United States Capitol.*

SIR: In view of the resolution introduced by you into the House on the 8th instant, and based, as I understand it, upon a statement published in a Chicago periodical known as *The Public*, in which you ask that respectful inquiry be made of Secretary Hay as to whether or not he had declined to make request upon the British ambassador in Washington for passports for Dr. Hiram W. Thomas and his wife to visit the noncombatant concentration camps in South Africa to do relief work, I take occasion, having had that matter in charge, to make a specific statement to you regarding the matter that was brought to the attention of Secretary Hay.

Dr. Thomas, for many years pastor of the People's Church in Chicago, and one of the most widely known ministers in the West, recently expressed his willingness to go to South Africa to carry relief to the sick in the noncombatant camps maintained by the British military authorities, and his wife wished to accompany him in his work of mercy. Their services were tendered to the Chicago committee recently appointed by Governor Yates as trustees for funds subscribed for relief work in noncombatant camps by citizens of the State of Illinois. The committee consists of Mayor Carter H. Harrison, Judge E. F. Dunne, and Peter Van Vlissingen, of Chicago. They are in possession of several thousand dollars subscribed within the last few weeks, and were glad to accept the proffered services of Dr. Thomas, as his name alone was regarded as a guaranty that the funds would be wisely used and administered in the charitable way that contributors intended.

In order to secure the admittance of Dr. Thomas to the concentration camps, however, it was realized that it would be necessary to first secure passports from the British war office to enable him to proceed to his destination, since the noncombatant camps to which he wishes to go are situated within the districts now under martial law and controlled by the British. The regular passports issued by our own State Department would not, of course, under such circumstances, serve his purposes, as he would still be subject to the orders of all the local British officers with whom he might come in contact, and might not be permitted to proceed to his destination at all.

At first the plan was entertained of having Dr. Thomas go direct to London and make his application there, but this was afterwards rejected, on the ground that such a trip would incur heavy expense and might be without satisfactory result. It was then decided to bring the matter directly before our own State Department, have the matter brought, if possible, by our Secretary of State to the attention of the British ambassador here, and laid by him before the London war office.

I was commissioned to take this matter in charge, and came to Washington for the purpose of using my best efforts to secure the passports. I first went to Senator CULLOM, of Illinois, and explained to him the nature of my mission. He then gave me a note to Secretary Hay, again explaining what I sought, as it had been stated to him, and speaking a high word of praise for the character of Dr. Thomas, with whom he is personally acquainted.

On being granted an audience with Secretary Hay I stated to him that Dr. Thomas wished to go to the noncombatant camps of South Africa to work among the sufferers and to disburse the funds in the hands of the Chicago committee for purchase of foods, medicines, clothing, or whatever might be most needed by the sufferers; that it would be necessary to secure passports from the British war office to enable him to reach his destination, and that I had been sent to him (Secretary Hay) to request him to use his good offices to bring Dr. Thomas's application for passports before the British ambassador, Lord Pauncefote, with a view to having it passed upon by the British war office.

Secretary Hay declined to do this, stating that such action on his part might be considered meddling and a remissness in the observance of neutrality; that to make such a request upon Lord Pauncefote would not be in accordance with his own views nor, he felt sure, those of President Roosevelt. It would be impossible, he stated, to take up the matter informally with Lord Pauncefote, as any request which he (Secretary Hay) might make relative to the matter would become official, on account of the very nature of his office. Secretary Hay stated that he would be very glad to issue passports from our own State Department for Dr. Thomas and his wife, but these have not yet been taken out, as they would be valueless without some assurance that endorsement of them can be secured by the British military authorities in control of the district in which the South African noncombatant camps are situated.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN O. KNIGHT.

HOTEL RALEIGH,  
*Washington, D. C., March 10, 1902.*

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I have no acquaintance with this gentleman, and I can not vouch for the truthfulness of the statements set forth in his letter; but it seems that his character is such that he has been measurably credited by the committee appointed by the Republican governor of the sovereign State of Illinois.

It seems his character was such that he obtained the entrée to the chairman of the great Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and secured from him a letter to our Secretary of State; and it occurs to me that the matters of fact set forth in his letter are of such serious character as to call for an explicit statement in reply to the resolution which has been introduced.

If the statements embodied in his letter are true, then we are driven to the conviction that our foreign office is so saturated with pro-British spirit and feeling that it can not respond to the ordinary appeals of charity when made in behalf of the unfortunate Boers, or to the dictates of humanity which should prompt anyone to lend aid to the dying women and children of these patriotic people struggling against the British army.

Another application has been made for the good offices of the Secretary of State to aid in this worthy purpose. I now ask the Clerk to read, from the desk, this paper.

The Clerk read as follows:

The honorable SECRETARY OF STATE,  
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: By virtue of the proclamation issued by the governor of the State of Illinois, calling upon the citizens of that State to contribute for the relief of suffering among the Boer women and children in South Africa, a large amount of money has been collected.

The committee appointed by the governor, as well as the contributors, strongly desire that this sum should be effectively distributed by an American delegate of repute, whose primary purpose would be to ascertain where the suffering was greatest, and to apply such relief as, under the circumstances, seem to call for the most pressing consideration.

Secondly, it would be the duty of such a delegate to inquire what further relief might be required, either in money or supplies of any kind, so that a fresh appeal might be issued upon his report.

The Chicago committee has requested Dr. Hiram W. Thomas and Mrs. Thomas to proceed to South Africa, and they have accepted this commission. It will thus be seen that their duties are purely philanthropic.

The committee is aware that it would be easy to procure passports in the ordinary way, and that Mr. and Mrs. Thomas could proceed to Cape Town or one of the other South African ports, but it is absolutely necessary that before undertaking the expense of the mission they should receive the assurances of the British authorities that no obstacle will be placed in the way of their visiting the concentration camps.

I have, therefore, the honor to request your good offices to procure, through Lord Pauncefote, the British ambassador at Washington, or such other agency as you may deem best, a permit from the British authorities for Dr. and Mrs. Thomas to visit the Boer concentration camps for the purposes recited in this letter.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully,

JOHN O. KNIGHT,  
*Acting for Chicago Boer Relief Committee,  
 Appointed by Governor Yates.*

HOTEL RALEIGH,  
*Washington, D. C., March 11, 1902.*

Mr. BURLESON. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the facts stated in the first letter which was read are true, and public opinion does not drive the officials who now occupy the State Department from office, then, indeed, in my opinion, will it be plain to all that we have arrived at the period in our history when the decadence of the Republic has commenced.

My object in having these communications read to-day is, if possible, to fasten the attention of the American people to the pendency of this application for the permit, and thereby arouse a real American, republican, public opinion which will prevent the officers of the State Department from manifesting this pro-British spirit.

I have an abiding faith and confidence in the love of liberty, the broad and generous humanity of the American people for the suffering women and children of the gloriously patriotic Boers, and feel that the effort to bring these sufferers aid need only be brought to the attention of the American people in order to enlist the tenderest sympathy.

A just public opinion when aroused will aid us, will aid charitable Chicago in its charitable endeavor to bring assistance to these unfortunate women and children who are dying by the scores in South Africa, while their patriotic brothers and husbands make the last struggle for civil liberty and independence and republican institutions which is to be made upon the Dark Continent.

Mr. Chairman, this policy of concentration of noncombatants in detention camps which has been adopted by the war office in Great Britain, the effects of which the charitable people of Chicago are endeavoring to obviate or relieve, is the same infamous policy that aroused the patriotism and the love of liberty and the feelings of humanity on the part of the American people that finally drove tyrannical Spain from Cuba and made the name of Weyler, because of his camps of reconcentrados, synonymous with brutality and cruelty.

Mr. Chairman, I have accomplished my purpose.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman in charge of the time to yield to me for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HITT. The remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] are a singular surprise. He introduced a resolution last Saturday, which he has just caused to be read, which was referred to a committee. The committee has adjourned to a day fixed by him, on his motion, for hearing it. He has the assurance of the chairman of that committee that it will be voted for by him, and I suppose by every member; yet he rushes in before the resolution is considered and before the answer of the Secretary of State, which we all await, is received, to make a speech prejudging a question touching our international affairs.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HITT. Certainly.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is not saying anything in contravention of what I have said. I candidly announced that my purpose was to influence the action that is probably to be taken to-morrow by an official of a coordinate branch of the Government.

