

for the relief of Thomas J. Estes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of the International United Brotherhood of Leather Workers on Horse Goods, of Fort Wayne, Ind., in favor of bills H. R. 89 and 4064—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of Texas, against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Walker Smith Company, of Brownwood, Tex., against the passage of bill H. R. 11964, regulating transportation of explosives—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Petitions of Rev. A. D. Seeleg and others, of Carson, Iowa; W. P. Moulton and 98 others, of Stuart, Iowa, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and other societies of Council Bluffs, Iowa, in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of citizens of Abilene, Gordon, Cisco, Stamford, and Sweetwater, Tex., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Rev. C. F. Fisher and 25 others, of Saybrook, Conn., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolution of New York Preachers' Meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church, relative to legislation in behalf of naval chaplains—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Association of Naval Militias of New York, in favor of bills H. R. 10137 and 10138—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, relative to the improvement of Bronx Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolution of Norristown Council, No. 722, Knights of Columbus, of Norristown, Pa., in favor of the bill for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolution of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 7, 1904.

The Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, offered the following prayer:

Let us now praise famous men, and our fathers that begat us.

The Lord hath wrought great glory by them through His great power from the beginning.

Leaders of the people by their counsels, and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people, wise and eloquent in their instructions.

All these were honored in their generations, and were the glory of their times.

There be of them that have left a name behind them, that their praises might be reported.

And some there be which have no memorial; who are perished, as though they had never been; and are become as though they had never been born; and their children after them.

But these were merciful men, whose righteousness hath not been forgotten.

The people will tell of their wisdom, and the congregation will show forth their praise.

Let us pray. Almighty Father, we thank Thee for everything; but this morning, first of all, for our fathers who begat us, for those from whom we spring, for the men who made the Constitution of this nation, for the men who first sat in this Senate, who led this people by their wisdom, by their counsel, by their foresight, and by their love of God. They are remembered by name or they are not remembered. But their righteousness shall never be forgotten, and we, the sons, will not be faithless to their memory. First of all, in this Senate, to the men who made the first rules for this great nation, men who listened to God and heard Him, men who were pure and peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good works, without partisanship and without hypocrisy.

And now, Father, for to-day and for to-morrow and the days that are to come, be with the children as Thou hast been with the fathers. Make the children move, as so many of the fathers moved, in the way of God. Show them Thy law, that they may make it our law; that we may translate the will of God into the will of men; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven. We ask it in Christ Jesus. Amen.

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. May Thy kingdom come, may Thy will be done, on earth as it is done

in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

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

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

SCHOONER HAZARD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law and the opinion of the court filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court, relating to the vessel schooner *Hazard*, Joseph Campbell, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

HENRY M. SMITH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Henry M. Smith v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

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

A bill (S. 127) authorizing the joining of Kalorama avenue;

A bill (S. 2134) to connect Euclid place with Erie street;

A bill (S. 2710) for the opening of connecting highways on the east and west sides of the Zoological Park, District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 3869) for the extension of Albemarle street.

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

A bill (H. R. 4085) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia;"

A bill (H. R. 9548) 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;"

A bill (H. R. 10424) to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near Council Bluffs, Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 11286) to prevent the unlawful wearing of the badge or insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic or other soldier organizations;

A bill (H. R. 11819) requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday;

A bill (H. R. 13218) for the relief of Adolph Weinhold;

A bill (H. R. 13773) to provide for the settlement of certain outstanding checks drawn by the disbursing officers of the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 13925) to amend section 983 of chapter 23 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 14048) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept donations of money and land for the establishment of branch libraries in the District of Columbia, to establish a commission to supervise the erection of branch library buildings in said District, and to provide for their suitable maintenance;

A bill (H. R. 14093) to incorporate the Carnegie Institution of Washington;

A bill (H. R. 14423) for the extension of T street, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 14424) for the extension of Wyoming avenue to Twenty-third street west.

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 (H. R. 878) granting a pension to Robert S. Rose;

A bill (H. R. 5298) granting a pension to William E. Coffin;

A bill (H. R. 5445) granting a pension to Susan R. Choat;

A bill (H. R. 6923) granting a pension to Olive Bassett;

A bill (H. R. 6931) granting a pension to Sarah A. McCann;

A bill (H. R. 7364) granting an increase of pension to Leonard M. Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 7431) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Burns;

A bill (H. R. 7772) granting a pension to Robert Leach;
 A bill (H. R. 8479) granting a pension to James H. E. Guest;
 A bill (H. R. 8620) granting an increase of pension to Celia M. Viven;
 A bill (H. R. 8715) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Siverd;
 A bill (H. R. 9079) granting a pension to Elizabeth Davison;
 A bill (H. R. 9280) granting an increase of pension James M. Hildreth;
 A bill (H. R. 9632) granting an increase of pension to Philip Loney;
 A bill (H. R. 9697) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Nightingale;
 A bill (H. R. 9738) granting a pension to Rebecca Simpson;
 A bill (H. R. 9792) granting a pension to Fanny Tracy;
 A bill (H. R. 9796) granting an increase of pension to William Berkley;
 A bill (H. R. 9812) granting an increase of pension to Henry N. McLane;
 A bill (H. R. 9929) granting an increase of pension to Frederick K. Bryan;
 A bill (H. R. 10045) granting an increase of pension to George Sluytor;
 A bill (H. R. 10340) granting an increase of pension to George F. Major;
 A bill (H. R. 10626) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Conant;
 A bill (H. R. 10651) granting a pension to Katherine N. Laurence;
 A bill (H. R. 10798) granting an increase of pension to James H. Allen;
 A bill (H. R. 10839) granting an increase of pension to John Conrad Dirschner;
 A bill (H. R. 10841) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth De Baugh;
 A bill (H. R. 10924) granting an increase of pension to Cline Morris;
 A bill (H. R. 10932) granting a pension to Eliza Woolard;
 A bill (H. R. 10941) granting an increase of pension to Mary Dougherty;
 A bill (H. R. 10974) granting an increase of pension to Robert Conn;
 A bill (H. R. 10988) granting an increase of pension to August Graf;
 A bill (H. R. 10997) granting a pension to Mary McGill;
 A bill (H. R. 11169) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Griffith Porter;
 A bill (H. R. 12029) granting an increase of pension to Esther J. Reynolds;
 A bill (H. R. 12102) granting an increase of pension to Lavallo C. O'Barr;
 A bill (H. R. 12461) granting an increase of pension to Milton Graham;
 A bill (H. R. 12474) granting a pension to George Preston Reeves;
 A bill (H. R. 12491) granting an increase of pension to Peter Scott;
 A bill (H. R. 12504) granting an increase of pension to Juliett Field;
 A bill (H. R. 12527) granting an increase of pension to Jane Allen;
 A bill (H. R. 12592) granting a pension to Henry C. Nash;
 A bill (H. R. 12628) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. McConkey;
 A bill (H. R. 12938) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Reed; and
 A bill (H. R. 13043) granting a pension to Esther J. Lee.

NATIONAL APPALACHIAN FOREST RESERVE.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Thursday, the 14th of April, I shall call up the bill (S. 887) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, to be known as the "National Appalachian Forest Reserve," for the purpose of submitting some remarks thereon, and after the conclusion of my remarks I shall ask for the consideration of the bill by the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. QUARLES presented petitions of the Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal churches of Manitowoc; of Local Lodge No. 203, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Wauwatosa; of Local Lodge No. 63, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Suamico; of the congregation of the Union Church of Waupun; of Local Lodge, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Waupun; of Veterans' Home Lodge, No. 473, of Waupaca; of Rock River Lodge, No. 11, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Waupun; of Star of Hope Lodge, No. 172, of Edgerton, and of sundry citi-

zens of Marinette, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Good Shepherd Church, of Racine, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., and a memorial of the Foundrymen's Association of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill" and also the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Las Vegas, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 16, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Springfield, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill" and also the anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of Trenton Musical Association No. 62, American Federation of Musicians, of Trenton, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Monday Afternoon Club, of Passaic, N. J., and a petition of the Woman's Club of Salem, N. J., praying for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains of New Hampshire; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Monday Afternoon Club of Passaic, N. J., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Eighth Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Camden, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to require internal-revenue officers to furnish certified lists of persons paying Federal tax as liquor dealers in no-license towns; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Trenton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Nonpariel Council, No. 22, of Palmyra, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend the statutes relative to lotteries; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DRYDEN presented a petition of the Transparent Cellulose Products Company, of Newark, N. J., praying that a tax be placed on free denatured alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Burlington County Retail Druggists' Association, of New Jersey, remonstrating against the definition of the term "drug" as proposed in the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Dr. Charles J. Kipp, of Newark, N. J., and a petition of the St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Trenton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Trenton Musical Union, No. 62, American Federation of Musicians, of Trenton; of Local Union No. 111, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers, of Trenton, and of Local Union No. 242, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers, of Orange, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill" and also the anti-injunction bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of Harrison S. Weeks Circle, No. 24, Department of Michigan, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Allegan, Mich., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP presented petitions of Lytle Post, No. 59, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Brownton; of Bryant Post, No. 119, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis; of Stanton Post, No. 33, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Fergus Falls; of J. G. Whittmore Post, No. 36, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Villard; of J. L. Buzzel Post, No. 24, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Annandale; of Alexander Wilkin Post, No. 19, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mankato; of Local Post No. 57, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Excelsior; of James Clabaugh Post, No. 54, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic; of George W. Clayton, of Frazee, and of Minnehaha Lodge, No. 705, of Minneapolis, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10208) for the relief of Allegheny College, at Meadville, Pa., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3941) for the relief of James W. Watson, captain in Tenth Cavalry, United States Army, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14110) to authorize the donation of a certain unused and obsolete gun now at Chickamauga Park, Ga., to Phil Kearny Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, at Nelsonville, Ohio, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on February 10, proposing to appropriate \$500,000 for the acquisition of square No. 324, in the city of Washington, D. C., as a site for an addition to the post-office building, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it with an amendment, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4277) for the relief of John M. Hill, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12331) for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9135) for the relief of F. R. Lanson, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5307) to wind up the affairs of the Seminole tribe of Indians in Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

BAYOU LAFOURCHE, LOUISIANA.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 126) providing for the extension of the time for the removal of the temporary dam and construction of locks in Bayou Lafourche, State of Louisiana, to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. McENERY. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

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

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

UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND MISSOURI VALLEY SURVEYS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the resolution submitted on the 5th instant by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE] proposing to print a report on geographical and topographical surveys of the Mississippi River and its tributaries and a portion of the Missouri Valley, to report as a substitute a concurrent resolution, and I ask that the concurrent resolution may be considered and agreed to.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,500 copies of House Document No. 52, Twenty-eighth Congress, second session, including map, 500 for the use of the Senate and 1,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, the same

being a report made by I. N. Nicollet of his geographical and topographical surveys under authority of the Government in the years 1836 to 1839, inclusive, of the Mississippi River and its tributaries from St. Louis to its source and of a portion of the Missouri Valley.

DESIGNATION OF BILLS IN STATUTES.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 143) amending the law relating to the printing of the statutes, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of State to include in the marginal references of the United States Statutes at Large for the Fifty-eighth and subsequent Congresses the number of the Senate bill, House bill, Senate joint resolution, or House joint resolution (designating same as "S." for Senate bill, "H. R." for House bill, "S. J. Res." for Senate joint resolution, "H. J. Res." for House joint resolution, as the case may be) under which each act was approved and became a law, said marginal reference to be placed within brackets immediately under the marginal date of the approval of each act at the beginning of each chapter as the same is now printed.

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

ALLOTMENTS TO CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

Mr. CLAPP. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5255) to provide allotments to Indians on the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

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

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

PENSIONS OF TELEGRAPH OPERATORS.

Mr. SCOTT. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 932) amending the act of January 26, 1897, entitled "An act for the relief of telegraph operators who served in the war of the rebellion," to report it with amendments; and I submit a report. It is a very elaborate report, and I ask to have it printed as a Senate document, owing to the fact that it relates to the service of telegraph operators during the civil war, and this data was accumulated with a great deal of trouble and care. It is a matter which will come before the Senate in determining whether all telegraph operators during the civil war shall be made pensionable. A part of them were mustered into the United States service; others doing the same duty were not mustered into the service. By the bill I now report favorably we hope to correct the injustice that we think is being done to those who were not mustered into the service. I therefore ask that the report which accompanies the bill be printed as a document. I think it will be interesting to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed upon the Calendar. The report will be printed under the rule, of course. The Senator from West Virginia also asks that it may be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RESURVEY OF LANDS IN CASCADE COUNTY, MONT.

Mr. GIBSON. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5203) providing for the resurvey of township 18 north, range six east, and township 19 north, range six east, Montana meridian, Cascade County, State of Montana, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

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

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

FIRST LIEUT. THOMAS MASON.

Mr. MALLORY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2354) for the promotion of First Lieut. Thomas Mason, Revenue-Cutter Service, to report it favorably with an amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

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

The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in line 4, after the word "authorized," to strike out the words "and directed;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to advance Lieut. Thomas Mason, Revenue-Cutter Service, one grade, from first lieutenant to that of captain, on the "permanent waiting orders" list in the Revenue-Cutter Service, for meritorious acts while in the service of the Navy and of the Revenue-Cutter Service of the

United States: *Provided, however,* That no increase in pay or allowance is to be made by the advance in grade hereby authorized.

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 to authorize the promotion of First Lieut. Thomas Mason, Revenue-Cutter Service."

SAILORS' HOME AT SAN FRANCISCO.

Mr. NELSON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred Senate Document No. 18, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, being a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a copy of the testimony in the investigation into the management of the Sailors' Home at San Francisco, Cal., to submit a report thereon, and I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be printed under the law.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that the report be also printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks that the report made from the Committee on Commerce be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

PORT OF VINALHAVEN, ME.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Maine reports favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce, the bill (H. R. 7292) making Vinalhaven, Me., a subport of entry, and asks for its present consideration.

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 5415) for the relief of the heirs of Simeon H. King, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 5416) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hopson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 5417) granting an increase of pension to Marshall H. Burnham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 5418) to construct and place a light-ship near the eastern end of Hedge Fence Shoal, at the entrance to Vineyard Sound, Massachusetts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 5419) for the relief of the estate of Oneziphore Delahoussaye, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 5420) for the relief of the Medwakanton band of Sioux Indians, residing in Redwood County, Minn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BACON. I submit an amendment, proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the promotion of skill in military rifle shooting among the organized militia of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, intended to be proposed by me to the sundry civil appropriation bill. The amendment is in the same language as the bill (S. 4875) to further promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes, heretofore introduced by me. I move that the amendment be printed, and referred, together with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DRYDEN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,200 to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year 1903, for the expenses of the board for the promotion of rifle practice throughout the United States; and proposing to appropriate \$756 to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year 1903, to reimburse the New Jersey Rifle Association for expenses incident to the national match of 1903, held at Seagirt, N. J., and to make up the deficiency in the cash prizes provided for by the act of March 2, 1903, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARD submitted an amendment authorizing the acquisition of additional land to enlarge the public-building site belonging to the United States in the city of Los Angeles, Cal., providing

for the erection of a public building on such site at a cost not exceeding \$850,000, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

A bill (H. R. 4085) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia;"

A bill (H. R. 11819) requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday;

A bill (H. R. 13218) for relief of Adolph Weinhold;

A bill (H. R. 13773) to provide for the settlement of certain outstanding checks drawn by the disbursing officers of the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 13925) to amend section 983 of chapter 22 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 14048) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept donations of money and land for the establishment of branch libraries in the District of Columbia, to establish a commission to supervise the erection of branch library buildings in said District, and to provide for their suitable maintenance;

A bill (H. R. 14093) to incorporate the Carnegie Institution of Washington;

A bill (H. R. 14423) for the extension of T street, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 14424) for the extension of Wyoming avenue to Twenty-third street west.

The bill (H. R. 9548) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies, reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 10424) to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near Council Bluffs, Iowa, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 11286) to prevent the unlawful wearing of the badge or insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic or other soldier organizations was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DAVID T. TOWLES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1851) granting an increase of pension to David T. Towles, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and agree to the conference asked by the House.

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. McCUMBER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PATTERSON were appointed.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State covering a statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the month of February, 1904, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission in pursuance of section 11 of the act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory, etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, April 7, 1904.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR HANNA.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, in accordance with the notice heretofore given, I now present the resolutions I send to the desk, and ask for their present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MARCUS A. HANNA, late a Senator from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I first met Senator HANNA at the national Republican convention of 1884, to which he was a

delegate at large. The other three delegates at large from Ohio to that convention were William McKinley, jr., Judge William H. West, and myself. McKinley and West supported Mr. Blaine, while Mr. HANNA and I were for John Sherman. Mr. Sherman was the first choice of very few delegates to that convention, but many of his friends thought he was the second choice of a majority.

While, therefore, the Ohio delegation was divided, and there was but little "first-choice" support from other States, there was good ground for hope that out of the possibilities of the situation our candidate might be chosen.

This fact encouraged us to labor industriously to make acquaintances and to bring about combinations that would be helpful to our cause.

Mr. HANNA was then a young man, only 46 years of age. He was in the zenith of his powers, both mental and physical. He was tireless in his efforts, pleasing in his manners, and direct and forceful in the advocacy of Mr. Sherman's claims, and in all these respects he impressed himself most favorably upon all with whom he came in contact. But he lacked then the name and influence he afterwards acquired. He was known only as a business man, who had never held an office of any kind, and who had never figured in public affairs, except in his own city and county, and he was really still a new man there.

He had been chosen as a delegate at large not because he was a factor in State politics, for he had not yet become such, but only because he was a strong man in his own county, and that county put him forward to represent it on the delegation, and the Republicans of the State accepted him on that indorsement.

It was on account of such circumstances and for such reasons that his efforts in behalf of Mr. Sherman, although earnest and zealous, were yet of but little avail.

In connection with those efforts, however, I became familiarly acquainted with him, and as a result of that experience we became warm friends, both politically and personally.

That friendship was uninterrupted until shortly prior to the national Republican convention of 1888, to which we were both again delegates, and as such once more united in the support of Mr. Sherman.

In connection with that convention incidents occurred which, together with minor differences that arose shortly before, entirely interrupted our relations for the next three years, when in a modified and less cordial way they were resumed and thereafter continued until his death.

These relations were less cordial than previously, because although we at times heartily cooperated and in a personal and social way were entirely friendly, yet in political matters we were generally opposed to each other in the factional contests and controversies among the Republicans of our State.

His relations to McKinley are well known. They were such that when McKinley became President and he became Senator he naturally and inevitably became dominant in Ohio politics.

I mention all this not to review or to revive the past, much less to discuss the merits of its disputes, but only to show the many points of view from which it was my fortune to know and study the man.

In the grave with him lie buried all differences, all hostilities, all animosities, all prejudices, and all unkindness of feeling of every sort that ever at any time may have been entertained.

I would not discuss anything of such a nature on this occasion if I could, and I could not do so with propriety if I would. Here and now all criticism should be hushed, except only that which may be an inseparable part of his actual life, character, and public services.

He would not, if he could, have it otherwise, for, if I knew him and understood him, I hazard nothing in saying that if he could have a voice as to the character of this day's exercises, he would not countenance false praise nor wish to have ascribed to him virtues he did not even profess to have.

He had too much sense of propriety, too much regard for truth, and too much confidence and pride in what he really was to desire to be painted here or elsewhere in other than true colors. Happily for his memory these colors are sufficiently bright.

Having expressed this belief, it is hardly necessary to say that I shall not consciously exaggerate in what I may say of him, but rather strive to speak only the words of sober truth.

To those who knew him only as I knew him for the first four years of our acquaintance he was an unusually lovable man. He was bright, cheery, generous, kind, strong, and ever ready to practice self-denial, especially when it involved the preferment of a friend.

These qualities were so pronounced and so manifest that none others could well be seen by those who looked through only the partial eyes of friendship.

By these traits and habits he naturally made such ardent friends of all with whom he met that it was easy for them to think and

believe that if he had differences with anyone or met with opposition from anyone, it must have been without fault on his part.

In some measure—perhaps in large measure—this may have been true. Whether it was always the case is immaterial, so far as present purposes are concerned. The fact is mentioned not to controvert or discuss it, but only to show his charming and powerful qualities in this regard.

But while he thus appeared to his friends and to all who were in accord with him and had no occasion to know him except in agreeable relations, he appeared to have some additional and less agreeable characteristics to those who were so unfortunate as to be in opposition to him concerning any matter he deemed important.

To all such he was the very impersonation of antagonism itself. He had such strong convictions that he always felt impelled in such cases to contend with all his energy and powers for the views he entertained and the cause he espoused.

In all such contests he invariably battled fiercely and unrelentingly to the end, spurning all compromises and stopping at nothing honorable short of unqualified success.

He was so constituted by nature that he could not easily do otherwise.

As a result he seldom resorted to diplomacy or to any kind of effort to placate or mollify opposition, but relied on the logic of hard knocks.

Like Napoleon, he believed that the way to win victories was to have the heaviest artillery, and plenty of it, and to make vigorous use of it.

While this policy made many enemies, it also made legions of friends and inspired them with confidence and affectionate admiration.

He reciprocated this devotion to such an extent that he never hesitated to support his followers in their troubles or to help them fight their battles without much regard to their character.

This at times brought criticism upon him, but he never faltered on that account.

He could only see the friendship he had enjoyed and refused to believe that the man who bore him attachment could be unworthy of his assistance.

Only a man of uncommon strength of character, and one possessing the confidence of his fellow-countrymen to an unusual degree, could have done what he so habitually did in this respect without serious injury to his reputation, but with him it came to be regarded as a virtue.

Combined with these characteristics he was blessed with an extraordinary intellectual endowment, a powerful physique, and a pleasing personality, an agreeable voice, and an absolute freedom from affectation. His conceptions were quick and remarkably accurate. His judgment was uncommonly good of both men and measures. He had wonderful power of endurance and the faculty of approaching men, although directly and at times almost bluntly, in such a manner as to prepossess them favorably both as to himself and his subject. Few men have been favored with such a rare combination of faculties and powers as he possessed, and yet he lacked qualities ordinarily deemed indispensable to a successful public career.

He was not a scholarly man, nor a student, in the ordinary sense, of public questions, but as though by intuition he comprehended accurately and appreciated fully every problem that arose.

He made no pretensions to any special refinement or culture, but was familiarly at ease in every circle.

History, science, art, and literature were all fields in which he trod but casually, if ever at all, and yet among his warmest friends and most earnest admirers were to be found the most learned of the schools and the professions.

His services in the Senate covered a period of almost seven years. During all this time he was prominent, influential, and helpful in determining policies and shaping legislation of national and international importance and consequence; but he left behind him no statute or other measure of which he was distinctively the author.

In short, although he had deficiencies and probably disappointed expectations in some respects, he filled a great place among the greatest men of his time, and died respected, beloved, and mourned by all classes of his countrymen.

His greatness was not like that of Webster and Clay, or Lincoln or Blaine or McKinley, for he did not pretend to have the powers or accomplishments that made them so distinguished. He belonged to an altogether different class and type of men. Although a pleasant and agreeable public speaker, unlike them he was not an orator, and did not seek to mold audiences by the persuasive powers of eloquence, nor did he undertake to formulate measures or to solve in statutory form the problems of constructive statesmanship.

His powers were of a different nature. They were of the organizing and executive character. While he had sound judgment and quick perception to enable him to perceive the right of pub-

lic questions and the policies that should be pursued with respect to them, he also had sound judgment as to how to reach the understandings of men and how to impress upon them the necessities of cooperation and the character of machinery and procedure by which to bring about effective results. Plainly stated, he had uncommon common sense and an almost unnatural knowledge of human nature. He was above all men of his time fitted for the work that fell to him in connection with the nomination and the election of William McKinley to the Presidency.

His training and experience as a business man enabled him to perceive and appreciate the incalculable importance of the questions to be tried before the American people, the superior qualifications of his candidate to represent his party at that particular time with respect to those questions, and the methods whereby to educate the American people and bring them to a united support of the views that finally prevailed with respect thereto.

This was his great opportunity, and he improved it so thoroughly that he not only excited the affectionate regard of his own party, but also commanded the admiration of his opponents. It was an arduous work well done.

He had the usual experience of men who do great things well.

He was made the target for all the criticisms, abuses, slanders, and libels that malicious ingenuity could invent.

There was no ignoble trait or passion that was not ascribed to him and portrayed of him in the political cartoons and writings of that day. A less strong man would have despaired and been destroyed by it, but he never showed the slightest concern on such account.

Conscious of his power and the ultimate vindication of his purposes, he disregarded them all and went steadily forward upon the lines of duty as he saw it.

He grew not alone with the years, but even with the days. Soon the whole country came to understand that he was one of the really great men of his day and generation. Then the pendulum of public opinion swung quickly in the opposite direction. Misconceptions faded and misrepresentations ceased. Praise succeeded to criticism, and favor followed, until he enjoyed at the hands of the American people a most rare and exceptional esteem and admiration.

He was given a most gratifying evidence of this regard, and one that he fully appreciated, by the people of Ohio at the last election. As the candidate of his party for the Senate he appealed directly for their suffrages, and at the close of a hotly contested campaign was accorded the most triumphant indorsement ever given by that State to any candidate for that office.

He had before him seven years of service, for which he had already been chosen, when the fatal summons came. Had he lived and been blessed with health they would undoubtedly have been years of still greater usefulness and higher honors. With his increased prestige and ripened experience all reasonable achievements were not only possible but probable.

Under such circumstances his death seemed not only untimely, but a most unusual public loss. The whole nation, as well as his family and close friends, experienced a deep sense of bereavement.

It is some consolation to realize that he ran his race well to the end, and that his career, successful throughout, was crowned until its very close with a succession of brilliant triumphs that endeared him to his countrymen and gave him a permanent place of high honor not only in their history, but also in their hearts.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

To live in hearts we leave behind
Is not to die.

From childhood on through each succeeding period, among the many with whom we are associated, there are always those to whom we are peculiarly attracted, with whom it is an especial pleasure to be, who seem in some way to belong to us and we to them. These we hold as friends.

In the morning of that day which we call life, the Angel of Death, with noiseless footstep, steals among a group of merry children and bears away the one whom we most love, while we stand by wondering, afraid, and lonely. Without our little friend school is a dreary, cheerless place; we fail in lessons that we knew, because our thoughts are far away. Nor have we heart for play; a shadow falls on every game and robs it of its sport, and every tree and field and brook reminds us of our loneliness. But sorrow does not long weigh down the buoyant, elastic spirit of a child; and so, after a while, some one else slips into the vacant place, and life is glad again.

Years pass. It is the noontime of life's day. Again the unwelcome angel comes and bears beyond our touch and ken our best beloved friend. The pain is keen, the wound deep. We are restless; and listlessly we take up our round of duties; the charm and zest have fled. To us the sky seems ever gray, and the glad sunshine to have gone forever. Yet this also is a period of elasticity,

of ceaseless, virile activity, a period of many interests. So here too, after a time, there is a rebound. Do we forget? Ah, no! This friendship becomes a sweet, a treasured memory, whose impress we bear through all the years to come.

Time hurries on. We reach the afternoon of life and feel ourselves, though all reluctantly, nearing the twilight. We are more slow than once we were to take on new friendships; but time and the experience of life have given depth and strength to those already formed. Nor do we here escape the visit of the angel. Indeed, he comes more frequently than in the years gone by and bears away those whom we cherish; but into the place of the friend whom death takes from us no new one enters. We are more lonely than we were in childhood or in earlier manhood, more full of yearning; yet is there no vacant place in our heart, for the inspiration of the personality of him whose form has vanished, whose voice is hushed, lives with us still to bless us.

Within a few brief years, thrice has the Angel come and borne away, beyond the dark, mysterious borderland, into that fair country where "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain," those whom I have had the honor to claim as friends—men of noble heart, of breadth of view, of poise of character, whose minds were masterful, whose loyalty knew "no variableness, neither shadow of turning,"—men great in achievement, who charmed alike the imagination and the heart—Hobart, McKinley, HANNA. And it is to honor the memory of the last of this noble trio, MARCUS A. HANNA, that we are thus met to-day.

When, on the evening of the 15th of February, representatives of the press called upon me and asked for some expression of opinion regarding Senator HANNA, I said: Gentlemen you must excuse me to-night. As well might you ask me to speak concerning the loss of some dear member of my own household, as to speak at such a time of him whom I have so loved.

All that day I had remained near the room in which he lay ill, hope struggling within me against despair, despair against hope, hope finally yielding to despair. When the word came that to the last grim enemy the great, strong will of the otherwise unconquerable HANNA had bended, and I stood face to face with the fact that the spirit of this brave, true man had gone to return no more forever, grief and desolation filled my heart.

He was a man made to be loved, and he was loved. To-day the world seems lonesome without him. I miss his kindly face, his cordial hand clasp, his genial companionship, his helpful counsel. Sometimes, indeed, it seems as if the very sunshine itself were not so bright and warm as once it was.

I speak because "he was my friend, faithful and just to me;" because I loved him; because his friendship was one of the priceless blessings of my life; and, finally, because to keep silent on this day set apart to do him reverence would seem to savor of disloyalty; not that I can add aught to the rich meed of well-deserved praise that has been accorded him during these weeks that have gone. I have no gift of eloquence with which to grace a splendid eulogy. Mine is but the simple tribute of a friend—a friend who knows no words commensurate with the mighty flood of feeling that surges through his breast. Those happier in the use of words than I, fellow-Senators—the orators of this honorable body—others brilliant and distinguished in public life, ministers of the gospel, the press, political and various civic organizations, have paid him noble tribute. And yet has he indeed need of these? Are not his own life and character his most eloquent eulogy?

"Nature herself will have no great things hastily formed; in the direct path to all beautiful and conspicuous achievement she heaps up difficulty," said Rufus Choate. And we have learned, each for himself, only too well the cost of even moderate achievement; we have learned also the cost of loyalty—especially the cost of loyalty in political life. When we remember, therefore, how preeminently Senator HANNA succeeded in every field that engaged his interest and to which he gave his endeavor; when we remember his unswerving loyalty to every cause that he espoused, to every promise that he made, to every friend that he had, we begin to appreciate how phenomenal he was.

The president of perhaps the most powerful railroad system in the United States remarked some months ago that, in the several conversations which it had been his privilege to have with Senator HANNA, he was struck with his comprehensive grasp of subjects to which, it might very naturally have been supposed, he had had but little opportunity to give much consideration; and that touching the question of transportation, for example, to which day after day and year after year he himself gave his serious thought—which, indeed, was his life study—he had never talked with Senator HANNA without receiving some new idea or some original and valuable suggestion.

His political life was inseparably connected with that of our late beloved President, William McKinley. For many years he

had been a warm admirer of McKinley and had supported him with all the ardor of a true friend in his political advancement. When the memorable campaign of 1896 drew near, the demand for McKinley as the candidate of the Republican party became widespread and insistent.

His long and honorable career in the National Congress and as governor of Ohio made him the logical candidate of the party. The country had just passed through a period of disastrous business depression, and financial interests were in a chaotic and demoralized condition. McKinley was the personification of the American policy of protection, and was heralded as the "advance agent of prosperity."

At this juncture there appeared on the horizon a star previously unknown to the political world. It flashed forth through the mists of obscurity with the brilliancy of a meteor, fixed itself in the firmament of political activity, and became the guiding star of the Republican hosts. As a political manager Mr. HANNA was an unknown quantity, and wise men shook their heads with doubt and fear at the sudden ascendancy of this new Moses of the party. Many gave utterance to expressions of deprecation, but his friends knew him and trusted him. Mr. HANNA, as I have said, was comparatively unknown in politics; he had never been a national character in the councils of his party, but he was a man whose name had been linked with success in every field to which his energies had hitherto been directed.

He addressed himself to this new responsibility with characteristic determination and zeal, and more than fulfilled the expectations of his friends. His name became a household word the country over. His great natural ability, coupled with his long and successful experience in the world of affairs, fitted him for his new task and enabled him to master its every detail with a thoroughness and an understanding that gave confidence to those associated with him and excited the wonder and admiration of even his closest friends. His methods were original, and his directness fascinated his political opponents and compelled their respect. He was the right man in the right place.

The splendor of the victory of 1896, following, as it did, one of the fiercest political campaigns the nation had ever experienced, demonstrated that there had been no error in the choice of a leader, and proved that those who placed their faith in Mr. HANNA knew in whom they trusted. It won for him the unbounded confidence of the country at large and made the second decisive victory, gained by the Republican party in 1900 through his wise and conservative leadership, but the realization of general expectation.

Great as these victories were, however, to Mr. HANNA, they brought something of bitterness. His position as chairman of the Republican national committee made him the target for the most merciless criticism, the most venomous abuse. As the strife grew more heated, the rival campaign orators and newspapers became more and more inflamed; and, in some instances, all sense of political fairness and of respect for the personal feelings of men seemed to be lost.

Mr. HANNA, the lifelong friend of labor, the kind, genial liberty-loving citizen, the considerate and respected employer of workmen, the honest, fair-dealing business man, in fact, the true, manly man in every regard, was pictured to the inflamed minds of the masses as a fiend incarnate, a monster, a hard-hearted and cruel crusher of labor. His personal as well as his business life was distorted so as present him in the most odious light; and for the time, he was much misunderstood, much maligned. Outwardly, this abuse did not seem to affect him. He was big enough and broad enough to tower above it; and when the storm was over, he stood erect and strong, his integrity unscathed. But inwardly he felt keenly the injustice that had been done him; the sting sank deep into his heart and hurt him to the quick.

I shall never forget one morning during the campaign of 1896 when he handed me a New York paper containing a cartoon of himself pictured as a huge monster, clad in a suit covered over with dollar marks, smoking an immense cigar and trampling under foot women and children until their eyes protruded from the sockets and their skeleton forms writhed in agony. After I had looked at it for a moment, he said to me: "That hurts! When I have tried all my life to put myself in the other fellow's place, when I have tried to help those in need and to lighten the burdens of those less fortunate than myself, to be pictured as I am here, to be held up to the gaze of the world as a murderer of women and children, I tell you it hurts." And, looking up into the frank, manly face, I saw the tears coursing down his cheeks, and he turned and silently walked away.

The subject which perhaps lay closer than any other to the mind and heart of this noble man, that to which he so often expressed the desire to devote the remaining days of his life, was the vital question of capital and labor, the matter of the adjustment of the differences between the employer and the employed. His position was a unique one. He held the respect and confidence not

only of the moneyed interests of the country, but also of the mass of the working people, and was therefore peculiarly fitted for the gigantic task of conciliating these two great classes in America. As an employer of labor, he gave the same earnest consideration to the welfare and advancement of his employees that he gave to his own. Strikes and lockouts were foreign to the industries which he conducted; and when differences arose, they were adjusted amicably and satisfactorily. I thought, as I listened to the eloquent words of Bishop Leonard that sad day in Cleveland, how Senator HANNA's great, tender heart, so exquisitely sensitive to kindness, would have burned within him at the silent and sublime tribute of those three hundred thousand miners who ceased their work that day, laid down their picks, and put out their lamps that they might thus witness to the world their reverence for "a righteous man, a strong leader, a considerate employer."

It has been said that self-interest rules the world from pole to pole; and when I see how men, forgetful of the divine command to love one another, turn against their fellow-men with hatred and malice, I am almost persuaded that the words are true. But, happily, amid the gloom of such pessimism, there ever flashes before me the golden example of my beloved friend. When I remember how he gave up luxury and flung away ambition that he might go forth on the lofty mission of helping humanity and healing the strifes prevalent among us; when I remember how, regardless of personal interest, he entered the arena where capital and labor were engaged in death struggles and brought them amicably together; when I hear the glad acclaims of the hundreds of thousands whom he reconciled and helped, the vision changes and I see no more the darkness and the gloom, but in their stead come the blessed sunshine of hope and the dawn of peace eternal, and the world with all its cares and miseries and crimes brightens as with the glory of the noonday sun.

How our pulse quickens, how our hearts are stirred, in the contemplation of a character so impressive! Wisdom, honor, courage, strength, and earnestness of purpose, self-control, frankness, steadfastness, simplicity, and kindness of heart—all were met in him. And to these must be added that other distinctive trait—the one to which, above all others, I believe he owed his preeminent success—an absolute love of justice and fair play. He abhorred unfairness. With admirable impartiality of judgment he quickly discovered the just side of every controversy, and this once ascertained, whether in the affairs of individuals or in the larger matters affecting the policy of his country, nothing could swerve him from the course that his sense of justice and of right marked out for him. It was this splendid side of his character that so endeared him to his fellow-countrymen and enshrined him in their affections. And could we, who knew him well, resist the magnetism of his high qualities? They were the subtle keys that unlocked our hearts and made them yield up to him their store of admiration and affection.

The world is better because he lived. So exalted was his character, so illustrious his achievements, so noble and unselfish his ambitions, that life gave him up reluctantly and death was proud to take him. But death can not take from us the memory of what he was and what he did. Men come and go; he alone lives forever in the hearts of his countrymen who truly loves and serves his brother man. Though dead, this immortality, this endless life in human heart and history, is the supreme, the sovereign reward of MARCUS ALONZO HANNA.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I desire to join in this last tribute of respect, friendship, and honor by the Senate to the memory of our late colleague, Hon. MARCUS ALONZO HANNA. Senator HANNA was born September 24, 1837, in Lisbon, Columbiana County, Ohio, and died in this capital city on February 15, 1904. With his father's family he removed to Cleveland, Ohio, in 1852, where he made his home thereafter. He was educated in the common schools of that city and in the Western Reserve College, at Hudson, Ohio.

His father was the senior member of the firm of Hanna, Garretson & Co., grocers. Senator HANNA began his business career as an employee in that firm and continued therein to the death of his father, in 1862, and thereafter represented his father's interest until 1867, when the business of the firm was closed up. He then became a member of the firm of Rhodes & Co., engaged in the iron and coal business, and at the expiration of ten years the title of the firm was changed to M. A. Hanna & Co., which continued up to the time of his death.

In this firm he became identified with the transportation business on the Great Lakes, in the ownership of vessels on the Lakes, and in the construction of such vessels. He was president of the Union National Bank of Cleveland and of the Cleveland City Railway Company.

He devoted all his energies and abilities to his business affairs

and was eminently successful, acquiring a private fortune which placed him in the rank of rich men in the country where riches are only counted by millions.

It is shown by the records that **MARCUS A. HANNA** was mustered into service May 5, 1864, at Cleveland, Ohio, as second lieutenant of Company C, One hundred and fiftieth Ohio National Guard Infantry Volunteers, to serve one hundred days, and that he was mustered out and honorably discharged from the service with his company, as second lieutenant, August 23, 1864, at Cleveland, Ohio.

This organization, upon its muster in, proceeded to Washington, D. C., where it arrived May 14, 1864, and was assigned to the defenses north of the Potomac. It was engaged in action at Fort Stevens, D. C., July 11 and 12, 1864.

The first civil position he held was that of Government director of the Union Pacific Railway Company, in 1885, by the appointment of President Cleveland. This position enabled him to extend and widen his acquaintances among leading business men and to form valuable friendships.

While a staunch Republican and taking a lively interest in party affairs, he had not sought any political preferment until 1884. He was chosen a delegate to the national Republican conventions in 1884, 1888, and 1896. He had been an ardent admirer and a warm personal and political friend of President McKinley, and was most active in securing his nomination in 1896, and was chosen chairman of the national Republican committee in that year and in 1900, and was holding the position at his death.

When Hon. John Sherman resigned his position as Senator to accept the position of Secretary of State under President McKinley, Mr. **HANNA** was appointed United States Senator by Governor Bushnell, on March 5, 1897, to fill the vacancy, and in January, 1898, he was elected to fill the unexpired portion of the term ending March 3, 1899, and also for the full term ending March 3, 1905, and in January, 1904, was reelected for the term ending March 3, 1911, by the largest legislative vote ever given a candidate for the Senate in that State.

In all business affairs Senator **HANNA** wielded a strong influence and his judgment was given great weight, and the results justified its soundness, and his organizations of enterprises were timely planned and capable of successful administration. As a politician Senator **HANNA** was preeminently successful and displayed a wonderful faculty and power for organization, gauging public opinion, adopting measures for promoting the interests and success of his party, and seeing where effort should be exerted. It is related of him that, in discussing his reasons for being in politics, he said:

I am in politics for the best interests of the country through the instrumentality of the Republican party.

Senator **HANNA** entered the Senate with the prestige of a most successful business man and a most capable and efficient party leader.

The eyes and the attention of his personal and political friends and also his political opponents were fixed upon his conduct and actions as a legislator in the Senate of the United States without any previous experience in any legislative body. His career in the Senate sustained the highest expectations of his personal and political friends and gave him high rank in the Senate. He was not a frequent speaker, but in his discussion of the questions in which he participated he spoke with great clearness and force and received the closest attention of both sides in this Chamber.

In regard to his death and loss I quote from an editorial in the *Evening Star*, of this city:

The death of Mr. **HANNA** is truly a national loss, and a considerable one. He has for eight years played an important part in our national affairs, and played it well. He secured and held the confidence of the country. In business circles as well as in wage-earning circles he was esteemed a statesman of sagacity and fair dealing. His influence was exerted in behalf of the public credit, of progress in affairs, and of a friendly, helpful understanding between capital and labor. **HANNA** the man was as busy in all matters touching these questions as **HANNA** the Senator. He labored unceasingly, taking his official commission as a serious call to duty, and finding in the work before him an inspiration to his best endeavors.

Mr. **HANNA** will rank as one of our remarkable men. He was 60 years of age when he became a commanding political quantity. Up to that time, while he had been no stranger to politics—bearing as a good citizen his share in the local campaigns—he had in the main addressed himself to private business interests which, because of their size, had been exacting. But when the man whom he had helped to make President called for his counsel here in office, he accepted office, and almost immediately rose to power there. He proved to be not only an excellent adviser, but a strong debater, holding his own in the Senate on questions of great difficulty with men schooled in discussion by a lifetime devoted to public speaking.

The voice which had not hitherto been lifted except at the council table of a business establishment was now heard in the Senate of the United States with respect and admiration. He spoke easily and effectively and as though born to the speaker's purple.

The relations which Mr. **HANNA** bore to Mr. McKinley were most affectionate. He helped the statesman and loved the man. Mr. McKinley's great success in office was dear to his heart.

As a member of the committee of the Senate appointed to accompany the remains of Senator **HANNA** to their last resting place in his home city of Cleveland, Ohio, I was present at the funeral services.

Although the weather was exceedingly inclement, the many thousands of the people from his home city and from many parts of his native State and from other States who were there assembled were the strongest possible testimonials to the great respect, warm friendship, and affection they cherished for him in all the relations of life. The last funeral services were held in St. Paul's Episcopal Church, under charge of Bishop Leonard, who, among other things, said:

We are gathered here to-day in this house of God for the last services of benediction over the body of our distinguished citizen, our kindly neighbor, and our beloved friend. The nation has honored him with its civic function at the capital of the United States; the Commonwealth of Ohio, by the hand of her governor, has received him back into her care and keeping; the city has stood silently about his bier, reverencing his memory and sorrowing at his departure. And now the holy church would commit his body from whence it came and his soul unto the righteous Savior who redeemed it and who loved it with an infinite affection. It is not the time or place for extended eulogy and praise; such will be fitly spoken by those well equipped for such a privilege. But there are certain qualities and characteristics of this man so highly regarded by all classes of people that ought assuredly to receive recognition in the midst of his friends and associates and at this solemn hour.

The testimonies that have been given from many and varied sources blend together in a common strain and harmony as they speak of his high integrity, his inflexible and dauntless purpose, and his tender, true heart. Their composite resultant seems to portray with unmistakable outline and detail the features of his human service. Those who are assembled here need no inspiration for their love and estimation of this earnest, helpful life. We knew him well; we loved him well; we mourn for him with undiminished sorrow because we shall see his face no more. But we may each of us go forth into the life God hath granted us, with added enthusiasm for our tasks and toils, since we have noted how worthily he did his duty for others, and we realize that the world he served is not unmindful of his greatness and goodness, nor ungrateful for what he strove after and for what he accomplished.

And, first, the universal comment is on his integrity. This was a keynote in his life. I recall a fine, ringing address he made at Kenyon College last year when the degrees were being conferred upon its graduating class. And the thought of his heart found expression in his eloquent words as he urged upon those men the essential importance of a high and pure integrity. It is this word that he has carved deep upon the stone that marks his long and successful business career. He was not only honest, but he was fair and just in all his dealings. He was respected by everyone in his employ.

Senator **HANNA** was warm and tender-hearted—devoted to his friends and his friends were devoted to him—was generous and kind to his employees, and enjoyed their respect and friendship. I shall never forget the words spoken by him at a dinner given by him in honor of General Booth, of the Salvation Army, after General Booth had explained the organization and work of the Salvation Army throughout the world. He told how he had become interested in that work, and enlisted in aiding it, and the great good it was accomplishing in reaching and elevating a class and condition of people not reached by other denominations of Christians, and plainly manifesting his tenderness of heart and his warm sympathy in behalf of those in lowly conditions in life. All these traits of his noble, generous character were exhibited in his family relations. As a husband he was faithful, devoted, and loving to his noble, good wife. As a father he was kind and affectionate to his two daughters and son.

He achieved distinguished success in his business, in his political aspirations, and in his career in the Senate of the United States. We shall miss him in this Chamber, taken from us by the grim reaper Death in the zenith of his achievements and power. We lament his death and tender to his bereft and sorrowing wife and children our heartfelt condolence and sympathy.

Mr. **PLATT** of Connecticut. Mr. President, it may with truth be said that when **MARCUS A. HANNA** died all the people mourned with a grief that was deep and unfeigned. Something in his life and character had endeared him to all classes. What that something was it is difficult to say, but we know that it is given to but few men in this world to inspire such respect and affection as did our deceased comrade and brother. His death saddened all. From one end of the nation to the other all felt the solemn hush which precedes impending disaster. Then came long, weary days of waiting, with alternating hope and fear, and finally the great sorrow which makes a whole people one in the sense of common loss.

The sun of life was clouded, and the whole air chill and dreary. It seemed as if the tie which bound his heart to every heart had been rudely sundered. While all shared the common grief, I think that nowhere outside of the circle of his domestic life was the mourning so deep as among his Senatorial associates. We had learned to admire him for his ability; to respect him for his strength; to wonder at his great influence; but more than that each had come to love him as a friend.

Others have spoken and will speak of his career; of his business and public life; of his statesmanship; of his success, and of his power; but I wish to-day only to speak of him as a friend, and to say that I cherish above earthly possessions the remembrance of our friendship.

The attachments of men one to another are inexplicable. How men are drawn to each other so that their lives seem to mingle and flow in one current is a mystery, but such friendships constitute the real pleasure and joy of life. I knew Senator **HANNA**

before he came to the Senate, but only as a casual acquaintance; I knew him as I had read of him, as a man in the public eye, who was doing the things he set out to do, a forceful, powerful man. There was no special bond of sympathy between us, and yet very soon a friendship sprang up which I cherished more and more until the sad day when he left us. I am sure that I came to know him intimately, and that he came to know me thoroughly. Whatever this passion of friendship may be, I knew that it existed between us. We did not always think alike or act together. Though our lives frequently appeared to run in different channels, I still felt for him, as I believe he did for me, a peculiar attachment. I felt that most grateful and satisfying assurance that he was my friend, and I strove to let him know that I was his friend. I found him to be genuine, sincere, loyal, and true-hearted; qualities which above all others go to make up the best that man can ever hope to attain.

He was genuine; I am sure no one ever doubted that. He never rang false or hollow; he never attempted to pass for that which he was not. He hated pretension and sham and concealment. He was outspoken. What he said he meant, and what he meant he said. He feared no one. He courted no one for the sake of advancement.

He was sincere; the genuine man is always sincere. His bond needed no seal, and his word was as good as his bond. I think more than anyone I ever knew he "wore his heart upon his sleeve." He illustrated the story of the old Athenian who is said to have built his house of glass, that all might look in and see what he was doing. Nothing hurt him more than to have anyone suppose that he had a motive that he was not willing to avow. Nothing wounded him so much as that the shafts of calumny should be directed at him, and yet he was so sincere that such shafts never pierced his armor, but always fell harmless at his feet.

His loyalty was something wonderful. With his friends, and no man had more friends, it carried him nearly to extremes. I often thought that he of all men was one who would be willing to die for his friends. Once he became convinced that one might be trusted as a friend there was nothing that he was not ready to do for that man. Neither personal exertion nor self-sacrifice would he spare in his behalf. Friendship has its burdens as well as its joys, and he took upon himself all of its burdens as easily and as heartily as he shared its joys.

He was true hearted—no man was ever truer to his convictions or to his sympathies. He never deviated from the path in which his great heart impelled him to walk. He never turned back from the course which his judgment and conscience marked out for him. He was as tender as he was true—almost womanly in his tenderness. He was never so engrossed in the management of important affairs or the direction of great policies, but that he was able and ready to turn aside that the poor, the suffering, and the unfortunate might know that he felt for them and was glad to help them. Children loved him, and knew by intuition that he loved them. I think the finest photograph which is preserved and cherished by his friends is that in which he stands leaning on the railing of a boat with the boys of the water front gathered around him in an apparently mutual and pleasant companionship.

Almost every generation produces one man who, above all others, understands his fellow-men and has for them such a human and brotherly feeling that all instinctively turn to him as their spokesman and leader. Such a man earns for himself the title of a "Great Commoner," and I know of no man in whom all the qualities of heart and mind and soul which find expression in these words were more finely blended than in Mr. HANNA. He was indeed a great commoner. He recognized no class distinctions. The worthy and industrious poor were as welcome to his handshake and his heart touch as the fortunate and the great. He looked upon all the people as one great family, in which there should be no distinctions between high and low, rich and poor, but in which the sense of brotherhood and mutual dependence should bind them together in a common fellowship. I think that man comes nearest to the attainment of greatness who sympathizes with and understands well the common people; who never ceases, on the one hand, to strive and toil for them, or, on the other, yields to their unreasonable demands.

There was nothing of the demagogue about our friend. He never pretended an interest in the people which he did not truly feel. He never sought to rise in the estimation of the people by any appeal to their prejudices or any pretense of sympathy which he did not actually feel. His political life was as far removed from that of the demagogue as the clearest sunlight is removed from darkness. He was a man of strong convictions, who lived and wore himself out in following his convictions.

Neither philosophy nor even faith can wholly reconcile us to the loss of such a friend. We know that death is the common lot, but we are never ready for the coming of its angel. We know that the golden bowl must at some time be broken, yet our

hearts must always break with it. The ties of human friendship are too strong to be sundered without a sense of loss and despair.