Mr. HITT. Well, I thought we usually spoke here for the House of Representatives, inasmuch as we are Representatives. The gentleman admits, however, that his speech is not for us. I am speaking to this House for that which concerns its usages and its rights. The House will, if it chooses, pass the resolution when brought before it, and the Secretary of State, upon the request of the House, as upon its direction, will make answer. When that comes, we can consider it. That is the proper time; that is the ancient usage of this body toward the public servants. Whether they are humble or whether they are eminent, they are entitled to fair treatment and to some hearing.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. HITT. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman has evidently mistaken the situation. I am not asking for any action at this time upon the part of this body. I am content to let the resolution be considered when the proper time arrives. I candidly announced what my purpose was, and I have accomplished my purpose.

Mr. HITT. The purpose, as candidly announced by the gentleman, is to prejudice a question upon which we are to have the evidence submitted. It is for the purpose of influencing public opinion.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman surely does not want to put me alone in the attitude of attempting to prejudice my resolution when he himself admits that he is going to vote for my resolution.

Mr. HITT. I can say that, because it is before me for action.

Mr. BURLESON. I have not prejudged it any more than the gentleman has.

Mr. HITT. It will be my duty to pass upon it, and I can speak of my action. I have no right to anticipate what the House will do. The resolution presents a question on which we will probably have to inquire; but it led me to revert at once in memory to what would have been the answer to a similar request if it had been made to this country by a committee of those in London who were sympathizing with that powerful organization struggling with our own in 1863 and 1864.

What would have been the answer if such a request had come to Mr. Stanton, to let a committee from London who were in sympathy with the Confederate forces go through our armed lines to distribute money among Confederate prisoners? There is something in international law. These gentlemen are private citizens. We have The Hague convention providing for exactly this thing, in so far as it is proper, by the recognized officers of the Red Cross International Association and Bureau of Relief and Information. This is not for the distribution of medicine, clothing, or the comforts of life now proposed, but money; but never—

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question, with his permission. Does he mean to impugn the motives and purposes of the citizens of Illinois who contributed this fund? Does he mean to say they have any other purpose than that which they themselves declare, to relieve the unfortunate Boer women and children in reconcentrado in South Africa? I can construe the gentleman's language in no other way.

Mr. HITT. No; I am only stating what is the rule and usage of nations under international law and what is the precise question presented. The question presented is whether our Government will ask another to permit those in sympathy with the other belligerent to go through their fortified lines. Now, there is an organization which, by international convention, has charge of such things, namely, the Red Cross Association and the Bureau of Relief and Information.

This is not for the conveyance of supplies. Now, anyone present who dates back to the days when the North had prisoners, remembers perfectly well the rule that no man was permitted to go into the camps. Senator Thurman, who went to the camp at Columbus, Ohio, was compelled to stay outside and our officers took the comforts in to the rebel prisoners. Never have I heard the suggestion that any government in hostility to any other would allow its lines to be passed and prisoners to be reached.

In the Transvaal our consul took supplies to the British prisoners from those who wanted to aid them, but the Boers never admitted them into the fortified lines. I do not know anything about the facts in this matter, nor will I until we hear from the Secretary of State, but any answer made by him to a proposition of that kind must have been made in view of well-known international law.

The rule that our Government followed in our war was estab-

lished by the instructions drawn by Lieber in that famous order which was a code of international law on that subject, and has been since adopted by all civilized nations. It was to our honor as a nation and to our glory that at the time we were achieving the unity of the people of the United States we established rules of war which have been adopted throughout the world.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HITT. Very well.

Mr. BURLESON. Do I understand the gentleman to express the opinion here that the Secretary of State ought not to lend his good offices to secure a permit which has been asked for by the people of Illinois for Mr. Thomas and his good wife to go to relieve the distress of the Boer women and children who are concentrated in the British camps of detention in South Africa and dying by the hundred?

Mr. HITT. I have not said anything of the kind. I have said nothing about the Secretary's withholding his sympathy or good offices. There is another pro-Boer committee like the one in Chicago, long since organized and very active, in London, and they send their money right forward to South Africa through recognized agents. I know those in this town who sent their money to that committee, the pro-Boer committee in London, which was sent or taken by the neutral officers into the camps and distributed there. Our consul distributed a good deal early in the war.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will permit the observation, it was that very condition which the people of Chicago are trying to avoid—distributing their charity through London sources.

Mr. HITT. The imputation that the officers of the army would be dishonest, or anything of the kind, is not, I suppose, what the gentleman means. In our war the money was honestly paid to the prisoners on both sides. It was given to those to whom it was addressed.

No one assumes that the officers are thieves, but forces at war do not permit the eye of the outsider to look through their camps. War is not a jest or play; there is no coquetry of politeness within its territory filled with armed men under martial law. I do not know what the Secretary said, but I call attention to what every old soldier must remember if he ever was a prisoner in a camp on the Union side or on the Confederate side.

There is no need of a passport from the Government. You must get your pass or permit from the absolute ruler of the place, the military officer. I never heard of a belligerent allowing provisions or comforts to be distributed in a camp of prisoners by anybody but their own officers. Jefferson Davis would not have permitted people to perambulate through the Southern camps filled with Union prisoners, giving them money and provisions. He would have said, Hand us the money and the provisions and our government will convey it and distribute it. No man will question the integrity of the officers, and the hardihood of a gentleman asking the Government to depart from that usage is to me astonishing.

The gentleman has intimated that the Secretary of State has shown that he was hostile, or that he was out of sympathy with this body of prisoners. I think that everybody here and everywhere else is in sympathy with the unhappy and distressed in war.

Mr. BURLESON. Does not the gentleman think that this denial of the permit or passport, if it is to be made, should come from British sources rather than from American sources?

Mr. HITT. I think the proper way would have been to do as was done during our war. It is not a passport that is required—

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly not.

Mr. HITT. The word "passport" is a misnomer in this connection. A passport is a document which takes a person through a country where there is no extraordinary condition impeding travel and intercourse. What was wanted was a military permit to visit, not to enter, these camps or fortified lines—a pass, not a passport. It would have been granted at once upon the presentation of the facts to the consul.

Mr. BURLESON. Then I understand the gentleman to say that the officials of our State Department should make the denial of this request and thereby avoid going to British sources for the purpose of giving them the opportunity to make the denial?

Mr. HITT. Does the gentleman think it would be wise in conducting the affairs of our country to make a demand which is out of all precedent, when there is another and better and unobjectionable way in which the object could be obtained? Does the gentleman think we should try to put a foreign nation into an adverse position by making a demand in that way, with the effect simply of putting our Government in conflict needlessly with another?

We all know the international rule in such cases; the gentleman knows it perfectly well; he is not a novice in these matters. It was not without good reason that he was assigned by the

Speaker to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He knows the rules of international intercourse in the time of war. Every book on the elements of the laws of war and peace shows that no people can demand of a belligerent, on any pretense, right to send persons through a military or fortified camp. Any person attempting to secure entrance to such a camp would be liable to be taken and shot as a spy.

I know Dr. Thomas. I have known of him for many years. There is no doubt of the sympathy of everyone with his purpose. I would like to see his mission effected. I would like to see him accomplish his purpose without any such prejudice being aroused as would be excited by making on the British Government a demand such as has not been known before.

Mr. BURLESON. The people of Chicago have been endeavoring to follow exactly what the gentleman from Illinois says would be the proper course. They have been endeavoring to send Dr. Thomas to South Africa to do this work of charity. Does the gentleman say that he ought not to be sent there; that he ought not to be allowed to secure this permit?