We know that our friend lives on; but we would see him, and speak with him, and feel the touch of his generous and noble heart. We look about us to the seat in which he sat as if our eyes might rest upon him, only to find that he has gone from us, and we turn again with a fresh sense of sadness and personal grief.

But this our friend lived well his life. It was not so brief but that it left its mark upon our times, and made men better and stronger and nobler because he lived. He died in the plenitude of his strength and power and usefulness. I believe, and I rejoice in believing, that the earth which covers up what is mortal in man never hides or covers his influence upon mankind; that it is not the evil that men do, but the good, that lives after them; that this generation, that all the generations to come, will be the better and stronger for the life which our comrade lived here, and for that great influence which, though he has gone from our sight, will live on.

So until we may rejoin him we must be content—not content merely, but thankful—for all that he brought into our lives, for what he accomplished for all lives. To-day we speak our farewells to our friend with the feeling that after all they are not real farewells, and that if he can not come to us we may go to him, where the friendship only partially interrupted will be taken up again for eternity.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, in the few remarks I shall make on this solemn occasion I find it difficult to determine what is most fitting to say.

Evidences of mourning occur so frequently in this Chamber that we can not forget that "in the midst of life we are in death."

In the death of Senator HANNA one of the most remarkable men of our country has passed away. He had an extraordinary career, a career that challenged the admiration of the people, without regard to section or partisanship.

Senator HANNA was never fully conscious of his own intellectual power or the strength of his personal influence.

He was a Republican from the organization of the Republican party. As a man of affairs, he did not seek office, but did his whole duty by his country and his party. When his devoted friend the late President McKinley became a candidate for the office of President of the United States, Senator HANNA became his champion and devoted himself, and all the energy and influence he possessed, to the work (which with him was a work of love) in securing President McKinley's nomination and election and then his election the second time. When his friend, and the friend of us all, was taken away by the cruel hand of an assassin, Senator HANNA was greatly crushed, but his brave heart bade him go forward in the discharge of his duties as a citizen and as a Senator.

He became a member of the Senate on the 5th of March, 1897. He at once took his place as a strong man. He had strong convictions and did not hesitate to avow and defend them, in the Senate or out of it.

He was in favor of the Panama route for the isthmian canal connecting the two great oceans in the interest of the commerce of the United States and the world. He was a powerful advocate of that route, as against the Nicaragua route, and it is not too much to say that success in the adoption of the Panama route was largely due to his efforts.

Mr. HANNA was a true and positive man, and whatever he undertook to do he did with great energy and power.

In his recent campaign for reelection to the Senate he attacked, without fear or favor, what he regarded as fallacies and injurious doctrines urged upon the people by his opponents, and he came out of the campaign after winning a victory at the polls which gave him, as I am informed, the largest legislative majority ever given to any man for the Senate in the history of the State of Ohio.

Mr. President, no man in this country had such a hold upon the affections of the people as MARCUS ALONZO HANNA had at the time of his death. He was acquainted with the people in all the walks of life. He was a great business man. He was familiar with mills and factories, mines and railroads, and steamships, and with the men who conducted the business, and with the men who did the work. He sympathized with the wage-earner, and, as has been stated here to-day, as an employer of labor he never had trouble with those who worked for him.

Mr. President, it is not so much what a man says as it is what a man does in his community, his State, or his country in whatever honorable calling he may be engaged. The man who does the best for the welfare of the people is entitled to the most gratitude.

Senator HANNA was a splendid example of industry, whether in the conduct of his great business enterprises, in political campaigns, or as a Senator in these legislative halls. We often hear men speak of the business man in politics. Senator HANNA, in his

brief service in the Senate, demonstrated the very great advantage which his intimate knowledge of important business enterprises gave to him in dealing with questions as a legislator.

For the last few years of his life he labored assiduously to bring about better relations between capital and labor. He believed he could render service to his fellow-men and to his country by his efforts to bring managers and men of extensive industrial establishments into closer and more friendly relations with each other. He was an employer of men, and his heart went out to the poor man. He worked to improve the poor man's condition, and, at the same time, to aid capitalists or proprietors by securing harmony between employers and the employed.

While Senator HANNA has gone from the Senate and from the world, he has left his impress upon the country as few men have done who have gone before.

Mr. President, as I stand in this presence, speaking of our departed friend, I am reminded of a long line of eminent statesmen, generals, lawyers, and judges of Ohio who have passed away and who, during my own recollection, made the pages of the history of our nation brilliant by the simple story of their great deeds.

Ohio has given the nation three great Presidents in the persons of Hayes, Garfield, and McKinley. She has given the country many great Senators, notably Sherman, Thurman, and HANNA; two Chief Justices and an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the persons of Chase, Waite, and Swayne; brave generals, notably Sherman and Sheridan. These are great names—names of noble men who did much to build up and do honor to their State and country.

Mr. President, one of the early statesmen, William Wirt, in delivering an oration on the lives and characters of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, both of whom died on the Fourth of July, 1826, said that they—

Rested not until they had accomplished their work, when they were called to their reward, and they left the world hand in hand, exulting as they rose in the success of their labors.

Mr. President, the late President McKinley and the late Senator HANNA, to the latter of whose memory we pay tribute to-day, two great Americans, devoted to their country and devoted to each other, did not leave the world hand in hand when their work was finished, but the one followed the other after a little while, and doubtless they are again together where trouble never comes and where there will be no more parting forever.

Mr. BLACKBURN. It is not, Mr. President, in studied terms of eulogy, but rather from the standpoint of a political opponent, though a personal friend, that I would speak of Senator HANNA. In the few moments that I will ask the attention of the Senate I will speak of him as I knew him. I have nothing prepared to say to-day, nor do I care to have.

There were some characteristics developed by this dead Senator that, in my judgment, not only marked him as an extraordinary man, but proved conclusively, to my mind, that he was a man of sufficient power and force to have made an left his impress upon any Senate that this country has ever known. The severest crucial test that can be applied to a man's greatness is to adopt the standard of achievement, and measured by this rule the friends of Senator HANNA may safely challenge comparison.

The public knew him as a public man for a half dozen years only, and I very much doubt if we can find in all the annals of our country's history a man who in that short space of time did more to leave an indelible impression upon his countrymen. His advent into public life was not fortuitous. Without experience, without the advantages of academic or liberal education, without identification with any deliberative body, after a life spent until he had reached his third-score milestone in the activities of business and commercial venture, he came for the first time into public notice as a member of this great Chamber.

Without the advantage of professional discipline, he found himself here, at the very starting point of a marvelously successful though short political career, to be measured by eighty-nine men who had been selected from 80,000,000 of people because of their assumed fitness for the great work upon which he entered. Here he took his initiation, pitted against eighty-nine old gladiators of debate, and he who is willing to do justice to this man's fame must admit that from his entrance here until his death, upon all questions, political or commercial, he maintained his place in the very front rank of the strongest debaters in the Senate. No ordinary man could have done that.

But more; when he came into public life he did not come heralded as we would choose to be, but quite the contrary. The public had been taught to regard him as a man whose methods were not to be admired. We believed, save those who knew him intimately—and I speak without regard to political party division—the American public believed that he was nothing more than a shrewd, effective manager of campaign politics. They believed that his methods were not commendable. They believed that he

had but one idea in the waging of his life's work, and that was grounded upon an unflinching faith in the power of money. This was the general estimate placed upon this man when he burst upon the public view.

I frankly avow, Mr. President, that to more than an average degree I shared the prejudice that was held against him. That prejudice upon a closer acquaintance and a better opportunity to measure the man disappeared utterly. That judgment was reversed. Its falsity and error I openly avow, and in lieu of that prejudice of feeling was substituted the broadest gauge of measurement for his ability and the sincerest personal sense of friendship and affection.

He did more, Mr. President. From his very entrance into public life he was recognized as the one public man in this country who, probably to a greater extent than any other, commanded the confidence of what is termed the "moneyed interests" of our people. He was placarded as the spokesman of the trusts, the trusted apostle of the combinations, and, singularly enough, he held the confidence of that element of our people to his death. It was never impaired or abated, whilst he built up for himself an equally potent place in the affections and confidence of the laboring masses of our people.

It is not more than just to say of him that at the end of his six or seven years of public service he held in greater measure than any living American statesman the confidence of all classes.

It is true he never reached what is regarded as the highest office within the gift of the American people, but he did more to illustrate his power. If he did not wear a crown, he put it upon the head for which he destined it. He proved himself the Warwick of American politics, and this meed of praise can not be fairly or truthfully denied him.

I got to know him well, and the better I knew him and the closer I came to him the more implicitly I trusted him, the more I admired him, and the more tenderly I felt for him.

It has been truly and eloquently said by Senators who have preceded me that he was an open-hearted, honest, candid man. More than once I have had occasion to go to him to know what his course would be upon a given matter pending before this body. He never refused to answer, and when he answered it was never by evasion. Whether friend or foe, you always knew where he would stand upon any disputed question. His faith once plighted was never violated. His word once given was never broken. Loyal in his friendships, true to his convictions, he commanded in fullest measure the respect and admiration even of his opponents.

I know no higher tribute to pay a departed friend, loyal in every relation of life. He never measured consequences nor considered sacrifices when he deemed himself called upon to stand by his friends.

It is true his public life was short, but point me, if you can, to any man in all the list of honored names that have preceded us who in six short years accomplished more than this dead Senator. Easily, concededly the strongest man of his party, and that party dominating and shaping the policies and destinies of this great country, his record, in my judgment, stands without comparison.

And yet, Mr. President, the time of his taking off was not unfortunate. Looking at it with a view to the preservation of his fame, the stroke could not have come at a more fortunate or opportune moment. Age had not impaired his powers. Time had not blunted his love of friends and fame and power. He died in the fullness of these envied possessions, and may we not conclude that it was fortunate, viewed from this standpoint, that he died when he did? What more could he have accomplished to have demonstrated his capacity, his character, or the strong points of his personality that commended him to his countrymen? He is to be envied in that he did not live too long, for—

When 'tis given us to choose the time, if we choose aright,
'Tis best to die, our honor at its height.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, the rise of the late Senator HANNA to political power and his advancement to the front rank of statesmen are unique in the history of American politics. From his boyhood until 1895 he devoted himself almost exclusively to business, and became widely and favorably known both in his native State and through the East in business circles. As the result of his industry, ability, honorable dealing with men, and genius for organization, he was successful from the beginning and accumulated a large fortune.

During this period Mr. HANNA gave but little attention to public affairs, was not known to the country as a politician and not widely known as such in his own State. In the year 1896 he began to attract public attention by his vigorous advocacy of the nomination of his beloved friend, the late President McKinley, for the Chief Magistracy of the nation. Watching political events with a keen interest, interpreting accurately the situation, and with an ardent devotion to the fortunes of Mr. McKinley, he de-

cided that the time had come for the Republican party to stand not only for the protective tariff, but unequivocally for sound money, and that Mr. McKinley should be its standard bearer. Without consulting Republican leaders, and often without their advice or approval, he moved boldly forward in the work of organization to carry out his well-formed purposes. He toiled with his whole heart to perform the task he had taken in hand. He addressed himself to his undertaking on the same lines that had brought him abundant success in his business career. His sound judgment, his knowledge of men, his confidence in the tact, commanding ability, and conservatism of William McKinley, made him feel that he was right and what he proposed was in the interest of his party and the country.

At first party leaders gave little heed to the doings of Mr. HANNA and to the plans he had made for the leadership and policy of the Republican party. They felt that he was an unknown quantity, too new to politics, too lacking in experience for such an undertaking, and that it was the audacity of the novice in public affairs for him to break away from the traditions of party management and refuse to be governed by the advice of the tried leaders who had for years controlled the party policy and its national conventions.

It was not long before the results of this new force in politics began to be felt throughout the country. Old leaders looked on with surprise and sometimes with amazement. Meantime the tide for McKinley, under the guidance of HANNA's splendid powers of leadership, rose higher and higher. Here and there sporadic attempts were made to present the claims of other Republican statesmen for nomination at St. Louis, but all to no purpose; and long before the convention assembled it was known that Mr. McKinley was the choice of the people and would be nominated without opposition.

It is not necessary to mention here even the leading features of President McKinley's wise administration and the magic results that followed in the business world. The people soon realized what Mr. HANNA knew long before—that Mr. McKinley was not only a good, pure, and just man, but that he was a leader who could lead and a statesman who could be trusted to care for the state. It followed, "as the day the night," that Mr. McKinley made a great President, and that, with almost unanimous consent, his name is classed in our history with the names of Washington, Lincoln, and Grant.

The claims of Mr. McKinley—because of his successful administration, his fairness to all interests, his statesman-like treatment of new and grave questions of serious concern, not only to this country but to the nations of the world, many of them as difficult as ever came to any of his predecessors—were fully recognized by the people, and his second nomination and election became a foregone conclusion. During all this time Mr. HANNA was the close adviser of the President, bearing himself in the position of recognized influence with the modesty of conscious power. He remained at the head of the national committee, conducted the Presidential campaign, and witnessed for the second time the inauguration of his friend, crowned with the benedictions of a prosperous and happy people—perhaps the most beloved President who had ever taken the oath of office.

For more than forty years Mr. HANNA was an employer of labor. He understood the wage-earner. He knew how to sympathize with him. Later in life, when his fame filled the country and he was blessed with large wealth, his heart went out to the wage-earners in their struggles to better their condition. His sympathies were so aroused and his conscience so worked upon that he firmly resolved to give the remaining years of his life toward helping to bridge the gulf that divides labor and capital. He openly and frequently declared that he would rather help reconcile differences between employer and employee and bring an end to useless strikes than to be President. Employer and employee looked upon him as their truest friend; and this confidence from these opposing forces, the strongest in our civilization, was one of the chief grounds if not the foremost reason for the unequalled confidence bestowed upon him by his countrymen. Such confidence and such success are not accidental, but the reward of merit.

Mr. HANNA was not a trained politician nor an experienced statesman. He entered upon his career in politics and statesmanship too late in life to be either. Yet he rose to be the recognized leader of his party and took high rank as a statesman. He did not toil as others through long and arduous years to reach his commanding position; he advanced, the people welcomed him with their confidence, and the leaders gave way and made place for him. It is as impossible as it would be useless to try to reason or speculate how all this came about, and how Mr. HANNA reached his high position in so short a time and apparently with so little effort. It could be seen at once that he was a man of ability, purity, integrity, and high courage. These virtues are often assembled in others but have not always yielded the success they brought to Mr. HANNA.

During President McKinley's first administration Mr. HANNA was elected to the Senate, and continued a member of this body until his untimely death, which brought tears to his friends, grief to his colleagues, and sorrow to the people. From the time when he first took part in national politics, at the age of 58, until his death covers a period of less than nine years. In this brief period he became, next to the President himself, the dominating force in public affairs, and after the death of his lamented friend unquestionably the most popular man in our business and national life.

In his daily life, though burdened with business cares and public duties, Mr. HANNA went about doing good. He gave the best that was in him to all his undertakings. He was sought out and consulted by people of all conditions, from the miner digging in the mine to the President of the great Republic, and gave alike to all the benefit of his aid and judgment. Measured by the truest standards—

He attained
To the full stature and maturity
Of simple greatness.

He was kind, generous, unselfish, with a heart full of sympathy for humanity. He helped the weak and lowly in their efforts to be strong, and the strong to be firm in good things and high purposes. He has left a name that "binds to honor and virtue;" an example that will be an inspiration to young men "far on in summers we shall not see."

He gained power and confidence unaided by high office. He was not the ruler of a kingdom nor of a republic, but he was a ruler in the minds and hearts of men. The soul at last, with its mystic unknown powers, is the greatest force we know.

Great truths are portions of the soul of man;
Great souls are portions of eternity.

Mr. HANNA may not have known it, but he convinced the minds of men, and conquered through the workings of a great soul, glimpses of which were had through his kindly, loving eyes, true eyes, that, with his genial smile, disarmed opposition and invited confidence.

Like most great men, he was simple, unselfish, and without affectation. Simplicity belongs to greatness.

He was—

Rich in saving common sense,
And, as the greatest only are,
In his simplicity sublime.

The lesson is taught us more and more every day that in the life of nations a people's chief reliance for security and progress is on their strong and godlike men.

The passing of such a man gives us pause, and we wonder why his going was so soon. His death brings us again face to face with the great ultimate mystery—the mystery which in the minds of men is being slowly solved; for, added to the light of the old revelation, light is still struggling in from the new revelations we are constantly receiving through the poets—the seers and prophets of the ages; and the truth is more distinctly dawning that death is the beginning of the real life, the life that lasts, "the change that never changes."

Our day of dying is our day of birth.

Franklin, taken all in all, our greatest American, says:

We are spirits—man is not completely born until he dies.

The great poet and seer, Tennyson, writing to Britain's peerless Queen, said:

The dead, though silent, are more living than the living.

It is a solace to believe that our individuality continues and that—

Death is the chilliness that precedes the dawn;
We shudder for a moment, then awake
In the bright sunshine of the other life.

The life of our dear friend and colleague has changed, not ended. It will go on in another place and with another body. His soul has passed "into the house not made with hands eternal in the heavens," into the all-pervading ether which fills the space between stars and suns, the home of spirits, with spiritual bodies, where revolving worlds bring no darkness, and where there is eternal light. He now sees with a clear vision. It has been given to him to understand all things, and for him all problems are solved.

For tho' the giant ages heave the hill
And break the shore, and evermore
Make and break, and work their will;
Though world on world in myriad myriads roll
Round us, each with different powers,
And other forms of life than ours,
What know we greater than the soul?
On God and godlike men we build our trust.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, again Death has entered this exalted Chamber and laid his hand upon a friend. With reverent and heavy hearts we come to place upon the enduring records of

the Senate our estimate of the life and work of our late colleague whom we loved and honored.

We are sharply reminded by what has transpired that the world is filled with tragedies, and that the profoundest among us can see but a little way into the future. When the present session of Congress began our friend was in buoyant spirits. He looked forward with happy anticipation to the accomplishment of many beneficent things for his fellow-men and for the Government. But a few weeks ago he returned from the great and loyal State which implicitly trusted him, bearing her credentials for an additional term in the United States Senate. His party had honored him with a more generous indorsement than ever she had given any of his illustrious predecessors.

It seems but yesterday that his voice filled this Chamber in advocacy of measures for the public welfare. The echo has scarcely died away. It seems but yesterday that we met and greeted him, radiant with hope and full of good cheer. We can scarcely believe that we shall not meet and greet him on the morrow.

MARCUS A. HANNA was one of the foremost Americans; one of the most eminent members of this great forum. He achieved place and power through no mere caprice of accident. He forged his way to the point of vantage occupied when he laid down his great responsibilities by the strength of his own genius and by virtue of arduous deeds done.

He was born September 27, 1837, in New Lisbon, Columbiana County, Ohio. His father's family were members of the Society of Friends and his mother was a Presbyterian. It was in this wholesome atmosphere he was reared. When he was of the age of 15, his father moved to Cleveland, where the son graduated from the high school and then attended the Western Reserve College for a brief period. He then entered the great business world, a university with a vast and exacting curriculum. He was well equipped and admirably fitted for the contest.

He had good executive ability, the initiative faculty, pluck, energy, the ability to attach men to him as with hoops of steel, and absolute, incorruptible integrity. Great enterprises sprang into being under his hand, and in due time he became one of the great masters of industry. Increasing material power did not make him careless of his fellow-men nor indifferent to the cultivation of those finer qualities which are the evidences of the best civilization.

While he always took more or less part in political affairs, he did not become particularly prominent until 1896, when he directed the campaign for the nomination of William McKinley for the Presidency, and when, later, he became chairman of the Republican national committee. The campaign, in which he displayed splendid abilities of leadership, was one of the most memorable in American history, and he emerged from it with a national prestige well established.

He was preeminent as a political organizer. He firmly grasped general principles and mastered essential details. He selected political lieutenants who were capable of executing his plans with loyalty and success. He employed those qualities in political management which had made him a commanding figure in the world of business, and which would have made him a successful general if he had chosen the profession of arms.

He successfully led the forces of the Republican party through two national campaigns. In each contest he displayed a generalship which commanded universal admiration. He organized the elements with which to achieve victory with consummate skill. He conducted a school of education upon a broader scale than ever before attempted, for he believed, and wisely, that our political safety rests upon an educated, intelligent, public sentiment.

It was fitting indeed that when President McKinley entered the White House Senator HANNA should enter the Senate. Here was a new theater for the display of his genius. He was unaccustomed to the official environment of the national capital. He had the most profound respect for the dignity and traditions of the Senate and a high regard for the distinguished statesmen with whom he was to fellowship. He did not attempt to assert leadership. He was willing to sit at the feet of his elders until the issues and the occasion commanded him to speak. He soon won, and held unimpaired to the end, the respect and confidence of his associates.

He attempted no personal aggrandizement at the expense of others. He sought to advance good measures in order that he might in some degree promote the best interests of his countrymen.

When he came to the Senate we were met with grave questions growing out of affairs in Cuba. Through all the days of anxiety, so familiar to many who are now present, Senator HANNA was a modest and safe counselor.

There was no exigency which he did not meet deliberately and wisely. He was a diligent and apt student of the great questions which engaged the attention of the Senate. He took a rational view of them and invariably arrived at conclusions which were entirely sound, and when the time for action came he met the issues squarely and without evasion.

He was not an orator according to the more critical or generally accepted standards. He cared little for the mere elegancies of speech. He was not a rhetorician, yet he was a speaker of uncommon power. His speeches were not carefully wrought out in advance. They were fashioned as he uttered them. He mastered the subjects to be discussed, and in plain and forceful language spoke to the hearts and consciences of his countrymen. He was one of the most popular speakers of the day. His services were in urgent demand everywhere, and he addressed vast multitudes who heard him with sympathetic attention.

He seldom spoke in the Senate, but always with manifest effect. His most notable speeches were made in support of a measure to build a merchant marine and in advocacy of the Panama Canal. He strongly favored a Government subsidy as the most certain and direct means of securing our rightful place among the carrying nations upon the high seas. He appreciated the natural prejudice in the minds of many people against the grant of a subsidy, but he thoroughly believed in the benefits to accrue to the country by the creation of an adequate merchant marine, and he was willing to stand against the prejudice of the moment, believing that the people would ultimately yield their approval.

He carefully studied and mastered the entire subject of an isthmian canal, in which the people had long been interested. Many had come to favor the Nicaragua route. Perhaps a majority of the American people preferred it. But the investigation led him to the conclusion that the Panama route should be chosen, and he advocated it with such force as to contribute largely to reverse the popular verdict and secure its adoption. His speech was a most powerful presentation. It drew tremendously upon his vital forces.

Yonder he stood for hours, speaking with great energy and with orderly arrangement and lucidity of utterance, which commanded the utmost admiration of the entire Senate. Wearied at times, he would resume his chair and speak from it. It was a notable and, indeed, a pathetic effort. He opposed able and resourceful antagonists, and in the sharp encounters, which were frequent, he demonstrated the fact that he was a debater of no ordinary ability.

His life had been spent in the business world, far removed from the forensic arena; yet when a great issue pended in this forum he met the ablest debaters upon a plane of absolute equality. He spoke with fluency and from a fullness of his subject. He comprehended it in its historical, scientific, and practical aspects, and he carried conviction with him.

He was one of the founders and chairman of the National Civic Federation, an organization designed to promote a better understanding and to maintain peace between capital and labor. He was particularly well fitted for this work, which was in the best sense a labor of love. He had long been a large employer of men, with whom he maintained good terms, and he had relations with vast capital. He possessed the confidence of both great interests in an unusual degree. The Golden Rule was the fundamental code of his procedure.

Although severely taxed by the exacting demands of the Senate and party leadership, he gave much thought and time to the work of the Federation. Many differences were composed by it, largely through his influence, before they had reached the breaking point. He lived to see the creation of the organization amply justified.

He regarded this service as of the utmost importance and looked forward to the establishment of better relations between labor and capital through the instrumentality of the Federation with confidence and pleasure. He frequently said that if he were obliged to retire from either the Senate or the Federation, he would feel it his duty to retire from the former, as much as he valued his seat here.

The systematic work of education—

Said he—

was begun during the last five years by the Civic Federation. I took some time to consider the work of the Federation, and am firmly convinced that it is the object to which I desire to consecrate the remaining years of my life. I fully appreciate that it is a long struggle, but the progress already made under the motto of the Civic Federation—the Golden Rule—has surpassed even my most sanguine expectations, and I am sure that the American people will sustain a policy based upon the highest moral and social impulse.

He was frank and outspoken in his views of the correlative rights of labor and capital.

Fairness and justice—

He declared—

will never agree to the confiscation of the products of one man's toil in order to insure comfort to the idle and worthless. The old law of compensation is operative now as ever. No "ism" is wanted by the American people that will take from any citizen the just and equitable reward for his labor.

Senator HANNA was a man of practical mind. He did not dwell in an atmosphere of purely speculative philosophy, but among the serious realities of life. He possessed in full degree the power of great initiative. He organized and set on foot vast enterprises which required large capital and gave employment to thousands

of workingmen. He was essentially a creator; never a destroyer. He opened the door of opportunity to others and thus became a benefactor. He was a man of innate modesty and never indulged in the merely spectacular. He coveted the respect and confidence of his fellow-men, not for selfish purposes, but that he might the better serve them.

He possessed a keenly sensitive nature and was deeply touched by the criticism of his political opponents, which for a time was so sharp and unjust. That criticism which sought to undermine the confidence in him of his countrymen and to impeach his broad humanitarian sympathies and purposes left a sting. He cared nothing for the criticism of his political views. He held to them tenaciously and conscientiously, with confidence in the ultimate sober judgment of the people.

He was a plain, blunt man. He was always perfectly natural. He did not pretend to be what the Creator did not intend him to be. He was no mere timeserver. He did not bend to every wind that blew. He was an honest man—honest in thought, in purpose, and in deed; honest with the world and honest with himself. He possessed in a remarkable degree the "genius of common sense." He was resourceful, and had at instant command all of his faculties.

He was tenacious of his opinions, though not dogmatic. He was ready to yield to a better reason when it was made manifest. He sought no compromise with expediency. What was right was right, and what was wrong was wrong. He occupied no middle ground. He was courageous and a total stranger to the arts of the demagogue.

He was a man of most attractive personality. He had warm and generous impulses and drew his friends close to him. He most delighted in their companionship. He had a keen sense of humor, a "gentle wit," and he was always a fascinating conversationalist. His friendships were fast, and he stood by those who dwelt within his confidence through good and evil report. No exigency could alienate his support, for the severer the storm the deeper sank the roots of his affection.

He was the trusted friend of the late President McKinley throughout his illustrious political career. He possessed his unbounded confidence, a confidence which he repaid with unfailing loyalty and unmeasured devotion.

His name was frequently mentioned, and with entire respect, for still further official honors than those he enjoyed here. The suggestion needed but the encouragement of his assent to make it a formidable reality, but he was content with the great distinction of a seat in this Chamber and discouraged all effort to make him a candidate for the most exalted place in the Government.

His career admirably illustrates the great possibilities that lie before the American youth. He became a power in widely separated fields of endeavor. To have achieved distinction in either was honor enough for one man. His early life as the successful man of business gave no promise of the eminence he was destined to achieve in the world of politics and statesmanship. He did not become a student of statecraft until after he had passed life's meridian. He proved to be a quick student of those great problems which concerned the State.

He was a man of indefatigable industry. He believed in the virtue of labor. He wrought on with no thought of self. His friends observed the serious inroads he was making upon his health and sought to dissuade him from overtaxing his strength, but he disregarded their kindly admonitions and labored on until he fell at his post of duty—a virtual sacrifice to his country and his countrymen. No soldier ever died upon the field of glory more surely for others than did he.

Senator HANNA and I were friends before coming here, and my entire public service to the hour of his death was in fellowship with him. One of the choicest memories I shall take into private life is the memory of his confidence and unvarying friendship.

I visited him a number of times after he entered the sick chamber with an illness supposed to be but temporary. He was loath to give up intercourse with his friends. He loved them and he loved the world. He had not gathered his harvest. He had no time to take account of death.

For many long and anxious days his countrymen awaited tidings of his illness. In the alternations of hope and fear we watched and reverently invoked the All-Merciful One to spare our friend to us and to his country. But his hour had come, and tenderly we laid him away by the lakeside which he so much loved and where he sleeps well.

Brave spirit, an affectionate farewell! We take up the burdens you left us and press on, and in good time, in God's providence, we shall leave them to others. This historic Chamber has its entrances and its exits, through which the stately procession comes and goes. We shall each, in his turn, seek an exit.

Good friend! We shall forever cherish as a priceless heritage the memory of your nobility of character and your services and sacrifices for the State.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, MARCUS ALONZO HANNA, junior Senator from Ohio, died in this city on the 15th day of February last, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. With the single exception of the President of the United States, he was at the time of his death the most conspicuous and the most influential of the public men in the service of the country. In addition to his official position as a Senator from Ohio, he was then chairman of the national Republican organization. Occupying those two great positions at a period when the party to which he belonged held the reins of power in all departments of the Government, and attributed its triumph in large measure to him, he naturally and justly wielded a mighty power, and was "the observed of all observers."

But beyond this, MARK HANNA, to call him by his popular designation, possessed a personality and had led a career apart from political station that gave him much significance. Trained to business from boyhood, he had risen to high place in the commercial world. "He that is diligent in his business shall stand before kings," was said of old. In our modern American life, so vast are the concerns of business that he who is diligent in his business is in power a king, and is often the maker of those who wield the powers of government. He had himself established a great business house and was either the immediate employer or interested in the employment of many thousand workmen. He had been brought in contact with and had won the confidence of the leading spirits of finance, transportation, and trade. He had established a reputation as a man of ability, fair dealing, enterprise, and sound judgment. He had won a great fortune through years of patient toil. He was, when he stepped into the arena in 1896, recognized as a representative man of the large business interests of the country. He was also the immediate friend and right-hand man of William McKinley, who, through years of political experience, had now become the star of hope and Presidential candidate of his party.

It was then that Mr. HANNA became the chairman of the Republicans, and it was under the most favorable circumstances and conditions for the appearance of a strong man in that position, for a political crisis was at hand. Up to this period both political parties had coquetted with the money question, and both of them were more or less divided in opinion respecting it. For the first time the Republicans proclaimed themselves explicitly for the single gold standard, and with equal explicitness the Democracy declared for the old-fashioned, long-accustomed, and age-honored bimetallic silver and gold standard money of the people from the days of Washington. Had the contest stood on this issue alone we should have had a battle worthy of the time "when knighthood was in flower." The single-standard people have said one thing and stood for it.

The Democratic advocates of bimetallism would have said one thing—silver and gold as standard money, and stood for that alone. "Under which king, Bezonian? Speak, or die." But this was not the presentation of that campaign. The Democrats added other things, some of them new things, to their platform. Whatever were their intrinsic merits, which I shall not discuss, they led to immediate assaults upon side issues, obscuring in some measure the main issue. It is probably in some measure due to this fact that the result of the campaign was not regarded as completely decisive of the question, and that it was to a degree revived in another Presidential election, in turn obscuring and handicapping the then greater issue involved in the annexation of distant lands and peoples.

The people are themselves the arbiters of public questions. When by their voice William McKinley was elected President, with MARK HANNA as the practical manager of the campaign, the latter had leaped upon the springboard of success to greater importance as a political factor than any man had hitherto done in the history of this Republic at a single bound. Upon the inauguration of the President-elect, John Sherman, then in the Senate, became Secretary of State, and on the day thereafter, March 5, 1897, Mr. HANNA, by appointment of the governor of Ohio, entered the Senate of the United States, his colleague, the Hon. J. B. FORAKER, having been sworn in upon the previous day. He was now in the sixtieth year of his age. Oliver Cromwell at the age of 43 became a soldier, and as captain in the parliamentary army rose to be a great general and the dictator of a nation. Mohammed at the age of 42 had a vision in which he was saluted as "the Prophet of God," and became the founder of a creed whose adherents yet number many millions.

- Chaucer, at Woodstock with the nightingales,
At sixty wrote the Canterbury Tales;
Goethe at Weimar, toiling to the last,
Completed Faust when eighty years were past.
These are indeed exceptions; but they show
How far the gulf stream of our youth may flow
Into the arctic regions of our lives,
Where little else but life itself survives.

MARK HANNA put on the armor of a new strife in the forum

at three-score years of age—a period when many, weary and worn with life's battle, lay it off—and I know of none who so late in life assumed the heavy tasks of public service, whether in military or civic station, who acquitted themselves with more vigorous and adaptive ability or who attained greater success. Entering the arena of debate on the hustings, at festival, and at public ceremonial without the training, experience, and equipment which prepare for such exercises, he competed in discussion with the foremost intellects and most practiced tongues of a land singularly fruitful in all varieties of oratorical and controversial genius. He sustained himself ably and readily. He spoke aptly to the point, exhibiting ample sources of information and facility of expression. He displayed a versatility and elasticity of talent that alike surprised and pleased, and to his solid abilities his good humor and gracious, hearty manners were powerful and attractive adjuncts.

There are two things that I would say of him that find utterance with special satisfaction to me. His personal relations with his colleagues, of whatever phase of political opinion, were marked by the unflinching courtesy and consideration that well become a member of this body and that bespeak the manly and generous spirit. I never knew him until he became a Senator. My relations with him were never intimate, and I never had negotiations with him respecting any matter of profound and general public importance; but I met him frequently in the ordinary circumstances of our business here. I had with him many consultations and conferences about matters of detail, and about some that deeply concerned my own constituents. I shared the courteous hospitality of his board, which he delighted to dispense to his friends and genial acquaintances. It is a pleasant memory to me that on all occasions I found in him that prompt and candid expression, that polite regard, and that cheerful and amiable companionship that can not fail to inspire friendship, to conciliate opinion, induce confidence, and brighten and bless existence.

MARK HANNA—I say it in his high praise—never at any time here, nor within my knowledge or observation at any other place, exhibited any narrow prejudice, any sectional repugnancy, or vindictiveness toward any segment of his country or any portion of his countrymen. On the contrary, his conduct in this regard seemed to me eminently worthy of the true American and the broad-minded statesman. He often spoke of his Virginia ancestry, his grandfather Hanna having gone to Ohio from the town of Lynchburg, Va., in which I live, and he, like Allen G. Thurman, William Allen, Benjamin Butterworth, George Pendleton, and many others, distinguished representative men of Ohio, being scions of old Virginia stock. His Americanism was catholic and comprehensive; his humanity was betokened by his manners as by his conduct, and he had a native and unaffected sympathy for his people and his kind. His ambitions were tempered by geniality and good nature, and his words were moderated by the discerning instincts that sever difference of opinion from personal hostility or hatred. Like William McKinley, his countrymen everywhere were not without a place in his regard.

Our enemies without we can readily provide against. The selfish, artful, or fanatical sectionalist within is the most insidious and dangerous foe to the peace, happiness, and dignity of our great national commonwealth.

In one respect Mr. HANNA occupied the vantage ground of exceptionally favorable relations to the suffragans of this country. Himself a capitalist, with large interests in transportation, manufactures, and trade, he had won the confidence of the moneyed classes and the business men.

As the employer of many workmen he had won their confidence and good will and that of others of similar vocations by a wise, conciliatory, and just course which had prevented strikes and broils. "Come and talk the matter over with me" was his standing invitation to all employees who had a grievance, real or supposed, and such was his tactfulness, which could only have had its base in his sense of justice and humanity, that his conferences always bore the fruits of peace, concession, and contentment. It is not to be wondered at that a man of such characteristics and of such a fortunate relation to the sources of political power should be widely spoken of and favored for the Presidency of the United States.

The star of that high office seemed at one time to hover over him. Had he yielded to the natural promptings of ambition and hitched his wagon to that star, there is no doubt that he would have proved a powerful and attractive candidate. The conviction of the masses that he was a level-headed man, well balanced, and that he had a lively regard for all his countrymen had increased his prospects of success. Perhaps the admonitions of advancing years and the prudential intimations of weakening health deterred him. Be this as it may, Mr. HANNA was yet in the zenith of high career. He had just been reelected to the Senate with unprecedented manifestations of support in his own State, and he was invested and surrounded with whatever this world can give of its

fruits, its honors, and its hopes, be he the toiling son of labor or the ambitious aspirant for public place and power.

Suddenly he was taken down with a dreadful typhoid fever. He resisted its siege with calm and patient courage, but soon it was well known that he had sickened unto death.

No party line divided those who hovered with anxious and sympathetic inquiry around his residence in this city or who eagerly sought the latest tidings in the morning and evening press. When the inevitable came, and science, wealth, station, friendship, and love stood at naught, the whole land mourned, and the sympathies of the people were poured forth to the circle of near and dear ones who bowed at his side before the stroke of Almighty Power.

It was universally thought and felt and said that a man of great ability and amiable disposition and remarkable accomplishments had departed; that he loved and served with tenderness those who were bound to him by ties of affection or kindred blood; that he bore no malice toward his political opponents; that he loved his whole country; that he fought openly with courageous conviction and manly ardor; that his abilities and virtues far exceeded whatever faults might be imputed to him, and that he was, all in all, a great American and a full-statured man.

May God's infinite goodness to his creatures pour balm into the wounded souls of the loving ones, sorely stricken by his loss, and may He sustain and comfort them in their affliction by His infinite power.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

Friend after friend departs;
Who has not lost a friend?
There is no union here of hearts
That finds not here an end.

It seems as if it were but yesterday that our friend and associate, Senator HANNA, was seated at my right in the seat he so long occupied. I can almost hear the echo of his familiar voice and his cheerful greeting and see the pleasant smile in recognition of those who were near him.

It was my good fortune to be associated with him upon several important committees, in attendance on which he was always punctual to the hour of meeting, and was watchful and painstaking in the consideration of every measure submitted for investigation, giving the subject-matter the same thought and consideration he would have done had it been a question affecting his own private business affairs.

He had the confidence and respect of all who knew him. Capital had confidence in him because by industry and economy he had become a capitalist. Labor believed in him because he had been a laborer all of his life, and all that he was or hoped to be he owed to labor.

Therefore he intended to devote a great part of the remaining years of his life in reconciling and harmonizing this imaginary conflict between labor and capital.

Could he to-day send a message to us from behind the veil that conceals him from our view, it would be one of patriotism, love of country, home, and our fellow-men, and mutual cooperation and confidence in each other, to the end that all might work together for the mutual benefit and happiness of our common country. He would say a generous use of capital in industrial enterprises should benefit the owner as it does the whole community.

It was in this earnest effort to bring capital and labor together on a basis of mutual understanding that much was to be expected from a man of his energy, uprightness, and usefulness. His whole heart was in the work he had undertaken, for he fully recognized that the questions involved are the most important with which our country is called upon to deal. Without the friendly and harmonious cooperation of these two fundamental bases of progress, prosperity, and peace the future will be dark indeed.

By early training and by later achievements, by character, intelligence, and knowledge of men, Senator HANNA was fully equipped for the great labor which he had voluntarily undertaken. He knew both sides of the question and had sympathy for both the parties arrayed against each other, for he saw where each had rights, as he also saw where each invaded the rights of the other.

He had decided views upon every question on which he was called upon to legislate. He did his own thinking, and it was no easy task to dissuade him from a line of action upon which he had once determined.

But he had a kind heart and was full of sympathy for the unfortunate and afflicted. Although a sufferer himself from lameness, which made it at times painful to walk, I have seen him many times within the hour leave his seat to answer a card from some one in the Senate reception room who had called to ask a favor.

Loyalty to his friends was a marked characteristic of his nature. If one had his friendship and confidence, nothing could swerve

him from his belief in their integrity. Calumny and abuse of his friends seemed to intensify his loyalty and cause him to put forth renewed efforts in their behalf.

I have read that in the Koran it is said: "When a man dies, they who survive him ask what property he has left behind," but the angel, the messenger from heaven, who bends over the dying man, asks what good deeds he has sent before him.

When Senator HANNA invited me, with other friends, to attend a dinner and reception he gave last year in this city to General Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army, I asked him, "Do you believe in the doctrine General Booth preaches?" He replied: "I believe in the great and good work in which the Salvation Army is engaged, and the practical results which we see from their efforts. They are reclaiming thousands of men and women from lives of dissipation and shame to those of usefulness and good citizenship. This, to my mind, is practical Christianity, and every month I make it a rule to give my contribution toward this splendid work."

Senator HANNA was a successful man in the business affairs of life, and industry, application, patience, and integrity were the only secrets of his success. But the acquisition of wealth was to him, aside from providing bountifully for those who were near and dear to him, to do good to others and to make the world better because he had lived.

The great problem was how to bring each side to look at the industrial field as one, and not two fields occupied by hostile interests; to show that hostility is suicide, in that the injury of one of the elements of production brings destruction to production itself, wherein all concerned, both laborers and capitalists, must suffer as surely as must the human being when the limbs are severed from the body. I think his policy in dealing with this question was not unlike that of the physician who treats bodily ills. The industrial body, like the human body, is an entity. Every part is essential to every other part. When the head aches from disorganization of the functions of the liver the latter organ is not extirpated, for that would mean death to the whole organism. When intense cerebral disturbance interferes with digestion the brain is not removed, for that likewise would mean death. The physician strives to discover the cause of the abnormal conditions which show their effects in remote organs, and by restoring a condition of health to one part to restore the normal well-being of all. When disease gets beyond human control, and loss of functions results or amputation becomes necessary, the organism can never recover its lost power, and its efficiency is permanently impaired.

It is thus with labor and capital, and that fact was the fundamental one on which Senator HANNA based his effort for the restoration of healthy industrial conditions. His aim was to ascertain the cause of discontent, whether injustice, actual or imaginary, unreasonable demands on the part of labor or of capital, or simple misunderstanding due to ignorance of existing conditions. Whatever the disease of the industrial body, he would cure by such remedies as would restore the natural conditions through the education of those most intimately concerned. Ignorance, misunderstanding, intolerance, passion, greed, and revenge are the diseases of the body industrial which bring in their train weakness, inefficiency, and, if not quickly cured, disaster and death. But they are curable diseases, and this was what caused Senator HANNA to bring to bear upon the problems they presented that wide sympathy, that profound knowledge of men, that faith in the efficacy of reason, which made him, like the tried and trusted physician, a man in whom all could put confidence, knowing that his sole aim was to restore to healthful activity the industrial world.

It seems an easy lesson to learn if capital and labor will but reason together, for the laborer of to-day is the capitalist of tomorrow, and he who ranks as a capitalist to-day may, by adversity and misfortune, again become a laborer. Every avenue to education, to honor, to fame, and wealth are open to the poorest boy and girl in our land, and they will surely win if they have industry and perseverance. There can be no class distinction in a government where the people are the source of all power. Here character is the shibboleth that opens the door which reveals to us our duty as citizens of our common country.

Had Senator HANNA lived ten years I believe that he would have seen the great and good results of his work. I believe that he would have brought about that understanding between capital and labor which must be attained before the dangers which confront us can be removed. I believe that he, of all men, was best qualified for the work in hand and would have been measurably successful; that he would have made it plain that the laborer and the capitalist have identical interests, and that the injury of one is the injury of the other; that they must work together for the common aim of the prosperity and well-being of all concerned; that sympathy must take the place of discord, and that man has no rights as against another, the enforcement of which would tend to disorganize the social fabric. This object, I believe, was that to

which Senator HANNA had devoted the remainder of his life, and this unselfishness is one of the lessons we may learn from him to whose memory we to-day pay tribute.

It is hard and sad to realize that we shall never see him here again. But such is the common lot of all. It is as natural to die as it is to be born and live. The sands in the life glass of each one of us here to-day are surely falling, and the places that we now fill will know us no more forever. Ah, mystery of death, and greater mystery of life! The human mind can not comprehend that which the Infinite has not revealed. May we have faith in the promise that death is the gateway of a new life.

When we solemnly and with aching heart bore the last earthly remains of our friend from the capital of the nation to his beautiful home, it was a day of sorrow and grief for the good people of the city by the lake. Business was suspended, buildings draped in mourning, and with sympathetic voice and face all united in paying their last sad tribute of respect to the memory of their friend and his bereaved family. Reverently to mother earth we consigned him, believing his spirit can never die and his influence will be a benediction to the living.

I stood a short time since upon the shore of the Pacific coast, and as I watched the sun sink beneath the ocean horizon and the gloaming twilight blend into darkness, I turned away with sadness, as it seemed as if the orb of day had disappeared never to return. But the coming morning brought it back again in resplendent glory and beauty, giving life and vitality to a slumbering world. So may we not hope that in the bright morn of the resurrection we shall again meet our friend and brother?

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, a commanding figure and positive force has passed out of our public life. It is difficult to estimate the qualities of leadership, but the facts remain. Neither the progress of civilization nor the development of the education and independence of the individual has minimized the power of a commanding intelligence. On the contrary, organization keeps pace with progress. The individual is not submerged in the mass nor left helpless as the slave of a tyrant, nor food for powder as in ruder times, but he looks to and loves to follow a leader for the accomplishment of purposes which will benefit both the mass and its units. "All for one" was the motto of the past. "All for one and one for all" is the maxim of the present. Napoleon brushed aside the charge that he was the butcher of his age by saying, "I only killed a million, mostly Germans." He did not reckon the countless millions who died of starvation and disease as a result of his wars and devastating marches. He did not reckon the suffering and ruin which required a century to repair.

The requisites for leadership are different in every age. Neither Cæsar nor Napoleon would have any place in our country or under our conditions. The problems which produced Washington, and afterwards the great trinity of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, and still later Lincoln and Grant, are not ours. They led their forces into battles for the bases upon which government should be constructed and institutions founded. Our age is dominated by commercialism. Like all phrases which concentrate in a word the description of conditions, this one has been subject to abuse, misunderstanding, and misrepresentation. For thirty years, or since the adjustments which followed the civil war, the United States has been a workshop. Its industries and their development have been as dependent upon politics and the triumph of political policies as was the existence of the Government of the United States as a great central power, or its division into sovereign States before the civil war. Each party promises success to commercialism by pleading that its ideas crystallized into legislation will bring larger and more remunerative employment to labor and capital, form more new enterprises, lead to larger development of resources, and produce more beneficent results to the people.

These questions are not new, but they had always been subordinated to others which related to the safety or the character of our institutions. Now they are dominant and have produced a new type of leadership. In the front rank stood our departed friend. He was the product as well as the organizer and commander of the forces of commercialism. His origin and growth were those of every boy whose alma mater is the public school. It equipped him for a clerkship in a store, which is the lot of millions who graduate every year. What happens afterwards, what career is found and followed to higher and better conditions, depend entirely upon the character, ambition, and efforts of the boy. The restless and resistless vigor of this farseeing youth could not be kept behind the counter nor confined to the countingroom. When to the culture of the common school had been added business training, he saw that to advance quickly he must open a new avenue of trade. Like many another of our most successful citizens, he found it in solving a local problem of transportation. It was easy for him to persuade capital to trust him. It was one of the few cases where capital, confiding in the promoter, escaped loss and made large profits.

To bring the iron ore of the Northwest from the mines across the Lakes cheaply to the furnaces in Ohio was simple enough, but, like the great feat of Columbus, which has been repeated down the ages, of making the egg stand on end, was his solution of the greater problem. This next step was natural to such an original and creative mind. Coal and iron must be brought together at the furnaces by the elimination of the countless charges of middlemen. He became an ironmaster, with his own lines on Lake Superior, his own transportation across the Great Lakes, his own coal fields connected with smelting works and mills. The minerals in which he dealt underlie the whole American continent. They can not be corralled or controlled as is possible with other products of nature which are only to be found in limited territories. He was therefore compelled to fight his way in the field of hot competition against the ablest and most successful of business men. The results of this struggle are preeminently the survival of the fittest. Statisticians who have studied the question prove that in New York City, where energy, talent, and capital come from all parts of the country and have larger opportunities than can be found at home, only one in 200 succeed. The other 199 fail and are submerged. In the open country the disasters are not so dreadful, but the great successes are equally rare.

It was not long before Mr. HANNA was confronted with the labor problem. Labor organizations were little known and had no combined existence at that time. The aspirations of labor, seeking a fair share of the production in which it was such an essential part, led to sporadic revolts, which were almost invariably defeated. This born fighter, with undaunted courage and a physical power controlling, in a measure, an aggressive mind, followed the methods in vogue in the early period of his career. One of the characteristics which made the varied success of the Senator was his open-mindedness. He saw earlier than any of the other great employers that labor had rights, and that it was to the interest of the capitalist both to grant justice to labor and to win its confidence. He abandoned hostilities for the much more difficult path of conciliation and arbitration. Ten thousand employees of his, who when he died mourned the loss of one who stood to them as a father and a friend, testified to the wisdom and success of his policy.

A life of strenuous business struggling, of reaching out for new fields to conquer, of education by absorption in the questions affecting industrial safety and development, of contact with and increasing knowledge of human nature in every walk and work continued until Mr. HANNA was in his sixtieth year. This was the education, preparation, and equipment which from the obscurity of business brought into the light of publicity and command, almost in a day, HANNA the party organizer, the party leader, the President maker, the Senator, and the statesman.

In his early business life, still very young to have climbed so high, and while fighting labor, he had on trial a score or more of his striking employees. A young enthusiast, whose heart controlled his mind, who possessed an almost feminine emotional and sentimental nature, was defending them. The argument of McKinley evidently opened the mind of HANNA to new ideas upon the relations of capital and labor. The advocate and worker immediately became fast friends.

Comparatively late in life came to him the belief that nothing is so imperatively necessary to the business man as politics. Costly experience had taught him that the successful outcome of his shops, furnaces, and mines was dependent upon the industrial policies of the Government. He had the easy confidence of the man triumphant in his ventures, that he could forecast and meet trade conditions. But the factor of legislation was beyond his power of calculation. He finally was convinced that the accumulations of a lifetime of hard work and the material future of himself and family depended upon the economic and financial measures of Presidents and Congresses. Without any thought of obtaining or holding office for himself, he began to build the bulwarks which he thought necessary about the protected industries of the country. With an audacity and confidence born of his triumphs in trade he set about to capture the Presidency for his faith. McKinley's illuminating speeches on the tariff convinced HANNA that in the Major he had found the man for his purpose.

There were many men in the party of longer service, larger following, and greater reputation. But HANNA brought to bear to win the favor of the people the methods of his business. He knew the virtue of publicity and promotion. He planned a speaking canvass for his candidate which covered every State, because he believed in the magnetic personality and persuasive eloquence of his friend. When, after many months, Mr. McKinley returned, the Senator said to him, "I thought you would be dead," and McKinley replied, "From the itinerary you gave me I thought your purpose was to kill me." The tour and the literature which went out unceasingly from HANNA's press bureau captured the convention before it met and side-tracked every other candidate. The unknown ironmaster of Cleveland had beaten the veteran politicians and nominated his friend. Now came a new test of

his ability, because the successful candidate placed in his hands the conduct of the campaign. To publicity and promotion he added education. At hardly any period in our history had the country suffered under such severe financial and industrial depression. At such times, as in periods of epidemic, public anxiety and frenzy seize upon novel remedies.