Mr. HITT. The permit is not essential in the least. As has been stated in the letter read here, the Secretary of State has offered to do everything he could to put Dr. Thomas in the way of getting to the point desired without making a demand which might result in a slap on the face perhaps from a foreign government which would be entrenched behind the rules of international law.

But there is no reason to believe that there would be any impediment against securing such a pass as would permit Dr. Thomas to reach those people with funds. Nothing of that kind is indicated in the conduct of the Secretary of State. The impression I caught from the reading is that Mr. Knight in his letter showed what has been the kindly spirit of the Secretary, who offered him letters of introduction and offered to do everything which would forward his mission.

Mr. BURLESON. But the State Department officials, so Mr. Knight says, declined to do the very thing which the gentleman from Illinois admits was absolutely necessary in order to reach the people whom they desired to relieve.

Mr. HITT. No; it was not necessary to have a pass to get the funds to prisoners in a military camp. Without such a pass he certainly would not be admitted himself.

Mr. BURLESON. Not with a permit from the war office of Great Britain?

Mr. HITT. Oh, no.

Mr. BURLESON. That is exactly the point. We wanted to utilize the good offices of the Secretary of State of the greatest Republic on earth in order that this permit might be obtained for the minister and his wife to visit those unfortunate people to relieve their distress.

Mr. HITT. No doubt he could do all that—that is, relieve their distress; but he would not be permitted to go through the armed camps or fortifications. It was never done in our war. I never heard of its being done North or South. If the object is to put our Government in conflict with another for the sake of political capital, I do not think that effort ought to succeed.

Mr. BURLESON. As to what occurred during the unfortunate period of 1861-1865, I am unable to speak from personal knowledge or recollection, inasmuch as I was not of age to participate in the occurrences of that time.

Mr. HITT. I spoke of it because it illustrated a rule universally accepted, a rule that nations generally have adopted.

I beg the pardon of the House for taking so much time.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You said just now that we have no right as a government to make a demand for this relief.

Mr. HITT. Oh, no; if I said that, it was a hasty expression. We have a right to demand almost anything.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I was trying to draw the distinction between a demand and a request. Have we not a right to make a request as a government?

Mr. HITT. Undoubtedly we may make most singular requests.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It seems that is what the Secretary of State has refused to do.

Mr. SULZER. Just another question, if the gentleman will yield a moment.

Mr. HITT. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. SULZER. Did we not make a similar demand on Spain, and did not Spain engage to do it?

Mr. HITT. That was done under organized forces, sent as officers of this Government, and the Red Cross was the one that had charge of it, and the Red Cross by international convention is charged with that particular duty.

Mr. SULZER. Is it not a fact that the English nation to-day in the war in South Africa refuses to permit the Red Cross people to minister to the Boers?

Mr. HITT. I have heard that asserted and I have heard it contradicted. I have heard it is contradicted by those in official po-

sition, who seem to be in possession of knowledge, but I do not know; however, for the purpose of a speech either might be asserted. I do not know the facts about it at all. South Africa is a long way off, and that is a controverted detail.

Mr. SULZER. Let me suggest that the information I have regarding that proposition comes from the Boer commissioners who are now in this country.

Mr. HITT. I am not in communication with the British or the Boer Government. [Laughter.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. McCLEARY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 62. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Minnesota Historical Society the steering wheel of the former ship *Minnesota*;

S. 1568. An act to restore Henry D. Hall to the Revenue-Cutter Service;

S. 3361. An act providing for the removal of the port of entry in the Albemarle collection of customs district, North Carolina, from Edenton, N. C., to Elizabeth City, N. C.;

S. 277. An act for the relief of Mathias A. Young;

S. 3990. An act authorizing the use, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, of certain moneys in the Treasury to the credit of the Sioux Indians of the Crow Creek Reservation in South Dakota, under the act of March 2, 1895, and for other purposes;

S. 3848. An act granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.;

S. 3513. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Parkville, Mo.;

S. 3231. An act to legalize and maintain a new steel bridge in lieu of the present wooden structure across the Little Tennessee River, at Niles Ferry, Tennessee, by the Atlanta, Knoxville and Northern Railroad;

S. 2172. An act to provide for the payment of medical expenses of sick officers and enlisted men of the Army while absent from duty with leave or on furlough;

S. 4096. An act to provide for a site for a depot for the Revenue-Cutter Service;

S. 3130. An act to provide for the removal of snow and ice from the sidewalks of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3449. An act to establish an additional land office in the State of Montana;

S. 3439. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;"

S. 257. An act to establish a light-house and fog-signal station at Mukilteo Point, near the city of Everett, State of Washington;

S. 3488. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint superintendents of chimney sweeps, to prescribe their duties, and for other purposes;

S. 3663. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting the right to the Omaha Northern Railway Company to construct a railway across and establish stations on the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes;"

S. 1673. An act for the relief of the officers and crew of U. S. S. *Charleston*, lost in the Philippines November 2, 1899;

S. 4003. An act to authorize the construction of a traffic bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland within the corporate limits of the city of Savannah to Hutchinsons Island, in the county of Chatham, State of Georgia; and

S. 3800. An act to grant certain lands to the State of Idaho.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 646) for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1981. An act for the relief of J. V. Davis;

H. R. 7458. An act to re-form the western judicial district of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 597. An act granting a pension to Adella C. Chandler;

H. R. 718. An act to correct the military record of James L. Proctor;

H. R. 1018. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Leighton;

H. R. 1350. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Grant;

H. R. 1688. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Armstrong;



- H. R. 1697. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Lawrence;
- H. R. 2175. An act granting an increase of pension to Kephart Wallace;
- H. R. 3288. An act granting an increase of pension to Elmer J. Starkey;
- H. R. 3694. An act granting a pension to Benjamin Wylie;
- H. R. 3747. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Underwood;
- H. R. 4035. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Longman;
- H. R. 4827. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Baker;
- H. R. 5160. An act granting an increase of pension to James Harper;
- H. R. 5247. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard Fristoe;
- H. R. 6435. An act granting a pension to Susan P. Crandall;
- H. R. 6515. An act granting an increase of pension to Carleton A. Trundy;
- H. R. 6861. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph K. Ashby;
- H. R. 6869. An act granting a pension to M. Callie Glover;
- H. R. 7432. An act granting a pension to Charles A. Sheafe;
- H. R. 7907. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Ballou;
- H. R. 7997. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Burns;
- H. R. 8954. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred N. Mosier;
- H. R. 9220. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Hunter; and
- H. R. 9383. An act granting a pension to Narcissa Tait.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed 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. 8586) amending the act of March 2, 1901, entitled "An act to carry into effect the stipulations of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898," and had still further insisted upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CULLOM, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. MORGAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to treat this question altogether from the standpoint that my friend from Georgia [Mr. BRANTLEY] in his captivating and rhetorical speech of to-day has pursued, nor do I desire, at this time, to go into the discussion as to the effect a certain rate of reduction of duty upon Cuban sugars may have upon the price of that commodity in the American markets.

"Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" is my motto, and I trust and believe that the vigorous action on the part of my colleagues on the other side of this Chamber—who are now sometimes called insurgents—will render it unnecessary at any time in the near future to enter upon that feature of the controversy.

I shall speak in a general way of the relations of our country with Cuba, and also incidentally upon the question of reciprocity and of annexation of that island.

Mr. Chairman, the active discussions of the future relations of the island of Cuba with the United States by statesmen, agriculturists, promoters, and all parties involved has renewed interest in a subject of high importance to this country until now it is the vital question. The tardy acceptance by the Cuban constitutional convention of the terms prescribed by Congress in the act of March 2, 1901, is not an end of the controversy. It is merely a step in the progress of events, and does not possess all the importance usually ascribed to it. This constitutional convention endeavored in every possible way to avoid acceptance of these terms of Congress defining the relations of the two countries.

They yielded reluctantly at last, and this reluctance really expressed public sentiment. The dominant forces in Cuba wanted a free hand. The leaders gave up simply in order to get rid of the American occupation and to grasp the reins and spoils of government as quickly as possible. They were not conscious of any special obligation to the people of this country. All our expenditure of blood and treasure and our grand historical pose of disinterested intervention for outraged humanity went for nothing. A distinguished Senator rightly says that the great majority of the

Cuban people are ignorant and utterly incapable of appreciating the humane sentiment that finally compelled this great Republic to espouse the cause of a suffering people on a neighboring island. He is probably right also in asserting that they viewed the interposition and friendly offices of the United States as "the selfish usurpation of another dominant power than Spain, governing by might without right." It is natural, therefore, that the leaders of the constitutional convention, brought to the front by the revolution, should now assume that "they secured the independence of the island," whereas in truth and fact, as the same Senator observes—

When the United States intervened they were really driven from the field and were only able to maintain themselves in the fastnesses of the mountains, from which they emerged at irregular intervals to carry on guerrilla warfare.

It was to this class of soldiers that we gave \$3,000,000, the aid of the United States Army and Navy, an expenditure of one to two hundred millions of money, and other sacrifices in war, and unstinted sympathy and admiration. It was magnificent, generous, emotional; but the world did not admire us for it as much as we had hoped, and the people for whom we did all this have forgotten, if they ever realized it, that we did anything for them at all. This may be a surprise, but it is not necessarily a misfortune. Perhaps it is a boon in recalling us from the episode of sentimentalism and hysterics to the old paths of wise and practical statesmanship. The well-known Platt amendment was a long stride in this direction. It was an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober.

#### AMERICAN INTERESTS PARAMOUNT.

The sum and substance of the Platt amendment was that, without wrong or injustice to Cuba, the great national interest and safety of the American people in respect to Cuba and other West Indian interests were to be made paramount and kept strictly in view. The amendment may not be perfect in terms; it may be apparently in conflict with the Teller proposition, as some persons assert; but in substance it means that the rights and interests of the United States in relation to Cuba, cherished by us for a century, are not to be suffered to be impaired, but will be upheld both in our own interest and in that of Cuba.

Cuba is to be independent for all practical purposes of home rule, but not enough so as to be utilized by any foreign powers or interests to strike us a blow. The keen and watchful eye kept on Cuba while a Spanish colony for long years is to be kept on those rulers who are to succeed Spain in its government. The problem is one that the Government can not afford to dismiss by reason of a formal technical acceptance of the Platt amendment. Indeed, it is by no means certain that the island of Cuba, whether as an independent State or under a quasi-protectorate, or as a State of the Union, or a colony of the Porto Rican type, may not be a greater cause of anxiety to the United States than she was as a dominion or colony of Spain. The difficulty of the question is disclosed by the very different suggestions of treatment made by public men who appear by their very different conclusions to have exhausted the study of the subject. In whatever aspect the question be considered, it is to be hoped that the epoch of sentimental sacrifices is at an end and that henceforward the interests of the American people, the taxpayers and the toilers of this land, may not longer be regarded as something of secondary and minor importance. [Applause.]

#### THE PLATT AMENDMENT.

The reasons for the Platt amendment, Mr. Speaker, have been so ably stated by Senator MONEY, of Mississippi, by Senator PLATT himself, and by others, as to render unnecessary any further exposition. The policy was accepted by the two Houses of Congress, approved by the Executive, embodied into public law, and has been indorsed by public sentiment. The concessions of one or two points for naval stations might fairly have been granted by Spain long ago, and if Cuba is to be defended against European aggression, and the interests of the United States in the West Indies properly guarded, the work of their construction can not begin too soon. The late war with Spain demonstrated the necessity of meeting a want long since felt by the intelligent officers of the Navy Department—Such naval stations in no wise impair the sovereignty or independence of Cuba, but will serve to assure and protect it if necessity should unhappily arise. The great advantage of the Platt amendment is that it translates the Cubans as well as ourselves from sentimentalism and dreamland to the domain of practical statesmanship.

#### CUBAN SUGAR COMPETITION.

The advocates of the policy of concession claim that the success of any Cuban government is dependent on Cuban commercial success. Her resources, they say, are limited to the production of sugar, tobacco, fruit, and possibly coffee. For these her natural market is the United States, yet here she comes into direct competition with the sugar and tobacco producers of the United States. Senator Thurston, in his statements, underrates the cane-

producing capacity of the United States, but rightly says a large portion of this country is adapted to the profitable production of beet sugar. The United States has nothing to gain financially or commercially by the liberation of Cuba. The trade exchange benefits Cuba.

The argument does not logically conduct us to annexation, if the interests of our own people are to be first considered, and yet surely this point is or ought to be the one paramount consideration.

#### AMERICAN SUGAR SACRIFICED.

Cuba may have a great immediate interest in securing the American market which annexation would give her, and this might make great fortunes for the Cuban planters or for others who have options on Cuban plantations, but for those in this country, white and black, who grow sugar cane, and for the beet-sugar grower of New York, Nebraska, Kansas, California, Michigan, and other States, it is small satisfaction to be told that he is to be butchered to make a Cuban holiday, to eke out a balance sheet in Habana, and to pacify the discontented guerrillas and coolies of the Ever-Faithful Isle. It is claimed, however, that this country is large enough to absorb Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines "without any permanent derangement of our own agricultural and industrial affairs—yes; and other portions of the globe."

There may be temporary inconvenience and suffering to the American sugar grower and tobacco planter. The trade may be "insignificant" compared with our trade to European countries, China, Canada, and those living in the temperate regions of the earth, but this is as unimportant as the suffering of those whose taxes helped to secure the liberation of Cuba.

Other advocates, notably Senator LODGE, in a late magazine article present us with a glowing picture of the wealth and undeveloped resources of Cuba—coal, iron, copper, forests of mahogany practically untouched, a soil of "unrivaled richness and fertility, capable of producing almost anything. In sugar and tobacco alone there is untold wealth for the island." Spain was the wicked stepmother that defeated the development of all this untold wealth; but Spanish rule is now only a hideous dream, a thing of the past.

#### EXPLOITATION FOR SPECULATORS.

One would suppose that an island "capable of producing almost anything," once relieved of grievous taxation and Spanish tyranny, would need only to be let alone in order to thrive and prosper. Capital has a keen eye for "untold wealth," and would naturally pour into a land thus ready to flow with milk and honey. A few steamers from Boston or New York, some sugar machinery, saw-mills, and other notions, and a horde of enterprising speculators and exploiters would speedily work such a change in the island that the Cuban treasury would become plethoric and everybody be made rich and happy. But no; this is not enough. We are informed that, economically, their fortunes are involved with ours. The prosperity of Cuba, it is said, depends principally on the markets of the United States. The abrogation of the Harrison reciprocity treaties by us, it is alleged, brought on the insurrection of 1895.

#### PREVENT CATASTROPHE.

This catastrophe we are told must not be allowed to occur a second time. We have given Cuba freedom and peace, provided for her safety in foreign relations and her financial arrangements, and the Almighty in his bounty has given Cuba the richest area on the globe, with "untold wealth" all ready to be evolved. It would certainly seem that Providence had done its share, and that the American people had also attended to this end of the line, and that all that was now necessary was to secure a good stand and witness the Cuban boom with respectful sympathy and admiration. But no such rest awaits our patient American public. We are told we must do much more for Cuba. We must "secure her economic prosperity" by "assuring" to her a market for her sugar. We are told we must give to Cuba a "preferential duty" on her sugar and tobacco. There is nothing said about a "preferential duty" for the untouched forests of mahogany, the coffee, "almost anything" and everything that the island can produce; but logically all this would follow.

It is now suggested that a small preferential duty of 20 per cent would suffice for the purpose, but once admit that it is necessary to assure Cuba the American market for her products, big or little, and a trifling matter of 10 or 20 per cent would not be allowed to stand in the way. In all of the elaborate argument of the question there is hardly enough of solicitude for the American producer to challenge attention. Cuba is one of the richest portions of the habitable globe, and we have given her the chance to be foremost in the race for wealth.