The silver panacea, however, was not new. It had secured much favorable legislation from both parties and was undoubtedly favored in the minds of a large majority of our people. McKinley himself was not free from advocacy of and belief in silver theories. Unexpectedly the currency question overshadowed that of the tariff. No such campaign was ever conducted before, and it would be difficult to repeat it. It required millions of money for its successful prosecution. Colporteurs were on the country roads in every county and State distributing the campaign literature which HANNA was having printed by the ton. The school-houses resounded with the eloquence of thousands of orators, whose expenses must be met. The literary bureau furnished plate matter and contributions to the press, much of which had to be paid for as advertisements. The commanding general alone knew the magnitude of the machinery and the colossal character of the forces he had called into being. With the same talent for administration and attention to details which had made his success in business, he knew the conditions in every State, county, and township, in every division, regiment, company, and corporal's guard of his army better than the local commanders themselves.

The results of the election demonstrated the necessity for this tremendous effort, for McKinley's popular majority in the total of 13,923,102 was only 601,854. The business man, known as such only in the branch of the trade with which he was identified and unknown to the people in June, 1895, was in November of the same year the Warwick of American politics and the most powerful man in the United States.

The President wanted him to be a member of his Cabinet, because of the intimacy of their relation; but HANNA, the business man, the representative of commercialism in public affairs, knew that his power would be subordinate to that of the President as one of his Secretaries, while in Congress his hand would be in the formulation or defeat of those measures which he conceived essential to the welfare, employment, income, and happiness of the American people.

Quite as suddenly as he grew to be supreme in political management the Senator became an orator. He had been accustomed in the boards of directors of many corporations, where the conferences were more in the nature of consultations than arguments, to influence his associates by the lucidity with which from a full mind he could explain situations and suggest policies or remedies. He did not dare, however, except on rare occasions, to trust himself upon his feet. We, his associates, can never forget the day when a mighty passion loosed his tongue and introduced into the debates of this body an original and powerful speaker. It was June, 1900. The Presidential campaign for the second nomination and canvass of President McKinley was about to open. Senator Pettigrew, an active and persistent laborer in the ranks of the opposition, was seeking material in every direction which would benefit his side. Without notice he suddenly assailed Senator HANNA in his tenderest point. He attacked his honesty, truthfulness, and general character. He accused him of bribery, perjury, and false dealing. HANNA's reply was not a speech, but an explosion. It was a gigantic effort, in his almost uncontrollable rage, to keep expression within the limits of Senatorial propriety. He shouted in passionate protest:

Mr. President, the gentleman will find that he is mistaken in the people of the United States when he attempts, through mud slinging and accusations, to influence their decision when they are called upon at the polls next November to decide upon the principles that are at issue and not the men. When it comes to personality, I will stand up against him and compare my character to his. I will let him tell what he knows; then I will tell what I know about him.

The newborn orator carried his threat into execution by a dramatic and picturesque speaking tour through South Dakota, in which, without mentioning Mr. Pettigrew or referring to him in any way, he took away his constituents by convincing them that the doctrines of their Senator were inimical to their interests and prosperity. The Titanic power the Dakota Senator had evoked was his political ruin.

From that time Senator HANNA participated influentially in debates upon those industrial questions which he so thoroughly understood and which were near his heart. The United States had been committed for thirty years to an isthmian canal by the Nicaragua route. It came to be considered as "the American line." The resolution in its favor had passed the House unanimously. Senator HANNA gave to the study of the question, which was purely a business one, a mind long trained in construction and contracts. He came to the conclusion that we should build on the Panama route. There have been many speeches in this Senate more eloquent, more scholarly, more profound, and more

erudite than the one delivered by Senator HANNA in favor of the selection of the Panama route; but when this man of business and affairs, of supreme intelligence in the creation and prosecution of business and enterprises, this constructive organizer in trade, who had found his talent for explanation, instruction, and argument, sat down, he had accomplished that rarest of triumphs, the command of a listening Senate.

Perhaps in the final reckoning of his place and achievements, his work in the Civic Federation will stand foremost. At first capital and labor both distrusted him. They thought there was a hidden political motive or personal ambition at the base of the movement. Capitalists who were unfriendly to labor and labor agitators whose profits depend upon trouble united in fighting HANNA as they often had done in fighting peace, but the genuine, patriotic, and broad-minded labor leaders soon became his ardent friends, while the distrust of capital was slowly disappearing. When he died the people recognized that his unselfish object and aim was to close his career by creating such relations between these tremendous forces that both would be benefited and the industrial interests of the country placed upon a safe and peaceful basis.

One of the most interesting phases of the life of Senator HANNA was his friendship with President McKinley. The men were wholly unlike; they had nothing in common. HANNA was a fighter, and beloved and lived in the storms of battle. McKinley was a diplomat, whose tact amounted to genius for the peaceful settlement of controversies and conversion of enemies. HANNA had the rare faculty of forecasting events and taking advantage of them which easily accumulates millions and the rarer common sense which keeps the fortune. McKinley in a large and comprehensive way could formulate and popularize policies which promoted prosperity and increased national and individual wealth, but the art of making money was for him an insoluble mystery, and he could not master the intricacies and details of business.

There is only one parallel instance in our history, and that is the relation between William H. Seward and Thurlow Weed. As HANNA believed that his economic and financial views were essential to the present and future happiness of the country, so Weed thought that the destruction of slavery was necessary to the preservation of the Union. As HANNA felt that he must have in the Presidency the ablest advocate of his theories, so did Weed believe that the most brilliant and profound orator against slavery should be kept in public life, and ultimately promoted to the Chief Magistracy. Thurlow Weed was one of the ablest and most expert of political managers. For thirty years he ruled his party in the State of New York, and subordinated all his power, skill, craft, and diplomacy to advance the political fortunes and keep in the Senate and at the front Governor Seward. Mr. Seward was devoid of the talent which controls caucuses and manages conventions, and so was McKinley. Weed, after twenty years, had the Presidency almost within the grasp of his candidate, and lost it by an accident. In less than a year HANNA had succeeded. Mr. Seward possessed an intelligence of wonderful insight and philosophical grasp of moral issues with the faculty of inspiring beliefs and inducing efforts to bring about the events he forecasted.

McKinley's talent was upon the practical plane of the questions of our day which affect more nearly employment, wages, and homes. Between the practical politician of New York and her greatest statesman there never existed much personal intimacy and confidences. The politician looked upon the statesman with awe and admiration, and the statesman wondered at the talent, and the results it accomplished, of the politician. But late one night during the Spanish war, when all was anxiety, I went to the White House with Mr. HANNA. The optimistic radiance which always characterized the President had given place to worry and gloom; but when he turned to his visitor and caressingly placed his hands upon Mr. HANNA's shoulder his countenance assumed all its old-time happiness and confidence, and he uttered with a depth of feeling and affection which no words can describe the word "MARK." Everyone was impressed with the fact that two souls with kindred thoughts were linked in a love which "passeth all understanding."

The career of a leader who does not at all hazards and at any risk of loss stand by his friends is a short one. The same is true of a leader who having defeated his enemies seeks to crush them. The accumulated forces of many vendettas will ultimately destroy him. HANNA would go to the death for his friend, and he inspired such loyalty and love that his followers would die for him. He often attached to himself a defeated enemy by a grateful and unexpected favor.

A schoolmate of Mr. HANNA, himself now a creator and manager of great enterprises and known everywhere, told me that the boys of the public school got in trouble with a street peddler and were in danger of being seriously injured when MARK HANNA came in sight. It was not his quarrel, but it was enough for him that his friends were in peril, and he rushed into the fight with such savage fury that the lads were encouraged, the tide of battle turned, and the burly bully put to flight. The act of the boy was the lifelong conduct of the man.

"How soon we are forgotten" was the pathetic utterance of the returning Rip Van Winkle after twenty years of absence from his village. Time soon obliterates the footprints of public as well as of private characters; but occasionally a rare personality becomes immortal by capturing the public imagination and winning the people's heart, but such a man must have been long before them and with them fighting their battles. HANNA is the exception. Eight years from the time of his entrance upon the public stage he died. Millions waited anxiously upon the hourly bulletins of his health. Millions mourned silently when he was no more. The President and Cabinet, ambassadors, judges of the Supreme Court, Senators, Congressmen, and captains of industry were at his funeral, but the sincerest tributes to his worth, his patriotism, and the beneficent work of his life were the thousands of working men and women who stood for hours in the deep snow and wintry blasts with bared heads and tear-stained cheeks while their best friend was carried to his last resting place.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, since to all earthly work an end must come, our words of farewell to a fellow-workman should not alone be those of grief that man's common lot has come to him; but of pride and joy that his task has been done worthily. Powerful men so weave themselves into their hour that, for the moment, it all but seems the world will stop when they depart. Yet, it does not stop or even pause. Undisturbed Time still wings his endless and unwearied flight; and the progress of the race goes on and up toward the light realizing at every step, more and more of the true, the beautiful and the good.

So it is not important that any of us should long remain; the Master Builder lacks not craftsmen to take our place. But it is important to the uttermost that while we are here, we should do our duty to the full perfection of our powers, fearlessly and faithfully, with clean hands, and hearts ever full of kindness, forbearance, charity.

These are the outline thoughts that the absence of our friend compels. With his whole strength he did his work from boyhood to the place of rest. He was no miser of his life—he poured it into discharge of duty, keeping with Nature no account of heart beats.

The things he did were real things. He was the very spirit of the practical. Yet the practical did not kill or even impair the human in him. He never lost the gift of loveliness. His sense of human touch and fellowship was not dulled, but made more delicate by Time and the World. The years made him wiser, but they made him mellow, too.

And so he won the people's affection as well as their applause. And affection is worth more than applause. There is no greater glory than this—to make a nation your friend. Senator HANNA did that. For, when the angel of peace, which men call Death, took our brother to his well earned rest, the people knew that a friend had left them. And the people were sad that he had gone away.

This human quality in him made all he did a living thing, all he said a living word. He was the man of affairs in statesmanship; yet his personality gave to propositions of mere national business something of the warmth and vitality of principles. He was the personification of our commercial age—the age of building, planting, reaping; of ships on ocean and on land steel highways and the rolling wheels of trade; of that movement of the times which knits together with something more than verbal ties all the children of men, weaves tangible civilization around the globe and will, in time, make of all peoples neighbors, brothers, friends.

Thus he was, unwittingly no doubt, one of the agents of God's great purpose of the unification of the race. We are all such agents, small or great. If this is not so—if we are not, ignorantly perhaps and blindly but still surely, spinning our lives into the Master's design, whose pattern He alone can comprehend—if we and all things are not working together for good—if life is but a breath exhaled and then forever lost, our work means less and is worth less than that of coral insects, which, from the depths, build ever toward the light until islands stand above the waves, permanent monuments of an intelligent architecture.

Work with real things—real earth, real ocean, real mountains, real men—made him conservative. And his conservatism was real. Much that is accepted as conservatism is spurious, mere make-believe. Conservatism does not mean doubt or indecision. It does not mean wise looks, masking vacuity, nor pompous phrase, as meaningless as it is solemn. Conservatism means clear common sense, which equally rejects the fanaticism of precedent and the fanaticism of change. It would not have midnight last just because it exists; and yet it knows that dawn comes not in a flash, but gradually—comes with a grand and beautiful moderation. So the conservative is the real statesman. He brings things to pass in a way that lasts and does good. Senator HANNA was a conservative.

Working with real things among real men also kept fresh his

faith and hope. No sailor of the seas, no delver in the earth, no builder of rooftrees can be a pessimist. He who plants doubts not our common mother's generosity, or fails to see in the brown furrow the certainty of coming harvests. He who sinks a well and witnesses the waters rise understands that the eternal fountains will never cease to flow. Only the man whose hands never touch the realities of life despairs of human progress or doubts the providence of God. The fable of Anteus is literal truth for body, mind and soul. And so, Senator HANNA dealing with living men and the actualities of existence had all the virile hope of youth, all the unquestioning faith of prophecy. These are the qualities of the effective leadership of men.

He is gone from us—gone before us. Strength and frailty, kindness and wrath, wisdom and folly, laughter and frown, all the elements of life and his living of it have ceased their visible play and action. "Where," said despairing Villon, "where are the snows of yesteryear?" Vanished, he would have us believe. Yes, but vanished only in form. "The snows of yesteryear" are in the stream, in cloud and rain, in sap of tree and bloom of flower, in heart and brain of talent and of beauty. Nothing is lost even here on our ancient and kindly earth. So the energies of our friend, and those of all men, have touched into activity forces that, influencing still others, will move on forever.

As to the other life, we know not fully what it is; but that it is, we know. Knowing this, we who are left behind go on about our daily tasks, assured that in another and truer existence our friend is now established, weakness cast aside as a cloak when Winter has passed, vision clear as when at dawn we wake from dreams, heart happy as when, the victory won, we cease from effort and from care. For him the night is done, and it is written that "joy cometh in the morning."

[Mr. DOLLIVER addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. KEARNS. I count it a special privilege, Mr. President, to participate in these exercises to-day, which commemorate the life and character of that great American, that loyal friend and matchless leader, MARCUS A. HANNA. Together with the thousands who knew him, I hold in grateful remembrance the share I had of that great heart, whose every pulsation was of kindness and love.

His life is the ideal for which the youth of our country should strive. In his intercourse with men he was all that stands for sterling manhood, and he surrounded his home with a halo of purity and love.

By his own endeavors he became a captain of industry and the foremost statesman of his time. Cruelly caricatured as the enemy of labor, vilified, and misunderstood, he lived at last to hear the cheers of labor hailing him as its champion and to realize he had won the confidence of the whole people. He discouraged the efforts of his friends to elevate him to the highest office in the gift of the people, and said he preferred to spend the remaining years of his life in the consummation of a better understanding between capital and labor. Here indeed is an example of devotion to the cause of mankind that had no other consideration than that which comes from a consciousness of well-doing, a heritage of which any man may well be proud.

Mr. HANNA was modest and unassuming, yet possessed of that nervous energy that begets success. He loved his friends and was ever willing to labor for them. Their success was his keenest pleasure, and with them he felt the sting of defeat. And, Mr. President, it was this godlike trait that rallied the legions to his cause.

The Middle West had heard of Mr. HANNA prior to 1896, and when the Republican convention of that year met at St. Louis I sought him out that I might know him better. The impression he made was that of a born leader of men, kindly, forceful, honest, and just. His frankness inspired confidence, his ability commanded respect, and his lovable nature won all who knew him as a friend.

In the memorable campaign of 1896 he demonstrated a new kind of politics. Himself a successful business man, he contended that business methods could be applied with equal success to politics. The organization of the Republican party of that year was a marvel of completeness. He was a master of detail, and no point, however obscure, was neglected in the consideration of a proposition.

Mr. HANNA's service in the Senate is one of the brightest pages in his career. Here we found him a careful and conservative legislator, broad in his views, and kind and considerate of others. He enjoyed the confidence of his colleagues, and the whole people came to regard him as a statesman of the highest integrity, and one in whose judgment every reliance could be placed.

But, Mr. President, however great Mr. HANNA was as a public servant, it was eclipsed in his domestic life. Here, indeed, we find the genial host, the lovable husband and father, traits that shine brightly in the crown his friends have made for him.

And when, Mr. President, all else of him has been forgotten, the evergreen of his career will be the love he bore his fellow-man. Like Abou Ben Adam, his name leads all the rest.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President and Senators, every friend of Senator HANNA, and they were legion, will thank you for your tributes of respect and your words of affection. This gratitude may never find outward expression, but in their behalf, and especially for Ohio—that grand old State to which he was devoted, which in turn was devoted to him—I gratefully thank you. This assumed duty will be pardoned, I am sure, when it is realized or remembered that to me this man was like an older brother.

MARCUS A. HANNA, born September 24, 1837, in New Lisbon, Columbiana County, Ohio, died in Washington, February 15, 1904, in the discharge of his duties as Senator from his native State. It was not his fortune to be born in poverty, nor did affluence in early years hinder his growth and development. He belonged to the great middle class of fairly well-to-do Americans, who are richest perhaps in their descent from long lines of sturdy, intelligent, God-fearing ancestors.

If, as has been said, God sifted the whole world to find men worthy the high calling of founding a new nation, as truly may it be said that all the original States of the Federal Union contributed to the making of Ohio, the first State of the nineteenth century, the first new State formed out of national territory. Here converged nearly all the early lines of continental travel. Here came the Puritan and the Cavalier, the Scotch-Irish, and those of pure Teutonic and Gallic blood; Lutheran, Presbyterian, Catholic, and Quaker. Connecticut bounded the State on the north, and Massachusetts and New Jersey and Virginia on the south. New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia furnished generous contributions to her population.

The abolition of slavery in the Northwest Territory drew to Ohio some of the best blood of the far South. All these coalesced to form a type of stalwart, intensely patriotic Americans. Here the tide of western migration halted for a time. It is by no accident that Ohio has furnished so many distinguished sons to the galaxy of our national heroes. The cause is found in the circumstances of her birth and development, in the composite character of her early settlers.

Mr. HANNA was a type of that mixture of elements so characteristic of his State. In his family is to be found Scotch-Irish, Cavalier and Puritan, Presbyterian and Quaker stock. His ancestors were pioneers. They were among the more hardy and venturesome spirits of the older settlements who followed the frontier as it receded westward.

The father was a country physician, who left a good practice in eastern Ohio and moved farther west, to Cleveland, then a town of fair promise, and engaged in merchandising because of the wider field it offered for achieving success. In his father's store the future Senator received his first training in business. The beginnings were small but prosperous. He spent a year in the Western Reserve College, with what benefit to himself he declared he never felt certain, though he doubtless builded more wisely than he knew. He served a brief enlistment in the Union armies. The years which immediately followed were years of commercial upbuilding and expansion. His training was in the problems which confront the man of large affairs. He learned to seize the strategic points of business growth and success.

Thus he spent nearly a lifetime in business and with scarcely a thought for other matters. By his hard common sense he won the confidence of his associates and was a leader among them. He had the tremendous personal force of an aggressive mentality. He was as stalwart in mind as he was in body. His strength lay largely in the directness of his methods. He was a masterful man, possessing at all times definite aims in life. He saw with a clear eye, and was able by force of intellect and character to make other men think as he did. He was a man who accomplished results, a leader who led. His business methods were conservative. He was never a speculator, except as all business is a venture. He was constructive, but not a promoter.

He developed great executive ability and built up great business enterprises which survive him. He selected his lieutenants, apportioned the work, directed in a general way without burdening his mind with details, and looked with confidence for results. He did not have the patience for infinite detail, but the greater power of conceiving and executing great undertakings. His success was the result of long years of preparation. He commanded success because he deserved it. Growing wealth developed in him the kindlier and more humane side. He gave freely and cheerfully, but modestly and without show. His charity was discriminating. His daily life was wholesome and clean, his pleasures were simple, his tastes natural. He was a most useful man to his community, but his mettle was yet untried.

At an age when most successful men think of retiring to pass the remainder of their years in ease and quiet he stepped into a larger field of action which immediately brought him into public

notice. His motive for entering politics was as unusual as his success was remarkable. He sought not to advance himself, but to advance others. His friendship for Garfield led him to take an increasing interest in politics; his love for McKinley absorbed his entire being. His devotion was unselfish and unwearied. The story of this mutual attachment is one of the idyls of American politics. With the same farseeing vision which marked his judgment in business affairs he predicted the elevation of his chosen leader.

Politics became for a time the passion of his life. He laid his plans far in advance and organized his forces with consummate skill. The victory he won in the pre-convention campaign of 1896 was so complete that it obscured the magnitude of the struggle. Success was so overwhelming that one was tempted to forget there had been a struggle. No man who participated therein, however, could make that mistake. A political campaign followed which alarmed the country and made business interests anxious. More money was offered him for the purpose of waging the contest than could be used. The statement of his expenditures could safely have been disclosed to the whole world. He handled large sums in the conduct of two national campaigns, but spent it all for education and organization. He was willing to give much for these purposes, but not a dollar for corruption. He brought business methods into politics, the direct, simple business methods of an honest, God-fearing, American business man.

If he married business to politics, it was because he brought to politics the same honesty, directness, and straightforwardness essential to business success. This country need never fear commercialism in politics as long as commercialism stands for Senator HANNA's methods and practices. Business men had been in politics before, but the advent of this business man with his frank, open methods came as a surprise and something of a shock to many party workers. He was a captain of industry who commanded his lieutenants. He was accustomed to say to this man, "Go," and he went; to another man, "Come," and he came. He managed campaigns the same way, and the innovation was not at first entirely acceptable. The ways of political managers had been looked upon as devious and secret; their comings and goings subterranean and nocturnal. He brought daylight into dark places, conducted his first national campaign as he planned and carried on industrial undertakings. The stockholders always had access to the books. This is a commercial era, and if he brought business methods into politics, who will say it has not been to the great advantage of politics?

The only political office he ever held, except membership in the school board of the city of his adoption, was a seat in this body. He was still serving his first full term and had been elected to another. The contrast between the circumstances attending these two elections marks the progress of popular knowledge of the man. In both campaigns he was indorsed by the State convention of his party, the nearest practical approach, perhaps, to election to the Senate by direct vote of the people. At the first election the margin of party success was narrow, but apparently entirely sufficient until factions opposition raised its ugly head within his own party. Men high in its confidence and enjoying honors granted at its hands joined to defeat the expressed will of the people. There was no scheme too desperate to be resorted to.

The intensity and bitterness of that struggle no one can appreciate who was not a part of it. It required an uprising of the people in their majesty and wrath to register the verdict which they had instructed. The people spoke, and in no uncertain terms. By resolutions and delegations and informally appointed committees they assailed those who were dallying with dishonor or were listening to golden-tongued tempters. They did not speak in vain, and the State was spared the misfortune and worse of violated instructions and tainted honor. Six years later he was the candidate of a united party for reelection. The State convention again declared him the nominee of his party. He was now its acknowledged leader and idol and the chief issue in the campaign. The result was an overwhelming personal triumph. He was returned to this body by the largest majority ever given in the State of Ohio.

Senator HANNA was not merely a scholar; he was more than that; he was a thinker who did not permit others to think for him, and he put his best thought in his daily life. He was not an orator in the sense that polished paragraph and stately language makes an orator, and he never prepared a set speech. When he first attempted to speak in public he spoke haltingly and hesitatingly, but practice gave him power. He developed amazingly in the faculty of apt and forceful expression. Much speaking gave him ease and self-confidence. He developed the power that was within him and became a convincing speaker. He believed what he said and said it in a way that carried conviction. When he spoke it was from a full heart and a mind richly stored with his subject. He talked the speech of common, everyday life, the vernacular of the plain people; and he talked to them, not over them. He had the gift of homely phrase, and these phrases often

crystallized into campaign cries. He used language to express thought, not to conceal it; speech was given him not to hide truth, but to proclaim it. Few public speakers have been more popular, have drawn larger audiences, or moved them more profoundly.

The enthusiasm and devotion he awakened are only possible to strong men. As he was loyal to others, so were his friends loyal to him. Those who knew him best loved him most. The Old Guard was not more faithful to Napoleon than Mr. HANNA's friends were to him.

Do we realize the great handicap of wealth, that no man with the possessions he acquired ever rose to great national estate? He achieved greatness not because of his wealth, but in spite of it. No man ever grew so rapidly in influence and power, and no man who entered politics so late in life ever rose so high. Success and high station in politics, as a rule, come only to those who have served an apprenticeship in lower places. He sprang full panoplied and equipped into the arena of national activity.

We seek for comparisons, but none can be made because no man achieved so great a success who was in public life as short a time as he was. No other man who wrought in the double field of industry and politics ever achieved so great a success in both. He applied the straightforward, honest methods of upright business dealing to affairs of party and of state. The country was surprised, doubted, and then applauded. He revolutionized politics by putting it on a business basis. He interested business in politics to the distinct advantage of the latter.

He was distinctly the product of his day and generation—a typical American of the latter part of the nineteenth century. He was constructive in politics and in legislation as he was in business. He was interested in building up instead of tearing down.

His greatest achievement in this body of which record appears was in converting a hostile majority to favor the route for an isthmian canal which his judgment declared was the best. He came to this conclusion only after most thorough investigation. When he entered upon this contest few of the Members of Congress agreed with him. The claims of the other route had been written into party platforms, and he was told that his efforts would be futile. He entered upon the contest with all the zeal and energy of his strong nature. By personal appeals, by labors in committee and on this floor, he urged his views. The country as well as Congress, when the final judgment was reached, was converted to his views and no one longer seriously questions the soundness of that position.

It is given to few men to complete the tasks they set before them. Man's plans are not often God's plans. Lincoln saw the end of armed strife, but it was not given his sublime patience to solve the trying problems which followed. We had not yet drunk the cup of bitterness to the dregs. McKinley saw the end of armed opposition to our national authority at the close of another war, but was taken away leaving many vital problems unsolved. Mr. HANNA did much; few men did so much in such a brief term, but his greatest task lay before him. Business success and political preferment became to him means to an end. He felt the necessity of saner methods for settling disputes between labor and capital. He devoted himself to the cause of industrial peace and social justice. To this great end he had consecrated the rest of his life, and had arranged his business affairs that they need no longer engage his attention. He repeatedly declared he would rather settle the labor problem than be President.