#### GENERAL CUBAN COMPETITION.

If the island possesses only half of the natural advantages which the advocates of this policy portray, and if it is capable of producing "almost anything," what show would the American producer have, either with annexation or with the tariff so cut down by

preferential duties as to "assure" her the American market for whatever she can raise—iron, copper, sugar, tobacco, mahogany, fruits, and a hundred other things besides? The question does not merely concern the beet or cane sugar grower of California, New York, Nebraska, Michigan, and Louisiana, or the tobacco planter of Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and other States. It concerns all those in this country who trade with them and supply them; the wheat grower of the upper Mississippi Valley; the manufacturers of New England, Pennsylvania, and Ohio; the stock farm of Kentucky, and all our varied industries, so bound together that you can not hurt one interest without striking a blow at all the others.

#### TARIFF QUESTION.

And all this brings us back to the great question, On what principle will you base your tariff and how shall it be framed? In the past there have been serious divisions in this country on the dividing lines of a tariff for revenue or a tariff for protection, or, what is equivalent to the last, a tariff for revenue with incidental protection and such adjustment of the schedules as will insure adequate protection against the pauper labor of Europe, Asia, and the Antilles. I do not seek to revive this old controversy; it seems to be settled. The trend of public opinion is obviously for such protective duties as will "assure" the American laborer his own market. The party that opposes this sentiment will be apt to come to grief. The party now in power won power in 1896 by loudly professing allegiance to the protective creed. If they go back upon it—if they apply the doctrine to some industries and leave others out in the cold—they will be at some disadvantage in the next Presidential election, and even sooner in the contest for the House of Representatives in 1902; and this is only three-fourths of a year off.

#### PROTECTION BETRAYED.

And yet there could not be a more insidious and dangerous betrayal of the protective policy than is involved in the scheme and theory of reciprocity treaties and legislation. It was probably for this reason that Mr. McKinley, who was an ardent and sincere protectionist, left out any provision for reciprocity in the bill which he passed through the House of Representatives in 1890. It will never do to suggest that this was an accidental omission. There was no oversight. It was no new topic to him; his policy was deliberate, and, as a friend of the protective system, he was eminently wise. The old free-trade proposition was to impose low revenue duties and to take the chances of other nations meeting you halfway. The reciprocity treaty also surrendered our control over our own markets in a large number of articles, and said to the foreigner, "Come in." It abandoned the old protective idea of a self-supporting country, equipped for war or for peace in all the essentials of life.

The moment we should begin to offer advantages and preferential duties to the foreigner there would be the temptation for him to ask and for us to concede to him competition with us in industries and productions which might not indeed be able to control or influence the Senate, but yet gave employment to many hundred thousands of our own people. It is obvious that if the protective principle is to stand at all it must be fair, honest, and must not discriminate against any American industry. Certainly it can not discriminate against agriculture or any other interest directly and openly, as is done in the case of the reciprocity treaties. The argument made against the protective policy by its opponents has always been that it pampered and enriched certain interests at the expense of other interests, and that it "robs Peter to pay Paul."

This may be true or not, but in the case of the reciprocity treaty it does so directly and boldly. The process of sacrifice once begun would not stop. Throw overboard the sugar beet and sugar cane producers and on what grounds will you refuse our markets to the foreign wool grower or to the Canadian farmer, with his numerous farm products, or to the Canadian lumberman? What stronger claim does the American farmer all along our northern frontier have to protection for his eggs, poultry, potatoes, barley, hops, and what not than the Michigan grower of beets or the negro in Louisiana who earns his living by working in the cane field? There is no surer way of sapping and mining the protective system than the reciprocity treaty. The valuable iron ores of Cuba and the copper and coal described by her exponents would have an equal claim, with sugar and tobacco, to the American market at the expense of our own producers under this reciprocity treaty.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL POWER OF SENATE.

It may be idle in these days to cite the Federal Constitution, but I may be pardoned for referring to it very briefly. This instrument, section 8, declares that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;" and in section 7 it says that "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills." There can not be a

doubt that the purpose of the Constitution was to give to the two Houses of Congress exclusively the function of imposing taxes and imposts of every character and description. This prerogative is of the highest dignity, and most intimately concerns the people of the land. It affects every citizen. Primarily the tax, tariff, or impost bill must originate in the popular branch of the Government, the House of Representatives, a body chosen directly by the American people in their Congressional districts every two years, and responsible to them for their action.

The Senate is associated, it is true, in this duty of adjusting taxes, but it can do nothing without the initiative of the House. Surely, there could not be a more palpable departure from the true theory and express language of the Constitution than to assume that the Senate alone can lay and define the taxes and imposts that are to be raised and elbow the House from its undoubted function of originating bills of revenue. Yet this is just what is proposed if the policy of reciprocity treaties adjusting tariff imposts with foreign countries is to prevail. In this important and serious work Nevada, Delaware, Idaho, and other States with scanty population are to have an equal voice with New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. I can not concede that such was the purpose of the Constitution. It may be argued that after the Executive and the Senate, acting secretly, probably, shall have made the treaty the House of Representatives shall pass on the work. They may come in at the tail end of the procession, when the Constitution expressly said they should be first. Why the first? Because the House of Representatives directly represents the people of the United States.

In the House of Representatives a tariff bill is usually carefully prepared by a committee. There are public hearings in the committee, and public debates on the floor when the bill comes up for action. The galleries are open to the press and the public. If any burden is grievous, imposed by mistake, ignorance, or undue means and agencies; if there is a job cunningly wrapped up in phraseology, there is an opportunity for the public to detect and for the press to expose it. There is also the ordeal on the floor of question, debate, retort, cross-examination. If, after all this, the bill passes, it goes to the United States Senate for inspection and concurrence. There is committee work on it once more, though not any public hearings, and there is debate on the floor, with the President at the close of all, able to sign or not, according to his judgment and conscience. This is the way in which the American people like to have laws passed which may affect their dearest and most vital interests. This is the mode of legislation our Constitution provides for. [Applause.]

#### HIGH-HANDED TREATIES.

The reciprocity treaty is fashioned on a very different style. The people are not taken into the confidence of its authors until they are bound hand and foot. The press can get no information. If they did they might make trouble. The executive department takes counsel in secret, whether wisely or unwisely. The foreign government is conferred with secretly. A bargain is patched up. The treaty is made. It is not published. No; that would never do. The treaty is sent in confidence to the Senate. There it is in all its stages a confidential matter. No Senator may confer about its provisions even with the Representatives of his own State or with a friend, or with the interests vitally affected, or with a constituent, and still less with the press. If he does this he has violated the Senate rule and may be dealt with accordingly.

The wisdom and knowledge of the Senate itself and of the Executive are assumed to be all that he requires. In all this business there are few of the guards and securities usually deemed desirable to protect legislative bodies against undue influence. On the contrary, by this process of usurping the functions of the House of Representatives and thus enlarging their own, the domain of Senatorial and Executive power is greatly augmented, and with it the temptations to mutual favors between these two branches. Is it necessary to argue that the opportunities for clean, healthy, intelligent, and wise legislation are vastly greater in the public joint action of the two legislative bodies as provided by the Constitution than in any secret conclaves? After all, this Government is assumed to be of the people and for the people. Are not their chances against fraud, jobbery, and injustice better under the public constitutional methods of adjusting tariff taxes?

#### GENERAL TARIFF REVISION.

I think it clear, Mr. Speaker, that a general policy of reciprocity treaties would necessarily involve a large loss of revenue and would constrain us to resort to fresh taxes, which would have to be paid in part by the very producers whose interests were sacrificed by the reciprocity arrangements. This would naturally lead to a demand for a general revision by Congress of the tariff and taxation system. It may be argued that it is possible to make a reciprocity treaty with Cuba and there stop, but this is not the plan of those who favor this mode of tariff arrangements. Even if the

policy were limited to Cuba the loss of revenue would be very large, and there would still be need for a general readjustment of the revenue system.

This subject rises above party and should be discussed without party bias or feeling. The division will not, I apprehend, be on party lines. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, who has enjoyed great popularity by his attention to agricultural interests, tells us that the aim of his Department is to enable the people of the United States to produce the agricultural products we are now purchasing from foreign countries; that we bought during 1900 about \$429,000,000 worth of agricultural goods, sugar being the principal product. Mr. Wilson thinks that we can produce all the sugar we require. The gentleman from Georgia says we can never produce sufficient sugar to meet the demand.

According to the reciprocity theory, this view of Secretary Wilson hardly deserves consideration; there is nothing gained by a country producing its own food supply, and, pushing the argument to its logical conclusion, the Department might well be closed or at least subordinated to the treaty-making power. The Secretary of State has had a number of difficult questions to handle, requiring great tact and skill; but he is to be loaded up with new duties, new responsibilities, involving a study of foreign productions and our own trade relations, matters of customs, tariffs, and what not, which, in the organization of the Government, it was considered by Mr. Alexander Hamilton and other great men had better be devolved upon a separate and independent organization known as the Treasury Department.

The placating of foreign countries, each one perhaps contending that this or that reciprocity treaty of ours was unfair to its own citizens, would take considerable time, even if the incidental friction between these two great executive departments of the Government could be smoothed over. Already there have been serious tariff controversies with Russia, Italy, and Austria, tasking all our diplomacy.

#### LET CONGRESS ADJUST DUTIES.

Perhaps, after all, it would be better to run along in the old way of the Constitution and leave to the House and Senate the adjustment of import duties. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, there is no considerable number of the American people who desire tariff agitation and controversy. The farmers and planters dread any unfriendly legislation by treaty, Congress, or otherwise. They care nothing about the success of the Cuban boom if they are to pay the piper. The business interests of the country deprecate agitation and change. They have always had a wholesome fear of the doctrinaire, the literateur, and even of the orator in politics. They may not render full justice to this interesting class, but this is the way they feel. They prefer a safe course and a safe man. Even Mr. BABCOCK's proposition, designed to check the trusts by tariff changes, has not met the favor of the great Republican leaders. But if the reciprocity line of business is to be pushed, there can be no reason for Congress refusing to consider Mr. BABCOCK's proposition. Still, for the Republican party to open the tariff controversy again might lead them to the Caudine forks. It would be a blunder.

The defeat of the last river and harbor bill, so important to the merchants, farmers, and commerce of the country, by questionable methods, was a fatal error for a party to make. The improvement of the waterways and harbors of a nation commensurate with the needs of its commerce and shipping is one of the grandest achievements of modern civilization. No party can stand in the way. Not less serious is the proposition to cut down arbitrarily the representation of certain Southern States, and thus reopen the old sectional controversy, repudiating, as it were, our late President's known policy of peace and reconciliation. It would not be wise to add on to these terrible blunders a renewal of tariff agitation. "Those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad." I am, however, not one of those partisans who desire their opponents to do wrong in order to reap a profit by their blunders. Whatever party be in power, the country is interested in a wise, prudent, and just policy. [Applause.]

Yet many of our fellow-citizens seem to think that there is no limit to the sacrifices to be made for Cuba by the American people. I submit that the armed intervention of the United States to secure the liberation of Cuba, the sacrifices of our soldiers and sailors, the expenditure of two hundred millions of money for the war, the payment of three millions in cash to her guerrillas to keep them from relapsing into brigandage, the generous aid given to the starving, and the rescue of the municipalities from filth and fever are costly and sufficient sacrifices, to say nothing of our lasting protection of Cuba against European rapacity and aggression. It is time to think something about the American taxpayer and producer. [Applause.]

The Speaker of this House, in a very able letter, has lately expressed some of the principal and improper influences which are at work to bring about the introduction of Cuban products at the

expense of our own industries. The letter throws so much light on the situation that, with permission of the House, I shall take the liberty to print it as an appendix to this general treatment of the question.

## APPENDIX.

I am just in receipt of your letter, which I have read with care and interest. It seems to me that you do not segregate the questions before Congress. There are three theories or questions pending or pressed upon us. First, the wiping out of all war taxes, which the party promised to do when we put them upon the people to carry on the war with Spain, and no one of any intelligence can say that the time has not come for wiping out these taxes, since we have \$176,000,000 surplus in the Treasury, with a working balance of about \$50,000,000 in the hands of disbursing agents for current work. If this pledge is ever to be fulfilled, it seems clear that it ought to be now. This first question stands alone without reference to any other.

The second question is, What are we going to do for Cuba? It is a separate and distinct proposition, and this is the situation: Those contending for Cuba want a reduction of 50 per cent or a clean sweep of duties between us and that country. Contending for this doctrine is, first, the American sugar trust, which is here in the person of its ablest managers; second, the money—the capital that has been put into the construction of railroads in Cuba, where a system of railroads extending along what may be termed the backbone of the island, with arms extending from the backbone into each part of it, is in process of construction.

All the money in this enterprise is anxious, of course, to build up the commerce of Cuba. Third, there are millions of dollars that have gone into Cuba buying up plantations, cheap lands, and with large syndicates formed, are seeking to make fortunes out of the sugar industry. Then, again, there are Americans over there with vast sums of money in various enterprises who are all anxious for this. Then, again, the Cubans themselves who have the capital are anxious to have free trade relations with the United States. These all touch elbows and are working together.

On the other hand, the beet-sugar industry of the United States and the cane-sugar industry are fighting most vigorously against any reduction. The beet-sugar industry has developed to a wonderful extent, and so much so in the States of California, Colorado, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Michigan that the delegations from those States have their faces set vigorously, firmly, and most determinedly against any reduction, their contention being that for the first time in the history of the country the farmer finds a direct interest in protection. They stand upon the doctrine of protection. The Secretary of Agriculture tells me that every acre of land in Iowa is capable of raising the sugar beet, and this is true of every State throughout the West and in the Mississippi Valley.

Now, in regard to my own position. You have accepted the lies sent out by the press, which is being manipulated in the interest of free trade with Cuba. I have never expressed an opinion against doing something, whatever we possibly can, to strengthen the hand of Cuba. I have stood side by side with the President and the Ways and Means Committee trying to devise some plan to do this without injuring the farmers of our own country and at the same time give encouragement to Cuba. The contention is brought to us from our own people that we have shed blood and money enough for Cuba, now an independent government, so to speak, without slaughtering the farming interests of our own country, and the most intense feeling exists.

I doubt if, with all the combined influence we have to bring to bear, we can dislodge or change the views of the States that I have named, that are operating in the beet-sugar industry, with sufficient force to carry the House. It may be that we can hit upon some other plan and harmonize matters, but I beg of a man of your intelligence and experience not to accept the flying reports and dispatches sent out and stimulated by the concrete organization, as I have indicated, who, indifferent to our own farming interests in this country, want to break down all the barriers between us and Cuba.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, before making the motion that the committee rise, I will ask what is the status of the Chairman's list of speakers? I have not paid much attention to that myself. Is there a demand for further time?

The CHAIRMAN. The requests which the Chair has received would cover something like four or five hours of debate.

Mr. LOUD. Then I would move that the committee do now rise, hoping that we may close the general debate possibly tomorrow. The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. LITTLEFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Post-Office appropriation bill (H. R. 11354) and had come to no resolution thereon.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of 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. R. 62. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to the Minnesota Historical Society the steering wheel of the former ship *Minnesota*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1568. An act to restore Henry D. Hall to the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3361. An act providing for the removal of the port of entry in the Albemarle collection of customs district, North Carolina, from Edenton, N. C., to Elizabeth City, N. C.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 277. An act for the relief of Mathias A. Young—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3990. An act authorizing the use, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, of certain moneys in the Treasury to the credit of the Sioux Indians of the Crow Creek Reservation in South Dakota, under the act of March 2, 1895, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3513. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Parkville, Mo.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2172. An act to provide for the payment of medical expenses of sick officers and enlisted men of the Army while absent from duty with leave or on furlough—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 4096. An act to provide for a site for a depot for the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3130. An act to provide for the removal of snow and ice from the sidewalks of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3449. An act to establish an additional land office in the State of Montana—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3439. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to license billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 257. An act to establish a light-house and fog-signal station at Mukilteo Point, near the city of Everett, State of Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3488. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint superintendents of chimney sweeps, to prescribe their duties, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3663. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting the right to the Omaha Northern Railway Company to construct a railway across and establish stations on the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1673. An act for the relief of the officers and crew of the U. S. S. *Charleston*, lost in the Philippines November 2, 1899—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 3800. An act to grant certain lands to the State of Idaho—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 4381. An act to authorize the Central Railway of West Virginia to build a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Morgantown, in the State of West Virginia.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 646. An act for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.