Labor grew to trust him, to abide by his judgment, realizing his friendship based on long years of service. In a political address delivered in Ashtabula, where he employed many thousand men, he declared, "If I have ever wronged any man in my employ I will resign my seat." That challenge went unaccepted. He wronged no man; gave no man just cause for offense. His own employees felt his sympathy. He had stood in the way of projected business consolidations which threatened to sacrifice men who had grown gray in his service. He declined to accumulate greater wealth at the expense of those who had helped him build up his fortunes. This showed the great heart of the man—his tender, sympathetic interest in his fellow-men. The greatest good he did was what he accomplished and tried to accomplish to solve the great industrial problem. His greatest service there lay in making labor and capital better acquainted. He was the great peacemaker. In this field there is no one to take his place, no one so high as he in the confidence of interests which oppose each other because they do not understand each other.

Mr. HANNA's response to his physicians' appeal to help them, made in his last illness, was characteristic of the man, "I'll do the best I can." He always did the best he could, always contended with all his might. He was the sturdy fighter who waged war not merely to win but to overwhelm his antagonist. While he did not seek such conflicts, he did not avoid them. Once involved, the martial spirit in him rose to battle pitch. He fought in the open, gave hard blows, and took them manfully. He

fought to conquer and to conquer overwhelmingly, but, truce declared and peace effected, he harbored no resentment and punished no enemies. He not merely forgave, he forgot.

True, he was not satisfied with a narrow margin of victory; it must be decisive. Even when success was absolutely assured he did not relax in his efforts in the least. This feeling was misunderstood and led to misconception and was the great source of the excess of caricature from which he suffered. He needed only to be thoroughly known to be vindicated of all charges. Kindlier feelings and a more generous appreciation succeeded to distrust and malignity. Vituperation and abuse recoiled from him. He went his way serene, calm, cheerful, and undisturbed. It was his good fortune to live to see all the shafts of malice blunted and turned back on his assailers. For eight years the strong searchlight of infinite inquiry was focused upon him, but nothing mean or small was ever disclosed. His life was an open book, every page as clean as the first.

He had no secret longings for other political honors. He was great enough to put aside any such ambition and was never greater than in resisting the flattery of those who would have made him a national standard bearer. The public will know but little of the great pressure brought to bear upon him to accept this crown, nor did he, like Cæsar, refuse each time with less and less insistence. He was firm to the last, because he felt he was following the path in which his duty lay. He had given his word he would not be a candidate, and he kept his faith.

Measure him from whatever point you choose, his sturdy honesty shines preeminent. The arts of the demagogue he scorned. He hated all shams and artifice. He had no secret, dark-chamber method of achieving results. He did not win by intrigue. He worked in the open; his methods might at any time have been laid bare to the gaze of the world. There was no secret in his handling of men. He was honest, frank, sincere, sympathetic, friendly. His friendships were not confined within the narrow circle of party politics, for he gained the admiration and respect of those who would not agree with him. His honesty and sincerity no one could doubt. If he was devoted to any cause, it was on account of its righteousness and justice, as he viewed it. He never concealed personal and selfish aims under the guise of advocating public measures. He was frank and open in his relations to all legislation. He did not look to the shifting weathervane of public opinion to find direction to guide his steps.

What seemed right to him he did. He never lacked the courage of his convictions. He was modest and unassuming. He never sought applause, and never carried himself to be seen of men. He won no victories on the field of battle; he did not fill the seat of highest authority, but he was a pillar of the State.

He was to a marked degree a well-balanced man, a man sane in all the relations of life. It follows that he was hopeful and optimistic. Cheerfulness and good nature were the very essence of his being. He bore with him at all times the atmosphere of love and sunshine. He was square, brave, and true; a great, tender-hearted, manly man. No one was ever deceived by his bluntness of speech when the beaming eye and kindly smile belied the sense of his words. The catholicity of his interests and sympathies was as boundless as his charities. He had some faults that are common to most men, but he possessed virtues so rare as to challenge recognition and admiration.

He passed away in the height of his power and influence, secure in the knowledge that he was known and honored by the whole country, that all misunderstanding and misconception had passed away; looked up to by one vast set of interests as its shield and by another as its sincere friend and true adviser. Not all he advocated in this Chamber has been enacted into legislation, but whether all his hopes are ever realized in the future or not, the projects in which he was interested will ever be associated with his name. Death was his first defeat. A nation grieved at his bedside and prayed for his recovery. The tears shed for his loss were genuine and heartfelt.

No man who made so brief a passage across the theater of our national life ever left a stronger impress on his day and age in every walk of life in which he took an interest. It is too soon to determine his rightful place in the valhalla of our national heroes, but it is certain that the impartial biographer will record him a great party leader, a statesman of high rank, a patriot of purest loyalty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the senior Senator from Ohio.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I move, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the departed, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 8, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 7, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, 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. 67. Joint resolution providing for the printing of Senate Document No. 240, relating to the beet-sugar industry in the United States;

S. 4054. An act for the relief of Richard King;

S. 3665. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. O'Connor;

S. 3361. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the maintenance and supply of fuel and illuminating gas and its by-products in Honolulu;

S. 1425. An act for the relief of Eleonora G. Goldsborough; and

S. 10. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Taft.

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

H. R. 13350. An act conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed in a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Ark.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2261) to amend section 4607 of the Revised Statutes, relating to soliciting seamen as lodgers.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

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. 3734. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha W. Cushing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1244. An act granting an increase of pension to Sue Stevens Eskridge—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 240. An act granting a pension to Charles Weittle—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3334. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances G. Belknap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT.

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

H. R. 8681. An act to detach the counties of Linn and Chariton, in the State of Missouri, from the western and attach them to the eastern judicial district of said State;

H. R. 10925. An act directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn in favor of the Pittsburg Shear, Knife, and Machine Company, now the Heppenstall Forge and Knife Company, of Pittsburg, Pa.; and

H. R. 9653. An act to provide for the withdrawal, free of duty under bond, from the Louisiana Purchase Exposition of any articles and materials donated to incorporated institutions established for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or literary purposes, or to any State or municipal corporation.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 5055. An act granting an increase of pension to Woodson R. Daniel;

H. R. 5105. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Fishback;

H. R. 5953. An act granting an increase of pension to Marcel Gagnon;

H. R. 5533. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Freeman;

H. R. 5846. An act granting an increase of pension to Carrie K. Baker;

H. R. 5856. An act granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. King;

H. R. 5681. An act granting an increase of pension to Phillip Whyrich;

H. R. 12386. An act to authorize W. Denny & Co. to bridge Dog River, in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5247. An act granting an increase of pension to Lora Milliken;

H. R. 5261. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia M. Oakley;

H. R. 5107. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. King;

H. R. 5888. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Irene Rosenthal;

H. R. 6973. An act granting an increase of pension to Simeon Billings;

H. R. 6966. An act granting an increase of pension to Roxana S. Ker;

H. R. 6062. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvin Gray;

H. R. 5912. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander S. Bowen;

H. R. 6881. An act granting an increase of pension to Zachariah T. Bryant;

H. R. 6976. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane Wheeler;

H. R. 6858. An act granting an increase of pension to Nelson Hart;

H. R. 6940. An act granting an increase of pension to Susannah O. Wardrop;

H. R. 7517. An act granting an increase of pension to Lemuel N. Bishop;

H. R. 7792. An act granting an increase of pension to Lazarus Minnich;

H. R. 7773. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Thoroman;

H. R. 8481. An act granting an increase of pension to Maggie E. Carter;

H. R. 9574. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Lennon;

H. R. 9599. An act granting an increase of pension to Grace P. Paddock;

H. R. 9905. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Sullivan;

H. R. 12452. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Mc Nerney;

H. R. 12202. An act granting an increase of pension to John Baughman;

H. R. 12363. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Barnard;

H. R. 12342. An act granting an increase of pension to Lawrence H. Rousseau;

H. R. 12498. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah N. Maddox;

H. R. 12544. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Hayford;

H. R. 12094. An act granting an increase of pension to James T. McKinstry;

H. R. 12389. An act granting an increase of pension to Napoleon Paulus;

H. R. 12099. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Slayton;

H. R. 12624. An act granting an increase of pension to Eva H. Wingate;

H. R. 13230. An act granting an increase of pension to Amos T. Richardson;

H. R. 13117. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis Sawyer;

H. R. 12680. An act granting an increase of pension to Hervey Polen;

H. R. 13067. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Prentiss;

H. R. 13263. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline E. Pratt;

H. R. 13283. An act granting an increase of pension to William York;

H. R. 8120. An act granting an increase of pension to Delzon Allen;

H. R. 8121. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Ellis;

H. R. 8283. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Herkes;

H. R. 8099. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen L. Richardson;

H. R. 12557. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Gardiner;

H. R. 11011. An act granting an increase of pension to John Linn;

H. R. 6530. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams;

H. R. 6592. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Wilson;

H. R. 6425. An act granting an increase of pension to David Walker;

H. R. 11301. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen Caroline Steele;

H. R. 11999. An act granting an increase of pension to William Vincent; and

H. R. 7986. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen Bricker.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

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

S. 10. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Taft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1425. An act for the relief of Eleonora G. Goldsborough—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3665. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4054. An act for the relief of Richard King—to the Committee on Claims.

S. R. 67. Joint resolution providing for the printing of Senate Document No. 240, relating to the beet-sugar industry in the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

MATTER OF IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE CHARLES SWAYNE.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania presents the following resolution as a matter of privilege.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the consideration of the resolution, No. 274, reported by the Committee on the Judiciary in the matter of the impeachment of Charles Swayne, judge of the district court of the United States, in the northern district of Florida, be postponed until the 13th day of December, 1904, and that the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, authorized to take such further testimony as may be offered by the complainants or the respondent, and report the same to the House, with its conclusions thereon. The said committee and subcommittee shall have all the authority conferred by the original resolution, No. 86, and the further authority to take testimony when Congress is not in session.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Florida, who presented the original resolution.

Mr. LAMAR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that it seems advisable that the matter of the impeachment of Judge Charles Swayne should be deferred until the next session of Congress. But there are cogent reasons that seem to point out that this course is the best one to pursue.

The printed evidence in this case is embraced in a volume of considerable size, comprising 360 pages, and included therein is the testimony of quite a number of witnesses and many pages of exhibits from the records of Judge Swayne's court, relating to the amount of time he served in open session of his court for eight years and relating to many bankruptcy matters, and to his fine and imprisonment of several persons for alleged contempt of the authority of his court.

The report of the majority of the Judiciary Committee recommending the impeachment of Judge Swayne for high misdemeanor, covers 23 printed pages. The views of the minority of the Judiciary Committee against impeachment cover 36 pages of printed matter. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if one-fourth of the Members of this House have read carefully and with exactness the report of the majority and the views of the minority of the Judiciary Committee and the 360 printed pages of testimony in the case. It is absolutely essential that each Member of this House read carefully and accurately the report of the majority and the views of the minority and the printed evidence in the case before they can vote intelligently upon the question whether impeachment proceedings will lie against Judge Swayne.

It is well known that an early adjournment of this Congress is contemplated, possibly May 1 next. And it is well known to this Congress and to the country that much important business of this Congress touching upon legislation is yet not acted upon. It is also known that many Members of this House are now absent in their respective States engaged in a canvass for renomination. It is also well known that the attention of Members of both Houses of this Congress is, to a great degree, centered upon the issues involved in the two national conventions of the two great political parties, soon to occur, and upon the subsequent Presidential election to occur this year.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, that the attention of this House can not be fixed with that certainty upon the issues involved in this case that the importance of these issues demand. And I appeal to this body, both Republicans and Democrats, that they may carefully examine the two reports made in this case, and the printed evidence, and prepare to vote on this great question with no other object in view except the cause of

right and justice. And I rely with confidence upon the hope that the Members of this body, without respect to party affiliations, will bring finally to the consideration of this high question no feeling or sentiment except the single desire to reach a just and righteous conclusion.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President; which was read, as follows, and referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, covering a statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the month of February, 1904, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission in pursuance of section 11 of the "Act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, April 7, 1904.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the bill making appropriations for the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the army appropriation bill. Does the gentleman desire to have the report read or the statement?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the report and statement been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HULL. It has.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement as printed on page 4406 of the RECORD.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the report of the conferees is practically the same as submitted in its first report, except that it agrees to the amendment in regard to the increase of the Signal Corps to correspond with the action of the House on that amendment, the Senate conferees agreeing to the amendment as it was passed by the House. The two amendments to which the point of order was raised have been changed so as to avoid any question on that score. In the one in the pay department we simply agree to the Senate amendment which is providing for the details or apportionment of the funds appropriated by the bill and the accounts to be made. On the hospital business the change made in the Senate amendment was to reduce the hospital at Fort Riley by \$10,000 and increase the hospital at Fort Snelling \$10,000, leaving the amount apportioned by the Senate amendment in its total amount exactly as it passed the Senate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of the four amendments that were not agreed upon one is in regard to the retired officers of the Army getting one advance grade, and the amendment appropriating \$250,000 for a road in Alaska, and \$10,000 for a trail in Alaska, and \$90,000 for a bridge across the Spokane River at Spokane, Wash. On these amendments no agreement has been reached. I am ready, Mr. Speaker, for a vote upon the conference report.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. I will.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to have the conference report agreed to?

Mr. HULL. I move to agree to the conference report.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman inform me whether or not this appropriation to build a military road in Alaska is put in this bill.

Mr. HULL. It is put in as a disagreement.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want it put out if it is in.

Mr. HULL. But you can not put it out, or out of the report.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have the matter of the amendment numbered 27, which is the amendment creating an extra major-general and brigadier-general in the Military Secretary's Office, which was debated by me the other day and in

which the House by unanimous vote refused to concur, made the subject of debate here and time allowed for it, and my reason for it is—

Mr. HULL. What do you desire now?

Mr. PARKER. I desire to move to nonconcur in that amendment and insist upon our disagreement.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the House unanimously resolved to disagree to every amendment reported by the Senate, except those amendments where an affirmative motion was made to recede from our disagreement and concur, so that the amendment in regard to the consolidation of the bureaus of the War Department is exactly on the same footing as all other amendments where no motion was made for the House to concur. Of course the gentleman from New Jersey must know that he could not have a separate vote on this, and that we must either vote up or vote down the conference report.

Mr. PARKER. I desire to have a vote on that matter. This was not stated by the gentleman from Iowa in making the explanation except to say they agreed. On this matter there was no debate except the few remarks I made, because all were in favor of nonconcurring, and it is a matter of so great importance that I desire to have an opportunity to have the debate, if it has to be taken on the whole conference report. But I desire to have a debate which ought to be on a matter which changes the whole law with reference to the Army by creating an extra major-general and an extra brigadier-general by order of the President, unconstitutionally, to appoint certain officers to these positions, although they are nothing but clerks.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is debating out of time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HULL. I do not. If the gentleman will tell me how much time he wants, I will perhaps give it to him. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. PARKER. I would like to have an arrangement for one hour on each side.

Mr. HULL. Oh, I can not agree to that at all. I want to say that when this motion was up the other day I yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey all the time he desired, and his remarks are printed in full in the RECORD, so that the whole membership of this House can read them. There was not a word said on the other side, because we believed that the House was familiar with the matter and was ready to concur. Of course if the gentleman from New Jersey did not finish his address when the conference report was up before, I am willing to yield him ten minutes to conclude it.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I know there are many Members besides myself who would like to give their views on this subject.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the amendment?

Mr. PARKER. It is amendment No. 27, which creates a military secretaryship to be filled by the Chief of the Record and Pension Office, which abolishes the place of Adjutant-General and leaves the present Adjutant-General no place whatever. It orders that another gentleman shall be made a brigadier-general, and it is a matter which ought to be thoroughly debated by this House.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know—

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a reasonable time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HULL. No, Mr. Speaker; I think the gentleman has explained his position fully to the House. I want to say just one word in answer to the gentleman from New Jersey, that this measure for consolidation is recommended strongly by former Secretary of War Root, and by the present Secretary of War Judge Taft, and that the only question is one of increased rank. Neither Secretary recommended increased rank.

I want to say that the Members all know something as to what has been done in the War Department for the past fifteen years. General Ainsworth, when he took charge of the records of the War Department affecting the Pension Bureau, found clerks were employed costing the Government a million dollars a year. He found letters on file there that had remained for months unanswered, and he has saved this Government more than \$500,000 a year in clerk hire alone. He has made it possible for every Members of Congress—of the Senate or of the House—to write a letter this morning and get an answer this afternoon. He has by his services won the gratitude of the country, not only by what he saved, but what he has done in expediting the public business. We all know what it is, and I think the House is ready to vote, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PARKER) there were—ayes 133, noes 31.

So the previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PARKER) there were—ayes 141, noes 30.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read amendment 29.

The Clerk read as follows:

Field, line, and staff officers of the Army below the grade of brigadier-general, with creditable records, who served during the civil war, who have heretofore been or may hereafter be retired, shall hereafter have the rank and retired pay of the next higher grade; and the Secretary of War may assign retired officers of the Army, with their consent, to active duty in recruiting, for service in connection with the organized militia in the several States and Territories upon the request of the governor thereof, as military attachés, upon courts-martial, courts of inquiry and boards, and to staff duties not involving service with troops; and such officers while so assigned shall receive the full pay and allowances of their respective grades, but no officer shall be entitled to the benefits of this provision who received any advancement of grade at the time of retirement or with a view to retirement.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] in order that he may offer an amendment to the Senate amendment. I do not want to yield the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 29, with an amendment as follows:

Strike out of said Senate amendment No. 29 the following:

"Field, line, and staff officers of the Army below the grade of brigadier-general, with creditable records, who served during the civil war, who have heretofore been or may hereafter be retired, shall hereafter have the rank and retired pay of the next higher grade."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That any officer of the Army below the grade of brigadier-general who served with credit as an officer or as an enlisted man in the regular or volunteer forces during the civil war prior to April 9, 1865, otherwise than as a cadet, and whose name is borne on the official registry of the Army, and who has heretofore been, or may hereafter be, retired on account of wounds or disability incident to the service, or on account of age, or after forty years' service, may, in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, be placed on the retired list of the Army with the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by him (or to which he was entitled by reason of seniority) at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to any officer who received an advance of grade at the time of retirement, or with a view to retirement, nor to any officer who received an advanced grade at the time or since the date of his retirement or who has been restored to the retired list by virtue of the provisions of a special act of Congress (nor to any officer who has received an advance of two or more grades since the beginning of the Spanish-American war)."

Also strike out of said Senate amendment No. 29 the following:

"But no officer shall be entitled to the benefits of this provision who received any advancement of grade at the time of retirement or with a view to retirement."

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands the gentleman, he moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which has just been reported.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. HULL. That is my understanding, Mr. Speaker. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania how much time he desires?

Mr. MAHON. Oh, four or five minutes.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a consensus of opinion in the House on both sides that these men who served in the Indian wars before the civil war, and who went through the great civil war for four long years, officers who were fighting men and who have been retired on account of disabilities, on account of wounds, or on account of old age, should, in their old age, be properly taken care of. This amendment provides that men now on the active list can not receive this retirement until they have served, like these old soldiers, for forty years. The trouble with the Senate amendment was this: That if we had agreed to it, men who had been in the service only a short time and had reached the rank of colonel could have been retired with the rank of brigadier. Now, to put them on the same footing with soldiers of the civil war officers must serve forty years before they can receive this advanced grade.

I am sure there is no Member of this House who will for one moment hesitate to give to these old officers of the Indian and civil wars, who have been retired on account of disabilities, who have been retired on account of wounds, on account of old age, this advance. I made an examination of the War Department and found that last year 17 per cent of these officers had crossed the great divide and gone into the other world. The best calculation is that 25 per cent of them will do likewise next year. Three years from now 40 per cent will have gone, and in five years from now there will not be 30 per cent of these old officers on the retired roll. I make this plea because I have served in the

ranks as a private with some of these officers. They are the men who helped to fight the great battles of our country, and I am sure if any recognition is to be given to any class of officers, it should be given to the men who fought the battles from 1861 to 1865. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to say anything more. I hope this amendment will be agreed to. It is perfectly fair, it is properly safeguarded, and will not cost this Government more than a few hundred thousand dollars each year.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just a word or two in addition to what I said the other day. Since our former report I have learned that the Senate has placed in the naval bill now a provision similar to this by which the marines are to be retired at one grade higher.

In 1898 in the personnel bill Congress gave to the Navy one grade higher for all civil-war veterans, and did not limit the rank in any particular. A man who was a captain was retired as a rear-admiral, and if a rear-admiral of junior grade he was retired as rear-admiral of senior grade. So that Congress gave to all the officers of the Navy who had had civil-war service a grade higher, regardless of their rank. This amendment provides that this advancement shall not apply to any officer above the grade of colonel.

The President of the United States in the last three years has taken largely the old colonels and made them brigadier-generals, and in many cases has taken the brigadier-generals and made them major-generals. He could not recognize the officers below the grade of colonel because they are by law promoted according to seniority. The result is that the old civil-war veterans affected by this bill are largely the men of low rank.

I have here a table showing something about what the Army has been doing since the civil war. I find that in the Indian wars since 1865 there have been 59 officers killed and 65 wounded, making a total of 124. In the war with Spain there have been 18 civil-war officers killed, 89 wounded, making a total of 107. In the Philippine war there have been 34 killed and 77 wounded, making a total of 111. And in China there have been 2 killed and 7 wounded, making a total of 9. In other words, since the civil war the old civil-war veterans have gone through enough war service to lose 113 officers killed and 233 wounded, making a total of 351.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the officers whom he has mentioned as having been killed in these recent wars had rendered civil-war service?

Mr. HULL. The officers named in this list are all men who had seen civil-war service.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And they were killed in war since the civil war?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir.

Of course these men who have been killed will receive no benefit from this bill. But I want simply to show that the Army has been doing arduous service and is entitled to as much recognition as the Navy and the Marine Corps. I say this without reflecting upon anybody. It is true, however, that the Navy has passed through these wars with better success than the Army in the way of losses since the close of the civil war. I am not finding fault. The Navy has rendered great service to the nation and added great glory to the American name. But they have done it at the expense of only one officer killed. In view of that record it does seem to me that this Congress ought to be willing to do equal justice to the officers of the Army who had civil-war service, especially in view of the fact that they are now mostly gone, and unless this recognition be now granted it will be useless in the near future, as the civil-war veterans will soon have all passed away.

If this had not been done for the Navy, and now proposed for the Marine Corps, there might be some argument against it.

Mr. WARNOCK. Does this amendment include all officers who were retired on account of wounds before 1865?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir; it covers anyone who had service in the civil war and is now on the retired list.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is no one else who desires to speak—

Mr. HAY. I ask the gentleman to yield me fifteen minutes.

Mr. HULL. I yield the gentleman ten minutes; and if necessary I will give him five more.

Mr. HAY. I do not expect to use all the time myself.

Mr. HULL. Very well; I yield the gentleman fifteen minutes.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa bases his argument principally upon the fact that this relief has been given to officers of the Navy and is proposed to be given by this Congress to officers of the Marine Corps. I understand that the Senate has placed such an amendment upon the naval appropriation bill for the benefit of the officers of the Marine Corps. The gentleman says that if this had not been done there would be some argument against this provision. Now, in my judgment, there is just as much argument against it as if this had not been done. Because

something has been done for one branch of the officers of the Army and Navy which ought not to have been done, that is no reason why we should now pursue a policy which is acknowledged to be wrong.

This matter has been thrashed out here on this floor over and over again, and the proposition has been repeatedly voted down. It was voted down a few days ago, and I do not see any reason why this should now prevail any more than it should have done the other day. I do not wish to consume the time of the House in talking about a question with which everybody is familiar. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose it will avail much, but, for my own satisfaction, I want to make my protest against this class of legislation. As I understand the amendment to the amendment, it proposes to retire men who have already been retired at one rank higher than that at which they were originally retired. In other words, if some time within the last twenty years a man was retired as a captain in the United States Army, it is proposed by this legislation to take him from the retired list and retire him over again with the pay and emoluments of a major. We not only propose to do that for all the officers on the retired list to-day, but for all the officers who go on the retired list in the future.

Now, the gentleman contends that there are precedents for doing this; that some years ago the Congress of the United States passed what was known as the "naval personnel bill," and provided for the retirement of naval officers at one grade higher than that which they occupied. I did not vote for that proposition myself, but at the time there was a reason given why it should be done. They said the Navy had been congested by reason of the number of men who had gone into it at the time of the civil war; that it had become congested so that an officer did not reach the command rank until he was ready to retire, and that in order to have efficient service in the Navy you should retire these old men who were captains and commanders, who were preventing the younger men from coming. For that reason, not as a gratuity to them, but for the efficiency of the service, it was claimed that we should retire them at a rank higher, and it was done.

And what has been the result? Why, a great many of the best men in the Navy have taken advantage of it. We have lost efficient officers, who have retired from the Navy and gone into private service, where they got more pay; and the complaint of the Navy Department ever since then has been that we needed more men and that we must have more cadets; that we are short of officers.