## V. W. M'FARLANE.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. POWERS of Maine, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of V. W. McFarlane, Fifty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. BALL of Delaware, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. ELLIOTT, for the remainder of this week, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and accompanying agreement and memorial of the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an addition to the court-house and post-office building in New York City—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for proving ground at Sandy Hook—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Select Committee on the Census, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1833) providing for the transfer of census records and volumes to the Census Office, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment,

accompanied by a report (No. 855); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 305) providing for a monument to mark the site of the Fort Phil Kearny massacre, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 870); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3083) providing for the adjudication of certain claims by the Court of Claims, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 871); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOODY of Oregon, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4393) reserving from the public lands in the State of Oregon as a public park for the benefit of the people of the United States and for the protection and preservation of the game, fish, and timber and all other natural objects therein a tract of land herein described, etc., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 872); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 185) to provide for a macadamized approach and roadway to the national cemetery at Wilmington, N. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 875); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, with Senate amendments thereto, reported the same, nonconcurring in the amendments of the Senate, accompanied by a report (No. 856); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8192) granting extra pay to officers and enlisted men of United States Volunteers who entered the service under act of March 2, 1899, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 857); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10081, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 162) for the relief of William T. Trammell, accompanied by a report (No. 859); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5486) for the relief of John M. B. Walker, administrator of the estate of James Walker, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 860); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10940) for the relief of Erick Haugen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 861); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11558) for the relief of James S. Frizzell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 862); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House 9655, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 163) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Alexander, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 863); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11982) for the relief of Joseph B. McCintock, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 864); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11559) for the relief of Thomas V. Stirman's estate, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 865); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11562) for the relief of Thomas C. Isgrigg, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 866); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House 11781, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 12402) for the relief of the Indiana State board of agriculture, accompanied by a report (No. 867); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11560) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Marcus L. Broadwell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 868); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1902) for the relief of Flora A. Darling, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 869); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1256) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Stephen A. Toops, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 873); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table as follows:

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10960) for the relief of Gustav Augerstein, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 858); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5852) for the relief of Aliza C. C. Armin, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 874); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8003) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. MacFarlane; and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12399) requiring all corporations engaged in interstate commerce to file returns with the Secretary of the Treasury, disclosing their true financial condition, and of their capital stock, and imposing a tax upon such as have outstanding capital stock unpaid in whole or in part—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 12400) to amend the charter of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 12401) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Juneau, Alaska—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 12402) for the relief of the Indiana State board of agriculture, as a substitute for H. R. 11781—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 12403) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into a contract or contracts for the dredging and improvement of the Anacostia River and the reclamation and improvement of its flats from the line of the District of Columbia to the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONDELL: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 40) that there be printed 3,500 copies of the "List of books on irrigation (with reference to periodicals)," compiled under direction of A. P. C. Griffin, chief of Division of Bibliography, for use of Congress—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A resolution (H. Res. 162) that the bill (H. R. 10081) for the relief of William T. Trammell and all accompanying papers be, and the same are hereby, referred to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts under the terms of the act of March 3, 1887, and generally known as the Tucker Act—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A resolution (H. Res. 163) that the bill (H. R. 9655) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Alexander, deceased, and all accompanying papers be, and the same are hereby, referred to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts under the terms of the act of March 3, 1887, and generally known as the Tucker Act—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Memorial from the legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the enactment of a certain bill introduced by Senator HOAR, of Massachusetts, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, relative to the meaning of certain technical terms—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 12404) granting an increase of pension to Westley Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 12405) granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12406) for the relief of John W. Foote, helpless child—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12407) for the relief of Amos C. Tewell, helpless child—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12408) granting an increase of pension to John A. Eveland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12409) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Peck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 12410) granting an increase of pension to Mary Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 12411) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12412) granting an increase of pension to Albert P. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12413) granting an increase of pension to William Zickerick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12414) granting an increase of pension to William E. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 12415) to reimburse Ulysses G. Winn for moneys erroneously paid into the Treasury of the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12416) for the relief of John M. Lea—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANBURY: A bill (H. R. 12417) for the relief of Frederick G. Klein—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Matilda E. Clarke—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 12419) granting an increase of pension to Edward Bland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12420) granting a pension to Wesley Brummett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 12421) to correct the military record of Isaac Chrisman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12422) granting an increase of pension to David Topper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 12423) granting a pension to Annie H. Zoll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 12424) granting an increase of pension to Wallace K. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 12425) to correct the military record of Timothy Crowley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 12426) for the relief of the widow of the late Capt. Henry B. Noble, Eighth Infantry, United States Army (retired)—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 12427) for the relief of the estate of Christian Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12428) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Getty—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 12429) granting an increase of pension to James Speed, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHEA of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12430) granting a pension to Abner H. Lester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama (by request): A bill (H. R. 12431) for the relief of William Beavers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12432) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of Curtis McCollum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12433) for the relief of Henry Green—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12434) for the relief of Stephen Fanning—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12435) for the relief of George Stovall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 12436) granting a pension to Samuel Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12437) granting a pension to Reuben M. Birdsong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12438) granting a pension to Martha J. Derington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 12439) to authorize the Navy Department to disinter and transport to his former home the remains of Jesse J. Everett—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 12440) granting an increase of pension to Demas L. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12441) granting an increase of pension to Peter Whitmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12442) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 12443) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12444) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Holmes, of Company E, Seventy-ninth New York Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 12445) for relief of Mrs. A. E. Hardin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 12446) granting a pension to Mary Shearer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12447) giving military record to James Grooms—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12448) giving military record to Henderson Robinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12449) giving military record to Henderson Angel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12450) giving military record to William R. Flannery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Resolution of Typographical Union No. 262, of Uniontown, Pa., for an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union of Uniontown and citizens of McKeesport and Dunbar, Pa., favoring passage of law for exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of Flint Glass Workers' Union No. 19, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration of persons, other than wives and children, who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Stone Masons' Union No. 34, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Resolution of Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Baraboo, Wis., favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Allen McVey Post, No. 154, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wisconsin, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Baraboo, Wis., favoring restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolutions of Bricklayers' Union No. 4, of Macon, Ga., urging the enactment of a Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of J. W. Woodall and other citizens of Bibb County, Ga., and of George W. Barfield, L. B. Calhoun, and 35 other citizens of Bibb County, protesting against change of appointment of rural free-delivery carriers to contract system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL: Resolutions of Interstate Irrigation Convention, favoring irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of Labor Union No. 1, of Denver, Colo., and Labor Union No. 5, of Florence, Colo., favoring Chinese exclusion—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union of Cripple Creek, Carpenters' Unions of Colorado City and Canon City, Railway