Now it is proposed to do the same thing with the Army, to put a premium on the retirement of men from the Army whom the United States Government has spent its money to educate and make officers. The precedent does not apply to men who are already retired. When we passed this retirement bill for the Navy it applied to men who were then in the service, but this bill proposes to make it apply to men in the service and men who are out of the service. Now, what good reason can you give why you should go into the Treasury of the United States and take the public funds and give them to gentlemen who have no connection with the United States Government; who retired years ago under the contract of service that they had previously made with the United States Government? These men who are on the retired list entered the Army under a certain contract. They knew when they entered the service that they had a right to retire on three-fourths of the pay of the rank that they had attained at the time of retirement for age or on account of disabilities. That was the contract they made. They reached the time of retirement. They were retired under that contract. They have gone into private life. The Government of the United States no longer expects to avail itself of their services. And what reason is there for this proposition? It is not a pension. If it were a pension, they could have their claims considered before the Pension Department. This in no way relates to the pensioning of soldiers; it is merely an effort to increase the pay of certain officers of the Army now retired or to be retired in the future.

Now, why should you go back into the past and drag back into the service these men who have retired, who have closed their contract with the United States Government, just because you think they are good fellows or that they did valiant service for the United States at some time in the past? You give them this additional pay without knowing any particular reason why they should have it. Possibly many of the men who are on this list are men who have large incomes, men whose incomes amount today to more than the income of a Congressman of the United States, many of them; and yet by this law you go into the Federal Treasury and take the people's money and give it to them as a gratuity. I say there is no reason or right for the passage of this bill, and it ought to be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I very reluctantly rise for the purpose of opposing an amendment which has been put onto this bill as an act of grace toward men who rendered brave and efficient service to their country. I would not do it at all if I did not believe that it was my duty to interpose every possible obstacle to an increase of the expenditures of this Government, expenditures the advantages of which are not shared in by the great mass of the taxpayers of the country.

These gentlemen whom it is proposed to benefit, a great many of whom I have the honor of knowing personally and with whom I have exceedingly pleasant personal relations, have already been retired at a rate of pay which is greatly in excess of the average income of the average American, however prosperous he may have been. It adds to the annual expenditure of the Government a quarter of a million of dollars, more or less. It undertakes to increase the compensation of people who are already enjoying a fair income.

In many instances these gentlemen have urged as a reason for this legislation that they were improperly retired; that they did not receive the promotion which they had deserved, and that their services have not been properly recognized nor adequately compensated. If that is true, it is unfortunate, but it is a condition of affairs which can not be corrected by this House at this time, and certainly not in this way. I hope that gentlemen who are going to vote upon this amendment will at least give a moment's consideration to the people who will be compelled to pay these bills. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Virginia the balance of my time.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, common justice to the old veterans demands that this bill should pass. The men who have stood by the old flag not only during the civil war but since that should be recognized in this very reasonable and patriotic manner. The question of the expense or increase of taxation should have no weight whatever, even with the gentlemen who are opposing this measure. They are now old men, men who have given the best years of their lives to the defense of their country; and in justice to these men who served in the Army they should receive the recognition that has been given to the officers in the Navy. [Applause.] I hope, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that this bill as amended will pass not only by a good majority, but by a unanimous vote in this House. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. HULL. I move the previous question upon the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HULL. I demand a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 121, nays 75.

So the motion to recede and concur with an amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 49: For continuing the construction of a military wagon road from Valdez by the most practical route to Fort Egbert or Eagle, on the Yukon River, in the district of Alaska, \$250,000; said wagon road to be surveyed, located, and constructed by and under the direction of the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to further insist on the disagreement?

Mr. HULL. I was going to move that, and the gentleman from Washington desires to move to concur. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment numbered 49.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment just read.

Mr. HULL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. CUSHMAN. About five minutes.

Mr. HULL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the matter now before the House, and which I trust the House will agree to, is the adoption of Senate amendment No. 49 to the military appropriation bill. That amendment reads as follows:

For continuing the construction of a military wagon road from Valdez by the most practicable route to Fort Egbert or Eagle, on the Yukon River, in

the district of Alaska, \$250,000; said wagon road to be surveyed, located, and constructed by and under the direction of the Secretary of War.

This is the amendment which the Senate added to the military appropriation bill when we sent that measure from the House to the Senate. This is the same proposed amendment which we had up for discussion three days ago on this floor, and I now wish to add to and emphasize what I then said in urging this House to recede from its disagreement with the Senate in regard to this item and agree to the Senate amendment.

This amendment proposes to appropriate \$250,000 for continuing the construction of a military wagon road from Valdez, on the coast, to Eagle City, in the interior of Alaska. We had up for discussion on this floor on yesterday a bill which, if enacted into law, will give the people of Alaska a Delegate on this floor to speak for them and represent their interests. I call attention to this matter now in order to bring plainly and forcibly before your minds the wisdom of Alaska having a Delegate on this floor. If we had a Delegate from Alaska on this floor now he could speak with both wisdom and authority on this proposed road appropriation which we are now considering. We are about to vote on a matter involving a quarter of a million of dollars, and yet there is no one on this floor properly authorized to speak for and on behalf of the region most vitally interested. But that is all I will now say on the need for a Delegate, and will address myself for a moment or two directly to this proposed amendment.

As Alaska has no Delegate on this floor I want to raise my voice in defense of this proposed appropriation, because I say to you that I think this is one of the most meritorious propositions that has ever been presented to this House for consideration. Three days ago this House voted against this proposed amendment by refusing to recede and concur with the Senate in this amendment. I do not mean to be offensive when I say that that prior vote of this House by which we refused to agree to this amendment was one of the worst and most indefensible votes I ever saw in this House. Let me explain this matter very, very briefly.

In the first place, this proposed wagon road is to be a military wagon road. It is for the purpose of transporting our soldiers and supplies from the coast of Alaska into the interior. To-day we have no way of getting our soldiers into the interior of Alaska except to take them across and through the territory of a foreign government—Canadian territory. Of course, in time of peace and tranquillity we can transport our soldiers through foreign country without trouble; but when we are at peace we don't need to transport soldiers to any great extent, and when we are in the midst of military trouble we would not be allowed to transport them through foreign country. In other words, when we don't need these facilities we can have them, and when we do need them we can't get them. It is the old story of the man who did not mend the roof of his house when it wasn't raining because he didn't need to. And he didn't mend the roof when it was raining because he couldn't work in the rain.

Now, then, I want to say first in as emphatic a way as I can that I am supporting this proposition first and foremost because it is to be a military wagon road, and I think there is a military necessity for its construction. We have American troops in Alaska now, and the prospect is that for many years to come we will have a greater or less number of soldiers in that Territory. This is the natural highway over which to transport soldiers and supplies from the coast to the interior. It is over this same route that the Government now transports every year both soldiers and supplies with great trouble, difficulty, and expense over a little insignificant, narrow trail. This proposed amendment if adopted will appropriate the money to make a decent wagon road out of that miserable little trail.

Now, then, having said this much from the military standpoint, I want to say there are other reasons, not military, that impel me to vote for this proposition; and I trust that no man on this floor, after he is convinced that this road ought to be built for military reasons, will then change his mind because other good reasons also exist. [Great confusion in the House.]

Mr. Speaker, I trust I am not disturbing the general conversation in the House by these remarks, because, if I am, I can quit. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. CUSHMAN. After the committee of United States Senators visited Alaska and made their report on conditions therein they said the greatest need of Alaska was for roads. They stated a startling fact when they said there was not a foot of roadway in Alaska over which a wagon or wheeled vehicle could be hauled. They said that the greatest need of that region in its proper development was the building of good roads. Now, I stated on this floor the other day, and it is a fact, that the prices of all kinds of goods and supplies in Alaska, especially in the interior, are greatly increased to the miner and settler by reason of the fact that there are no adequate transportation facilities.

Not only are prices in Alaska very high, but they are even

higher than prices usually are in a new and far-away country. Prices on the American side are much higher than they are on the Canadian side of the international boundary line at points not many miles apart. This is because they have good roads in the Canadian territory and we have not on the American side. And I want to state in this connection that these good roads on the Canadian side were built and are being built to-day by the Canadian government. We pride ourselves as a nation on the way we look after American interests. And as a general thing we usually do, but it seems to me we have made a startling exception in the case of Alaska. On this proposition I want to quote from the report of the Senate committee who visited Alaska. Speaking of road building, they say:

The action of the Dominion government has been a marked contrast to the inaction of the United States. Prior to 1896 and 1897 there was practically no settlement in the region of the Klondike and no development of its resources, but as soon as gold was discovered and miners from various sections swarmed in to seek their fortune the government immediately began the construction of roads leading from Dawson to the camps. During the last five years it has expended \$750,000 in that work. This sum is the first cost of 850 miles of wagon roads and winter trails. They now have 225 miles of thoroughly built roadways, over which the heaviest freighting is done, coaches are run, machinery of such weight and dimensions as to require the use of from six to twelve horses is brought in.

Owing to the newness of the roads and the heavy traffic upon them, the government has been obliged to spend \$50,000 annually in their maintenance and improvement. Up to this time the combined cost and maintenance of these roads has required an investment of \$1,025,000. The committee when at Dawson were taken out to view the mining operations in that vicinity, and besides visiting a large number of plants and witnessing the operations there carried on were driven a distance of more than 40 miles in a coach drawn by six horses. The roadbeds were hard and smooth, as good as would be found in almost any section of the United States.

When a settlement is started that has promise of permanency it is the custom of the Canadian authorities to send out engineers to investigate conditions, and upon their report the local government determines when and where roads shall be established and presents estimates therefor. The Dominion government makes the necessary appropriations of money and the road is at once constructed. The result of this system has more than justified the expenditure required. To in part meet this expense a system of taxation has been adopted in which a license fee from miners and an export duty upon gold are features.

In contrast with this, attention is called to the conditions in the Fortymile district, just across the line in American territory. Eagle should be the base of supplies for this entire district as well as for the headwaters of the Tanana, but not a rod of wagon road has been provided for by the Government. In the absence of such wagon roads the American population makes its purchases in Dawson. The goods are floated down the Yukon to the mouth of the Fortymile, then poled or lined up that stream as far as possible, and carried on pack animals the remaining distance. In winter they are brought on Canadian roads to the boundary line and drawn by dogs the remaining distance.

The results are indicated by the fact that in 1902, when the Canadian Yukon miner could have flour delivered to him at \$3 per 100 pounds, the American miner at Chicken Creek had to pay \$32. In the summer of 1903, when he was paying \$7.50 for his flour, his American friend was paying \$18. The difference in the price of ham and bacon in the two places was nearly 25 cents per pound. The price of condensed cream was doubled to the American; the same was true of onions, while the price of potatoes was three times as great to the American. What is true of this district is equally true of the Copper River Valley, the Tanana, the Koyukuk, and other gold fields before mentioned.

The committee are strongly of the opinion that a great obligation rests upon the Government of the United States to adopt a system of wagon roads for the relief of miners in the American territory, and that as a basis for such a system a well-constructed wagon road should connect the waters of the Pacific at Valdez with those of the Yukon River at Eagle, the length of which to be about 400 miles. This should follow the general lines of the military trail constructed, under direction of the War Department, by Captain Abercrombie, in 1899 and 1900, along which trail there has since been constructed and put into operation a military telegraph line. Valdez is the most northerly harbor in the Pacific Ocean. It is in all essential particulars the finest harbor on the coast, being open and free from ice throughout the year, and is the natural gateway to the interior. It is the key to the Copper River country, the upper Tanana, and the Fortymile district, and to their future development. The time has now come when the construction of a wagon road over this route is imperatively demanded.

You will observe from the reading of the foregoing statement that in Canada the government builds the roads and pays for the roads in part at least by a system of taxation levied on those who live in the region. On the American side we levy the taxes on them all right and take the money out of them, but we don't give it back to them in the construction of roads. Last year, in the year 1903, we collected from the people of Alaska in license fees alone the sum of \$73,398.98, and for the entire period since we have been collecting license fees in Alaska we have collected from them the stupendous sum of \$433,446.56 (down to and including the year 1903). That is almost a half a million of dollars. I think we should spend some of this money in building roads in that Territory. And let me remind you that in so doing we are not only helping them, but we are increasing the value of our own property by so doing.

I was somewhat surprised the other day in the course of this debate to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] and others assert that there was some kind of veiled proposition concealed in this amendment whereby the men who owned or had an interest in the copper mines in the interior desired to have this roadway built for the benefit of their copper properties. On the contrary, exactly the reverse is true. This roadway will not only benefit the Government in the transportation of our military supplies, but it will benefit the miner and the prospector. I was at Valdez, Alaska, last fall, and I talked with one of the men who owned or

had an interest in the large copper properties in the interior. He said that from a personal and selfish standpoint he would rather this wagon road would not be built, because he hoped that his company would build a railroad in there, and if they did they would rather not have any wagon road built. That is the situation.

However, it is only fair that I should state that that gentleman did say from a broad and philanthropic standpoint that he would be willing to have the wagon road built for the general benefit of the country, although it would be to his interest and to his own personal benefit if it was not built. I hope upon reconsideration of this matter in this House that the House will recede and concur in the Senate amendment. We are now near the end of this session of Congress. We have not had a day in this House for the consideration of Alaskan matters. This probably will be the last opportunity we will get during this session of Congress to confer a distinct benefit upon the people of Alaska, and I for one hope that the House will recede and concur. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire five minutes?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have here for our immediate consideration a proposition to take \$250,000 of money out of the Treasury of the United States, out of the revenues of the United States, out of revenues belonging to the Government of the United States, to start—for that is what it will do—to start to build a road in Alaska 400 miles long.

Mr. CUSHMAN. That is exactly what the gentleman said, and he did not stutter when he said it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, I never stutter when I speak, and I generally say something when I do speak, unlike my friend. [Applause.] Now this is a beginning point—

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit an interruption?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I could not possibly deny my friend anything.

Mr. TAWNEY. You speak of this coming out of the revenues of the Government?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Are you aware of the fact that last year the Territory of Alaska paid into the Treasury of the United States \$329,000 more than the legitimate expenses of that Territory?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What of that? We must keep an army and naval vessels there all the time. Has not nearly every State in the Union paid in "infernal" revenues into the Treasury of the United States more than the cost of running those States, and yet the States did not get back the money they pay in by building roads, as any gentleman knows? [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. They do in the river and harbor bills and Government buildings.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is entirely another proposition. Almighty God made the rivers, and Congress did not and Congress will not, and here you are undertaking to inject into the American system the building of a wagon road—not building a national road, not building a military road to carry arms or soldiers over, but, as the gentleman from Washington says, to build a wagon road. My God! Could you see some of the wagon roads in my country, I dare say some of the gentlemen sent here from their sweet homes in the far golden West would say that charity begins at home.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has not dared to go down into the rural portion of our country and spend money in building wagon roads.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CUSHMAN. The "gentleman from Washington" did not say "wagon road;" he said "military wagon road."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon; it may have been in one of his stuttering moments [laughter], but the gentleman said "wagon road." However, I will accept the apology. [Laughter.]

Mr. CUSHMAN. Now will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a moment?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why, Mr. Speaker, did not the gentleman say "cannon road?"

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a suggestion?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I want to remind the gentleman that there are only 700 soldiers up there, but this is an entering wedge contemplating the building of a military road.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, the gentleman from Indiana is the watchdog of the Treasury. I want to ask him how much it will cost before they get through with it. Why, Mr. Speaker, it will take all of the gold in Alaska to build this road, 400 miles long. Mr. Speaker, we had to abandon the Cumberland road,

that was started when we had no railroads and no telegraphs, but we had to do it to get east of the Mississippi. It was a "national" necessity. One hundred and thirty-two miles of that road cost about \$20,000 a mile, and we were obliged to give it up and surrender it to the States because of this expense and the keeping it in repair.

Now, where did the revenue come from to build that road? It came from the sale of the public lands, in consideration of which the different States wherein it was built agreed that these lands should be exempt from taxation for five years. Mr. Speaker, there might be no particular objection to this matter if it is built from funds derived from the sale of public lands in Alaska. We will give them the ice. They might send their ice down here to New York, where Chief Justice Parker and associates crushed the ice trust. [Applause.] We are going to put him in the White House, and he will crush the balance of the trusts of this country, which the Republicans will not do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House a few days ago on this proposition I endeavored to call the attention of the House to the conditions in Alaska with respect to the present and future development in that territory. In company with some friends last summer I visited southeastern Alaska, spending some time in the territory. Never was I so impressed with the absolute injustice inflicted upon any people under the sovereignty of the Government of the United States as I was with the injustice Congress is constantly inflicting upon the people of that territory.

In the last Congress we enacted a homestead law for Alaska, confining its benefits to citizens of the United States, upon whom we conferred the right to take up 320 acres of agricultural land. We did not at that time know, and if we did know we had no respect for the fact, that there are 5,000 intelligent natives in southeastern Alaska for whom we had no consideration whatever in enacting that legislation. As a result of our ignorance of the existence of these natives, their intelligence, industry, and loyalty to the United States, under that homestead law enacted by an American Congress we made no provision whatever for the protection of these natives in any right, property or otherwise. While at Wrangell the Reverend Mr. Corsair informed me of a case in that vicinity where a native Alaskan during his entire life had lived on a valuable piece of land. He was in possession of it when we purchased the territory from Russia. His father had lived there before him and his grandfather prior to that—it was his ancestral home—but under the homestead law which we passed, which the Congress of the United States enacted, that native was unable to obtain title to his home from the Government, and along came an American citizen and entered upon it and took his ancestral home away from him.

A native in Alaska can not own a mineral claim, however valuable. The only right he has in respect to it is the right to work for the benefit of some other man, to whom he may convey the information as to the location of it. He can not, under the beneficent laws of Congress, enter that land and take up that mineral claim in his own right. These people are not savages; they are civilized; they dress in citizen's clothes, and live in houses partitioned off for the accommodation of the different members of their families. They are not Indians; they are industrious; they support themselves; but in our legislation heretofore no consideration has been given to them whatever, although they have been self-sustaining, and have never cost the Government of the United States a cent.

I cite this, Mr. Speaker, only for the purpose of illustrating the fact that in dealing with Alaska legislation generally, and especially with respect to the question now before us, which is absolutely essential to the development of the interior of that great empire, we are absolutely ignorant of conditions, and should not be influenced by the arguments of men who know absolutely nothing about this territory or by the plea that this money comes out of the Treasury of the United States. That it comes out of the United States Treasury is true, but who put it there? Who put that money into the Treasury of the United States? The people of the territory in which this road is proposed to be built. A people who have no part or voice in their government, either local or national; whose every occupation is taxed by the Government, but who have no voice in appropriating these taxes for any purpose whatever. Now, this proposed road will extend from Valdez to Eagle City. Only 45 miles of it is at all difficult of construction.

Since addressing the House the other day I have obtained the following estimate from a civil engineer who is thoroughly acquainted with the conditions that will have to be met in building it. This estimate was made November 10, 1903, and is addressed to Mr. B. F. Millard, at Valdez, Alaska, a former citizen of Chipewa Falls, Wis., a man who has lived in Alaska for six years

and with whom I am personally and very well acquainted. It is as follows:

VALDEZ, ALASKA, November 10, 1903.

Mr. B. F. MILLARD, Valdez, Alaska.

DEAR SIR: Following you will find an approximate estimate of the cost of constructing the first 45 miles of a wagon road from Valdez to Stewart River:

Estimate of average mile.	
Clearing and grubbing.....	\$800
Grading 5,000 cubic yards, at 60 cents.....	3,000
Ballasting 800 cubic yards, at \$1.....	800
Bridging, culverts, etc.....	400
Total per mile.....	5,000
Total for 45 miles.....	225,000

The first section of the road (45 miles) covers the difficult country, beyond which the cost of construction can be much reduced, probably to \$2,000 per mile.

Yours, truly,

ALFRED B. LEWIS, Civil Engineer.

References: Locating and division engineer, Everett and Monte Cristo Railway; locating engineer, White Pass and Yukon Railway.

Communicate with E. C. Hawkins, Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; S. B. Fisher, chief engineer Missouri, Kansas, and Texas Railway, St. Louis, Mo.; John P. Heartman, Burk Block, Seattle, Wash.

I am informed by Mr. Millard, who is thoroughly acquainted with conditions there, that when you reach the end of that 45 miles you are over the summit of the Coast Range, and from that on the building of the road is comparatively inexpensive.

So much for the probable cost of the road. Let me present to the House a few words from the people of Valdez, who are speaking in respect to this matter from their own personal knowledge, in the form of a petition to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States. It is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: Whereas the Senate appointed a committee of that body to investigate the needs and resources of Alaska; and whereas the committee visited our city and while here expressed themselves favorable to Government aid to the construction of a wagon road from Valdez to the Yukon: Therefore, be it

Resolved, By the citizens of Valdez, through the chamber of commerce, that we set forth the needs of opening up transportation from this place to the interior.

Valdez is a landlocked harbor, open the year round, with sufficient water to anchor any vessel afloat.

The pass over the coast range is an easy one to construct a wagon or railroad over, being less than 3,000 feet above the sea. Wagons could be used over a road five months of the year, and trains could run every day of the year.

The Government has established a telegraph line from Valdez to the Yukon and on to St. Michael. It has also contracted for and the mails have been carried successfully for over four years from Valdez to Circle, and bids are asked for to carry the United States mail from this place to Fairbanks during the coming winter. This is the only land route for mail to the Yukon and Nome over American soil.

With a wagon road completed, the cost of maintaining mail and wire system from here to the Yukon could be reduced 75 per cent, besides having a road to transport troops and supplies through the country should the occasion arise to do so.

From 110 to 180 miles inland from Valdez there is the greatest mineral belt yet discovered, consisting of gold placer and quartz, copper in abundance, tin, and platinum. There have been over 600 mineral locations recorded at Valdez alone, and a large number placed on record at Eagle for the Tanana district. These claims are owned and held principally by poor men who have come into the country, facing the hardships and dangers of a new country for the purpose of bettering their position in life, and in doing so they are opening up a new and vast territory that will add millions to the wealth of the United States and her citizens.

The people of Alaska are good citizens and come from every walk of life—from the South, East, and West. There are thousands of acres of low-grade placer ground that under the present conditions can not be worked. Mines of gold, quartz, and copper can not be opened, the cost of transportation being too high. With a good wagon road, however, machinery could be transported to the mineral claims and the mines could be opened up and the low-grade placer ground worked. Farms would be opened and the country settled up with a hardy race of people. The Canadian government constructs roads for every mining camp, and the results are beneficial in the highest degree to her people, and we know of no reason why the Government of the United States should not help her struggling citizens in Alaska as well as those of her island possessions.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there are two or three things the House ought to realize. The first is that this is not a new enterprise. In the previous army appropriation bills of 1900 and later there have been carried different amounts which have already been used in commencing the construction of just such a road as provided by this amendment. There have been \$178,000 so far expended in building a trail which can be enlarged into this road. Surveys have been made. Some sort of estimates have already been made for the trail, for the road that has proceeded out of previous appropriations in just this kind of a bill, and it is only for the purpose of enlargement and caring for previous work already begun by previous acts of Congress. Now, again, it is true that Canada expects and does realize some revenue out of her territory and her industries that is expended on the road.

This bill can not be effective until the 1st of July. After that time \$250,000 can be expended if this provision shall be adopted.

The Committee on Territories can go to work at once. They can frame a law, if they see fit to do so, taxing the output of gold. They can tax the output of fish; they can tax the output of agricultural products, and with that pay for this road to be built under this act if it is deemed necessary to do so. It is in their power to do it, but the enactment of this law right now will enable this road to be built one year sooner and when it is so needed by the people of Alaska and by the military authorities of the United States.

This is a military necessity. There are at least 700 troops kept in Alaska. The War Department has already entered into contracts to and did last year transport our munitions and troops and supplies over Canadian territory. This thing ought to be stopped just as quick as the Congress of the United States can stop it. We ought to reach our own military posts there over our own territory. We ought to carry our supplies over our own territory. We ought not to trespass on foreign soil with our military or supplies.

I wish to speak of another thing. This road will save money to the Government. If it were built, the contractor who carries the mail reports that there will be saved to the Government \$29,000 a year on the mail contracts alone, and that there will be saved to the Government \$35,000 a year on the carriage of supplies and troops for the northern posts in Alaska.

There will be a saving of over \$64,000 a year by the construction of this road. This will pay a good interest on the investment alone, and you can compel the road itself to be paid for if you so enact.

Now, it is in the hands of Congress to tax the industries of Alaska to build this road if we want to do so. The people there can not do this work themselves. You have not given them the power to do it or to impose taxation on themselves for the purpose of accomplishing it. They have not the power to enable them to raise the taxes for this work and thereby save this money to the Treasury. You can pay them what you owe them now. You can help them to help themselves, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Washington will be adopted.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I want to occupy a few minutes now, in addition to what I used the other day when this matter was up, in calling the attention of the House to the situation as it really is. The gentlemen who have addressed the House have talked from a sentimental standpoint and appealed for sympathy for the Alaskans, and I am willing to agree with them on almost their entire argument. But we have here a proposition to commence the expenditure of a large sum of money—because there is no pretense that this sum of \$250,000 will be any more than a commencement—without going into the question of what it will ultimately cost to build this road.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] has read some figures here furnished by some one who, he says, is competent to make estimates. But, Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States has officers whose duty it is to submit estimates for great public works like this, and we have had nothing submitted to Congress by any officer of the United States authorized to submit estimates of what it will cost to build this road.

The proposed route is 410 miles long. It crosses a lofty range of mountains. In my judgment the estimate quoted by the gentleman from Minnesota shows that the man who made it is not competent to make such estimates, because he claimed that we can cross that range of mountains and build a wagon road for \$5,000 a mile. In my judgment that estimate alone destroys all the value that the estimate of such a man might otherwise have.

Mr. TAWNEY. That estimate was made upon the basis of using the present road which the Government has already constructed—merely widening the trail which the Government has already made.