Conductors of Salida; Typographical Union, Stonecutters' Union, and Plasterers' Union, of Colorado Springs; Upholsterers' Union, Carpenters' Union, and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Pueblo, Colo., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BENTON: Resolution of Brewery and Ice Workers' Union of Joplin, Mo., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Bricklayers' Union No. 8 and Typographical Union No. 350, of Joplin, Mo., asking for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Electrical Workers' Union No. 95, and Typographical Union No. 350, of Joplin, Mo., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12404, granting a pension to Westley Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolution of the Interstate Irrigation Congress, with reference to reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BRICK: Resolutions of Broom Makers' Union No. 6, of South Bend, Ind., favoring Chinese exclusion—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Broom Makers' Union No. 6, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of George H. Thomas Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, relative to establishment of Army post near Indianapolis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolutions of Stereotypers' Union No. 5; Division No. 95, Locomotive Engineers, and Division No. 107, Railway Conductors, all of Cincinnati, Ohio, concerning immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Sign Writers' Union No. 224, Wood Workers' Union No. 89, and citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Joe Porter, J. W. Bishop, and J. H. Antrobus, committee, asking the restoration of P County, now known as Woods County, Okla.—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, New York, favoring the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolution of Interstate Irrigation Congress, favoring the irrigation of the arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolution of American Flint Glass Workers' Union and Carpenters' Union No. 463, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of McKeesport, Pa., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Brown Chapel, African Methodist Episcopal Church, Allegheny, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to William Shields, of Washington County, Ark.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to amend the military record of George W. Glenn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Interstate Irrigation Congress of Colorado and Nebraska, favoring irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of Interstate Irrigation Congress, with reference to reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of Frank Head Post, No. 16, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, favoring the building of war ships in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of National Shoe Wholesalers' Association, for removal of the tariff on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Interstate Irrigation Congress and of the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., favoring irrigation of arid lands, etc.—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolution of American Pulp and Paper Association, urging the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GRAFF: Paper to accompany House bill 5357, for the relief of William Leech—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, favoring the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, Catawissa, Pa., in relation to various matters of legislation pending in Congress, principally relating to agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Iron Molders' Union No. 77, of Allegheny, Pa.; Glass Bottle Blowers' Union of Sharpsburg, Pa., and Branch No. 95, of Tarentum, Pa., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of Electrical Workers' Union No. 32, of Lima, Ohio, favoring the construction of war vessels at the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 9719, granting a pension to Sally Ann Horner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of citizens of Three Oaks, Mich., relative to restriction of immigration into the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILL: Paper from the Bureau of Pensions, relating to the claim of Matilda E. Bietry, now Clarke, for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petitions of Carpenters' Union of Orange, N. J., and Bricklayers' Union of Perth Amboy, N. J., favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolution of Los Angeles Division, No. 111, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring the passage of the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of officers of the National Guard of California, favoring House bill 11694, increasing the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Typographical Union of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring passage of law for exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Typographical Union of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., for restrictive legislation on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNAPP: Resolutions of Lowville Grange, No. 171, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lowville, N. Y., opposing appropriation for deep-waterway canal through the State of New York—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, resolution of Parish Grange, No. 575, Patrons of Husbandry, of Parish, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the Sherman cheese-branding bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Central Trades Assembly of Watertown, N. Y., in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of Brickmasons' Union No. 9, of Ottumwa, Iowa, favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of G. C. Northrop and others, of Bloomfield, Iowa, for the establishment of a station for the employment of labor on the public domain—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Interstate Irrigation Congress at Sterling, Colo., in relation to the irrigation and reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LANHAM: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Isaac Chrisman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 132, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against any reduction of tariff on imported cigars that come from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hopkins & Hopkins, Washington, D. C., in relation to foreign-built vessels in competition with American vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of Iron-ship Builders' Union No. 168, of Bath, Me., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Petition of Hopkins & Hopkins, relative to American registry for a foreign-built ship—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of W. M. Hays, of Minnesota Agricultural School, in relation to the appropriation for physiological and pathological investigation of the Bureau of Plant Industry—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of International Association of Machinists, relative to leaves of absence in United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MOODY of North Carolina: Petition of Charles Moore, of Buncombe County, N. C., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OTEY: Papers to accompany House bill 559, for the relief of E. W. Donnelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of Jemima Chambers, of Fayette County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Frank Thomas Post, No. 30, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maryland, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Robert L. Beeman and 49 citizens of Lonacoming, Md., and W. E. Wagus and 50 other citizens of Frostburg, Md., favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to James Speed, jr., Bradford, Me.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Resolutions of Order of Railway Conductors, Corning, N. Y., urging the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Washington, D. C., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Union No. 222, of Fort Wayne, Ind., asking for reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): Petition of William Bushby, of Washington, D. C., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 141, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 9350—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of American Paper and Pulp Association, for the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolution of Western New York Horticultural Society, concerning irrigation—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of Lake Seamen's Union of Buffalo, N. Y., urging continuance of Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Iron Molders' Union No. 13, Buffalo, N. Y., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of McMahon Post, No. 208, Grand Army of the Republic, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring House bill 10150—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHIRM: Resolutions of Glass Bottle Blowers' Union No. 9; Baltimore Division, No. 337, Order of Railroad Conductors, and petition of citizens of Baltimore, Md., relating to Chinese exclusion and immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., for reciprocity measures with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolutions of Union No. 90, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Utica, N. Y., for the exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States and insular possessions—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Resolutions of Edward Pomeroy Post, No. 48, in favor of House bill 7924, placing the name of Joseph R. Smith on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Union No. 436, of Pontiac, Mich., and of Bricklayers' Union No. 12, of Flint, Mich., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Post No. 455, Grand Army of the Republic, of Montrose, Mich., and of United Association, Local Union No. 241, American Federation of Labor, of Flint, Mich., urging the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Pontiac Lodge, No. 436, of Railroad Trainmen, for legislation requiring greater safety in operating trains—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Resolutions of Core Makers' Union No. 70, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 557, and of Bricklayers Union No. 3, of Toledo, Ohio, favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Allied Metal Mechanics' Union No. 18, of Granite Cutters' Union, of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers' Union No. 8, of Bricklayers' Union No. 3, of Freight Handlers' Union No. 121, of International Association of Machinists No. 105, of International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths No. 98, and of Core Makers' Union No. 70, all of Toledo, Ohio, favoring passage of the Chinese-exclusion bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Brass Workers' Union No. 2 and Carpenters' Union No. 25, of Toledo, and Post No. 110, of Bloomdale, Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the construction of

war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Egbert Command, No. 101, Corps of Ohio, Spanish War Veterans, Toledo, Ohio, favoring thanks of Congress and presentation of gold medal to Miss Clara Barton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Interstate Irrigation Congress, Colorado, favoring the irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. THAYER: Resolutions of Team Drivers' International Union No. 196, of Worcester, Mass., favoring a further extension of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Worcester Lodge, No. 339, International Association of Machinists; Team Drivers' International Union, Local Union No. 196; International Union of Steam Engineers No. 78, and of Stone Masons' Union No. 29, of Worcester, Mass., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Resolution of Sanborn Division, No. 11, of Mason City, Iowa, and Division No. 113, of Des Moines, Iowa, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Fort Dodge Division of Order of Railway Conductors, for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOMPKINS of New York: Resolution of Lucky Thought Lodge, No. 232, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Middletown, N. Y., favoring the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Orange County, N. Y., for the protection of native races in the islands of the Pacific and elsewhere against the sale of opium and intoxicants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolution of Typographical Union No. 305, of Newburgh; Bricklayers' Union No. 68, and Cigar Makers' Union No. 488, of Middletown, N. Y., asking for reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 574, Cigar Makers' Union No. 488, and Bricklayers' Union No. 68, all of Middletown, and Typographical Union of Newburgh, N. Y., for an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOMPKINS of Ohio: Petition of Stereotypers' Union No. 14, Columbus, Ohio, against foreign immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Stereotypers' Union No. 14, Columbus, Ohio, favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON: Resolution of Watchcase Makers' Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring restrictive legislation on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODS: Resolutions of Interstate Irrigation Congress of Colorado and Nebraska in joint convention, favoring irrigation surveys and the construction of reservoirs for flood-water storage—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petitions of the officers of First Artillery, Second Brigade, National Guard of California, of San Francisco, favoring the passage of House bill 11654, to increase the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of C. C. Moore Post, No. 774, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 12, 1902.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

### PROMOTION OF COMMERCE.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that when the ship-subsidy bill comes before the Senate for consideration to-morrow I shall ask permission to address the Senate upon it.

### KANSAS INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and accompanying agreement and memorial of the Kansas or Kaw tribe of Indians of Oklahoma relative to their tribal lands and funds; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.