Mr. HULL. In taking out the rock alone for the railway from Skagway to the summit of White Pass nearly \$100,000 a mile was expended. They had to let men down from the top to drill holes in the rock and fix the charge, and then bring them up and discharge the blast by electrical appliances.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman compare the work proposed here with that done at White Pass?

Mr. HULL. There can not be so great a difference as this estimate would imply. There is a range of mountains to be crossed. The gentleman says that when we have gotten over the mountains it will be easy to build the other 480 miles of the road; yet the testimony submitted to the conferees by the Senate Committee on Territories and by the senior Senator from the State which the gentleman represents was to the effect that after you go over those mountains you strike a boggy country; that you must take from the top of this road from 8 or 10 inches to 2 feet of soil before they can begin the work of macadamizing.

Mr. TAWNEY. What the gentleman speaks of is moss.

Mr. HULL. They do not call it moss out there. It is a boggy

surface which a horse sinks into. The trail that the Government uses is simply over the mountains; it is only used in winter. From there on supplies are taken in by dog sleds during the winter. Your road will be utterly worthless unless you remove this boggy deposit on the surface of the ground, so as to bring the macadam above the surface. I am not opposed to building roads through Alaska. I am not opposed to improvements for that Territory, but it seems to me that this House, if it has any regard for the interests of the Government, will not enter upon this system of improvements until we have some authoritative statement from the proper officers of the Government as to what we should do and what it will cost. That is all.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no great, crying necessity for this work, because the Government of the United States has taken no steps to call the attention of Congress to it. To call it a military road is an absurdity. If it were necessary from a military standpoint, the statements of officers of the Government would have been submitted to us in the form of estimates, asking for the construction of this road. On the contrary, the officers of the Government who were competent to make estimates claim that this road, if built, would be practically useless for the benefit of the Government—in other words, that a team starting from Valdez for Eagle City would be able to carry only enough forage with it to feed the six mules on the trip, and it is doubtful if it could haul that much. Any soldier who is taken in there now is taken in by water in the summer. If you build this road every soldier will still be taken in by water and brought out by water. The supplies of the Government are taken in by water and brought out by water.

There is a proposition—as the company is already organized—to build a railroad from Valdez to Eagle City. Private capital, private enterprise, can build this road, and it will be profitable. This wagon road, in my judgment, is utterly worthless. But if the time comes when the Government of the United States, through its proper officers, shall submit estimates to Congress and give reasons why this road should be built, I will cheerfully join with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] in voting an appropriation; but I do protest against this great enterprise, which in my judgment will cost more than \$4,000,000, being inserted in an appropriation bill and forced down the throat of Congress without any information.

Mr. PALMER. Your bill carries \$361,000 to build a submarine cable from Sitka to Fort Liscum, does it not?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. And that provision went out on a point of order in the House as being new legislation?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. And it was put back in the Senate?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. And you have now agreed to that, have you not?

Mr. HULL. We have.

Mr. PALMER. Do you not think there would be more sense in appropriating \$250,000 to build a wagon road than there is in appropriating \$361,000 to build a submarine cable?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania I want to say to him that that submarine cable was estimated for by the Government; the amount that it would require to finish it was stated in the estimate. It was in continuation of a work in progress. It is the last connecting link between the system of communication by telegraph and cable with all the Alaskan points, and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, after he had further investigated it, said that if he had been convinced that this was to continue a work in progress he would have ruled differently on the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman state the purpose of this submarine cable?

Mr. HULL. It is to keep in close touch with every fort that we have in Alaska.

Mr. TAWNEY. How many soldiers are there there?

Mr. PALMER. How many does that reach?

Mr. HULL. About 700, and they are scattered in different parts of the Territory.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

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

Mr. TAWNEY and Mr. CUSHMAN demanded a division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 56, noes 70.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 87, nays 133, answered "present" 8, not voting 153, as follows:

YEAS—87.

Adams, Wis.	Douglas,	Humphreys, Miss.	Olmsted,
Aiken,	Dunwell,	Jenkins,	Otis,
Bell, Cal.	Dwight,	Jones, Wash.	Palmer,
Benny,	Esch,	Kyle,	Ryan,
Bonynge,	Finley,	Lafean,	Scott,
Bradley,	Fordney,	Lilley,	Sherley,
Breezeale,	Foster, Vt.	Lind,	Sibley,
Brick,	French,	Lindsay,	Smith, Ill.
Brooks,	Fuller,	Littlefield,	Smith, Pa.
Brown, Pa.	Gibson,	Lloyd,	Southard,
Brown, Wis.	Goulden,	Lucking,	Spight,
Burke,	Granger,	McLachlan,	Steenerson,
Castor,	Greene,	McMorrin,	Stevens, Minn.
Cochran, Mo.	Hamilton,	Marsh,	Sullivan, N. Y.
Cromer,	Haskins,	Marshall,	Tawney,
Crumpacker,	Haugen,	Martin,	Van Duzer,
Currier,	Hermann,	Maynard,	Volstead,
Cushman,	Hill, Conn.	Morgan,	Watson,
Daniels,	Hogg,	Morrell,	Williams, Miss.
Davidson,	Howell, Utah	Murdock,	Williamson,
Davis, Minn.	Hughes, N. J.	Needham,	Woodyard.
Dixon,	Humphrey, Wash.	Nevin,	

NAYS—133.

Allen,	Gardner, N. J.	Lamb,	Rucker,
Ames,	Garner,	Lanning,	Russell,
Bartholdt,	Gillespie,	Littauer,	Sheppard,
Bates,	Gillet, N. Y.	Little,	Sims,
Beall, Tex.	Gillett, Cal.	Loud,	Slayden,
Birdsall,	Glass,	McCall,	Small,
Bishop,	Gregg,	McLain,	Smith, Ky.
Bowers,	Grosvenor,	Macon,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bowersock,	Gudger,	Maddox,	Smith, Tex.
Brundidge,	Hamlin,	Mahon,	Snook,
Burgess,	Hardwick,	Mann,	Sparkman,
Burkett,	Hay,	Moon, Tenn.	Sperry,
Burleson,	Hemenway,	Otjen,	Stafford,
Butler, Pa.	Henry, Conn.	Padgett,	Stephens, Tex.
Byrd,	Henry, Tex.	Page,	Sterling,
Caldwell,	Hitchcock,	Payne,	Sullivan, Mass.
Campbell,	Hitt,	Perkins,	Swanson,
Candler,	Hopkins,	Pierce,	Thayer,
Cassingham,	Houston,	Pinckney,	Thomas, N. C.
Clark,	Howell, N. J.	Porter,	Tirrell,
Clayton,	Huff,	Pou,	Trimble,
Cooper, Pa.	Hughes, W. Va.	Powers, Me.	Underwood,
Cousins,	Hull,	Powers, Mass.	Van Voorhis,
Dalzell,	James,	Prince,	Wade,
De Armond,	Johnson,	Pujo,	Wadsworth,
Denny,	Kehoe,	Rainey,	Wallace,
Dinsmore,	Keliher,	Randell, Tex.	Warnock,
Dovener,	Ketcham,	Reeder,	Wiley, N. J.
Driscoll,	Kitchin, Claude	Reid,	Wynn,
Evans,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rider,	Young,
Field,	Kline,	Rixey,	Zenor.
Fitzgerald,	Klutz,	Robb,	
Fowler,	Lamar, Fla.	Robinson, Ark.	
Gaines, Tenn.	Lamar, Mo.	Robinson, Ind.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Adamson,	Goldfogle,	Miers, Ind.	Sherman,
Cassel,	Howard,	Richardson, Ala.	Smith, Samuel W.

NOT VOTING—153.

Acheson,	Dickerman,	Landis, Chas. B.	Rodenberg,
Adams, Pa.	Dougherty,	Landis, Frederick	Ruppert,
Alexander,	Draper,	Lawrence,	Scarborough,
Babcock,	Dresser,	Legare,	Scudder,
Badger,	Emerich,	Lester,	Shackelford,
Baker,	Fitzpatrick,	Lever,	Shiras,
Bankhead,	Flack,	Lewis,	Shober,
Bartlett,	Flood,	Livernash,	Shull,
Bassett,	Foss,	Livingston,	Slemp,
Bede,	Foster, Ill.	Longworth,	Smith, Iowa
Beidler,	Gaines, W. Va.	Lorimer,	Smith, N. Y.
Benton,	Garber,	Loudenslager,	Snapp,
Bingham,	Gardner, Mass.	Loving,	Southall,
Boutell,	Gardner, Mich.	McAndrews,	Southwick,
Bowie,	Gilbert,	McCarthy,	Spalding,
Brandegree,	Gillett, Mass.	McCleary, Minn.	Stanley,
Goebel,	Grantley,	McCleary, Pa.	Sulloway,
Broussard,	Gooch,	McDermott,	Sulzer,
Brownlow,	Graff,	McNary,	Talbott,
Buckman,	Griffith,	Mahoney,	Tate,
Burleigh,	Griggs,	Metcalf,	Taylor,
Burnett,	Harrison,	Meyer, La.	Thomas, Iowa
Burton,	Hearst,	Miller,	Townsend,
Butler, Mo.	Hedge,	Minor,	Vandiver,
Calderhead,	Hepburn,	Mondell,	Vreeland,
Capron,	Hildebrandt,	Moon, Pa.	Wachter,
Cockran, N. Y.	Hill, Miss.	Mudd,	Wanger,
CConnell,	Hinshaw,	Norris,	Warner,
Conner,	Holliday,	Overstreet,	Webb,
Cooper, Tex.	Hunt,	Parker,	Weems,
Cooper, Wis.	Hunter,	Patterson, N. C.	Weisse,
Cowherd,	Jackson, Md.	Patterson, Pa.	Wiley, Ala.
Crowley,	Jackson, Ohio	Patterson, Tenn.	Williams, Ill.
Curtis,	Jones, Va.	Pearre,	Wilson, Ill.
Darragh,	Kennedy,	Ransdell, La.	Wilson, N. Y.
Davey, La.	Kinkaid,	Rhea,	Wright.
Davis, Fla.	Knapp,	Richardson, Tenn.	
Dayton,	Knopi,	Roberts,	
Deemer,	Lacey,	Robertson, La.	

So the motion to recede and concur was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee.
 Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. MEERS of Indiana.
 Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. ADAMSON.
 Mr. LORIMER with Mr. MAHONEY.
 Mr. KNOPP with Mr. WEISSE.
 Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.
 Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.
 For the remainder of the session:
 Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. DICKERMAN.
 Mr. CASSEL with Mr. GOOCH.
 Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.
 Mr. HUNTER with Mr. RHEA.
 Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS with Mr. TATE.
 Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.
 Mr. DEEMER with Mr. SHULL.
 Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.
 For the remainder of the week:
 Mr. SNAPP with Mr. EMKRICH.
 Mr. SLEMP with Mr. FLOOD.
 For the 7th and 8th:
 Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. LEWIS.
 For this day:
 Mr. WACHTER with Mr. TALBOTT.
 Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts with Mr. BASSETT.
 Mr. WANGER with Mr. GILBERT.
 Mr. METCALF with Mr. BARTLETT.
 Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. BOWIE.
 Mr. THOMAS of Iowa with Mr. GARBER.
 Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. VANDIVER.
 Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. CROWLEY.
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. McNARY.
 Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. LIVERNASH.
 Mr. KNAPP with Mr. SULZER.
 Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. LIVINGSTON.
 Mr. CURTIS with Mr. COCKRAN of New York.
 Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.
 Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania with Mr. HULL of Mississippi.
 Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. SCUDDER.
 Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. COWHERD.
 Mr. FLACK with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. TAYLOR.
 Mr. GRAFF with Mr. GRIFFITH.
 Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. HEARST.
 Mr. HEDGE with Mr. LEGARE.
 Mr. GAINES of West Virginia with Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 Mr. DRESSER with Mr. DOUGHERTY.
 Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. LESTER.
 Mr. DRAPER with Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BADGER.
 Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BAKER.
 Mr. BEDE with Mr. BANKHEAD.
 Mr. BRANDEGEE with Mr. BRANTLEY.
 Mr. BUCKMAN with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.
 Mr. BURTON with Mr. BROUSSARD.
 Mr. CAPRON with Mr. BURNETT.
 Mr. CONNER with Mr. COOPER of Texas.
 Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. JONES of Virginia.
 Mr. HINSHAW with Mr. LEVER.
 Mr. KENNEDY with Mr. McDERMOTT.
 Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.
 Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. LOVERING with Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
 Mr. MILLER with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. SHOBER.
 Mr. PEARRE with Mr. SOUTHALL.
 Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. STANLEY.
 Mr. MINOR with Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana.
 Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. WEBB.
 Mr. VREELAND with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.
 Mr. WEEMS with Mr. WILSON of New York.
 Mr. WARNER with Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois.
 Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.
 On this vote:
 Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. LACEY with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my vote recorded.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?
 Mr. FLOOD. I was listening a part of the time. I do not know whether I was when my name was called.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.
 Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER] has voted?
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not voted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I voted "yea." I wish to withdraw my vote and vote "present," as I am paired with the gentleman from New Jersey.

The name of Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama was called, and he voted "present."

Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my vote recorded. I was present and did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana. I can not say that I was listening. My attention was attracted for a moment, and so I can not say that I was listening at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can not be recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do further insist upon its disagreement to this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read amendment numbered 50. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, after line 2, insert:
 "For locating and constructing a military trail, under the direction of the Secretary of War, by the shortest and most practicable route, between the Yukon River and Coldfoot, on the Koyukuk River, \$10,000."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move that the House do further insist upon its disagreement to this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House do further insist upon its disagreement to this amendment.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington moves that the House do recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is that the House do further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read amendment numbered 51. The Clerk read as follows:

After line 23 on page 23 insert the following:
 "The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to cause to be constructed across the Spokane River in the county of Spokane, in the State of Washington, at such point as may be most advantageous for the Government service at Fort Wright Military Reservation, a bridge, and may permit the use of such bridge by the city of Spokane for the maintenance of the water main, and may make such arrangements as may be deemed best with the city of Spokane and the county of Spokane for the maintenance of a good macadamized road to said bridge, and make such regulations and requirements as may be deemed fair and just for the use of said bridge by the people of Spokane and by any corporation or company. To carry into effect the foregoing provision the sum of \$90,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available until the title shall be acquired and vested in the United States to sufficient land to accommodate the terminal abutments and necessary approaches for said bridge and until jurisdiction over the same shall be duly conferred upon the Government of the United States."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do further insist upon its disagreement to amendment numbered 51.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to move that the House do recede and concur in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

Mr. HULL. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this matter I explained to the House the other day. The appropriation calls for an amount which was estimated for by the War Department as the cost of this bridge, and will no doubt cover the full cost of it. It will be a saving to the Government, because it will shorten the road between Spokane and the military post almost one-half of what it is now. The road is now very winding and hilly, a rather dangerous road because of the numerous railroad crossings and bridges along it, and they are in a deplorable condition, liable to fall down at almost any time, and there may be a great deal of delay and expense caused by this. The military-post site is one of the best and most suitable for the purposes in the United States.

The city itself has deeded to the Government 1,022 acres of land which is now estimated to be of the value of from \$250,000 to \$500,000. They have also given to the United States a free water right for ninety-nine years, which, on the basis of the sale of water to private individuals, is worth \$5,000 a year. That right alone is worth nearly \$500,000. The Government there has expended a little over \$342,000, just about one-half of what the people of that city have given to the Government. The Government officials recommended that the city pay half of the expense of this bridge, but under the conditions and circumstances which I have just set out I do not think they ought to have to do it.

I do not believe I will take the further time of the House in any further explanation, and, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to recede and concur, hoping that the chairman will feel justified in accepting this amendment.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recede and concur having been withdrawn, I ask for a vote on my motion to insist.

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has asked for a further conference, and I move that the House agree to the request of the Senate for a further conference on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House agree to the request of the Senate for a further conference. The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. HULL, Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, and Mr. HAY.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers the privileged report which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the House resolution No. 281, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report the following in lieu thereof:

"Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption hereof it shall be in order to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2259) entitled 'An act to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes;' and after two hours of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and pending amendments to its passage, without intervening motion or appeal: *Provided*, That amendments as to the date when said act shall take effect, changing the year therein mentioned, may be offered and considered as pending at the time the previous question becomes effective.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question on agreeing to the report of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, what is the time for discussion on each side?

The SPEAKER. After the previous question is ordered, twenty minutes on a side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman from Ohio think it would be better to have the twenty minutes' discussion now?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I think it would be better to take the regular course.

The question on ordering the previous question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSVENOR) there were—ayes 93, noes 69.

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule to bring before the House Senate bill 2259, an act to regulate shipping in the trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago. Under the existing navigation laws of the United States no foreign ship is allowed to trade between two ports of the United States. That is the law which has stood upon the statute books of the United States through all the Administrations from 1789 until now. When the Philippine Islands were acquired by the United States, and pending litigation growing out of whether or not the Constitution of its own force was extended to these islands, a law of Congress was passed, reported to the House from the Ways and Means Committee, in which certain language somewhat ambiguous was used. The language is found in the majority report on this bill: "That until July 1, 1904, the provisions of law restricting the vessels of the United States in the transportation of passengers, etc., shall not be in force in the Philippine Islands."

We are now rapidly approaching the end of that period, and on the 4th of July next, according to the opinion of many lawyers of the country, the time would come when the coastwise laws would go into effect and exclude from the traffic all foreign vessels. It is not deemed desirable by the majority of the committee that there should be an exclusive right to this traffic in American ships at this time; and so the bill provides that on the 1st day of July, 1905, the coastwise laws of the United States shall go into effect upon trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands.

Then there is another question, which I will not go into now, which relates to the law in regard to what is called "the inter-island trade." The inter-island trade in the Philippine Islands is carried on in an entirely different class of vessels from those that ply between the United States and the Philippine Islands. The provision in this bill is to provide that the regulation of that traffic—interisland, as it is called—shall be vested in the authority of the Philippine government, while the coastwise-trade laws of the United States shall go into effect on the 1st of July, 1905.

The question is on bringing this bill before the House. It will appear to any gentleman who will take the trouble to look into it that there is a variety of opinion as to what the law is to-day. Very many believe that the passage of no bill, no interference

now by Congress would cut off all application of coastwise laws on the 1st day of July. Very many others, and they have very strong support for the proposition, believe that on the 1st day of July next the coastwise laws of the United States will exclude from this trade all ships of the world except those carrying the American register. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding further I want to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as the forefront of my own remarks the bill which is the subject of this rule, and the report of the minority, so that the country may understand the nature and effect of the legislation sought to be put through in this unusual way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as stated. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Here is the bill (S. 2259):

An act (S. 2259) to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after July 1, 1900, no merchandise except supplies for the Army or Navy shall be transported by sea, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States. But this section shall not be construed to prohibit the sailing of any foreign vessel between any port of the United States and any port or place in the Philippine Archipelago: *Provided*, That no merchandise other than that imported in such vessel from some foreign port which has been specified on the manifest as for another port, and which shall not have been unloaded, shall be carried between a port of the United States and a port or place in the Philippine Archipelago.

SEC. 2. That on and after July 1, 1900, no foreign vessel shall transport passengers between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, either directly or by way of a foreign port, under a penalty of \$200 for each passenger so transported and landed.

SEC. 3. That sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not apply to the transportation of merchandise or passengers between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago. Until Congress shall have authorized the registry as vessels of the United States of vessels owned in the Philippine Archipelago the government of the Philippine Islands is hereby authorized to adopt, from time to time, and enforce regulations governing the transportation of merchandise and passengers between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago.

SEC. 4. That sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not apply to the voyage of a vessel between a port of the United States and a port or place in the Philippine Archipelago begun before July 1, 1900.

SEC. 5. That sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not apply to vessels owned by the United States.

SEC. 6. That on and after the passage of this act the same tonnage taxes shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all foreign vessels coming into the United States from the Philippine Archipelago which are required by law to be levied, collected, and paid upon vessels coming into the United States from foreign countries: *Provided, however*, That until July 1, 1900, the provisions of law restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from one port of the United States to another port of the United States shall not be applicable to foreign vessels engaging in trade between the Philippine Archipelago and the United States: *And provided further*, That the Philippine Commission shall be authorized and empowered to issue licenses to engage in lighterage or other exclusively harbor business to vessels or other craft actually engaged in such business at the date of the passage of this act, and to vessels or other craft built in the Philippine Islands or in the United States and owned by citizens of the United States or by inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

SEC. 7. That this act shall not be construed to impair or affect any privilege guaranteed to Spanish ships and merchandise by the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain signed at the city of Paris on December 10, 1898, and ratified April 11, 1899.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall, from time to time, issue regulations for the enforcement of this act, except as otherwise provided in section 3: *Provided*, That such of the navigation laws of the United States as are in force in the Philippine Archipelago in regard to vessels arriving in the Philippine Islands from the mainland territory and other insular possessions of the United States shall continue to be administered by the proper officials of the government of the Philippine Islands.

Here is the report of the minority, with further special supplementary views submitted by Mr. LUCKING, of Michigan, and the appendix supporting the views of the minority:

We, the minority of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, are compelled to dissent from the favorable report made by the majority upon S. 2259.

The majority adopt the Senate report upon this bill, which states that the object of the bill is contained in section 3, which exempts the interisland traffic from the application of the United States coastwise laws. This is a most misleading statement. If it were true, the bill would have confined its provisions to this exemption, and it would then have passed both Houses unanimously.

The main argument in this report is therefore based upon the need of doing what everybody is willing to agree to. Its chief purpose or effect is to cloud the real object of the bill. This object is to extend the American coastwise laws to the traffic in both directions between the Philippine Islands and the United States, thereby giving to American vessels absolute control of this business regardless of rates or consequences.

The notes on the bill by the Department of Commerce and Labor, published in the majority report, open with a warning because of their remoteness against creating the Philippines a great coasting district, as was done with Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. Their most definite statement shows that the second section of the bill, requiring all passengers to and from the Philippines to go in American vessels, would involve great hardship and inconvenience in its enforcement and would prevent passengers going at all by the Suez route, because there are "no American steamers except army transports." This same lack of American steamers via the Suez route makes it as impossible for freight as for passengers to take this route, and unless American steamers are to be put on via Suez, of which we have no guaranty, would absolutely destroy sea transportation between the Philippines and Atlantic ports.

These notes carry an implied doubt as to the whole bill, implied indorsement of the portion of the bill relating to freight traffic, and strong direct criticism of the portion relating to passenger traffic.

The closing paragraph of the majority report expresses a half-hearted belief that by July 1, 1905, when the bill is to take effect, American vessels will be able to conduct this business, and then throws cold water on this belief by adding that if extortion should be practiced, or if there should not be a sufficient supply of transportation, it will be an easy matter to extend the provisions of the bill to some future date. If this bill survives the majority report it will be because the House will not take time to study either.

OFFICIALS IN OPPOSITION.

The last annual report of the civil governor of the Philippine Islands, Governor Taft, stoutly urged the injustice to the Philippines of this proposed legislation, and recommended that it should not go into effect "for a period of at least five years from July 1, 1904." The Philippine Commission and the collector of customs for the Philippine Islands took similar ground in their reports.

We append hereto quotations from these recommendations and other official statements which may be hereinafter referred to.

The repeated declarations on behalf of this Government in guarantee of the open-door policy in the Philippines are in direct opposition to this legislation, and are well in the mind of Congress.

The late Secretary of War, Hon. Elihu Root, in a letter on the subject, published as Senate Document No. 94, inveighed earnestly against similar legislation applicable to the transportation of Government supplies, and expressed the opinion that the cost of freight would thereby be increased from 100 to 500 per cent. In a subsequent letter the same high authority said in effect that an increase in freight rates of 50 or even 100 per cent would be preferable to the legislation proposed. It is evident that the increase in freight for private parties would at least equal the increase in Government freight.

HEARING BEFORE SECRETARY TAFT.

The advocates of the proposed legislation were given an extended hearing by the Secretary of War, Hon. William H. Taft, which is published as Senate Document No. 182. In that hearing they utterly failed to make out their case, and Secretary Taft by numerous questions and direct assertions showed that he believed the passage of this bill would be ruinous to the Philippines. We quote the Secretary briefly to illustrate his view:

"The ratio now between the different countries for the import trade is \$5,000,000 for England and \$4,000,000 for the United States. I am sure if this law went into effect that might be reduced to one or two millions. (S. Doc. 182, p. 24.)

"Will it not necessarily destroy all business from the United States into the Philippine Islands? (Ibid., p. 12.)

"I confess it may be. I don't understand the ordinary motives that govern men and merchants, but why, if you increase the cost of taking goods from the United States to the Philippine Islands (meaning an increase to the extent involved in the bill), it won't destroy the import business from the United States to the Philippines, and why it will not transfer it necessarily to England and Germany, where the competition is very great as it is, I do not understand. (Ibid., p. 13.)

"If there was a difference produced by the application of the coastwise trading laws to the Philippine Islands, a difference in favor of the foreign trade with those islands as distinguished from United States trade in those islands, would it not necessarily follow that the trade would be thrown into the foreign countries? (Ibid., p. 23.)

At this same hearing, Mr. Brewster Cameron, who represents the American interests in the Philippine Islands, stated, page 16:

"If this bill passes and this additional price is put on American goods, it will mean the absolute destruction of the commercial interests of the United States with the Philippine Islands."

CONSUMERS THE CHIEF SUFFERERS.

Let it not be forgotten that the chief sufferers next to the Filipinos will be the American consumers of Philippine products. During the campaign following the acquisition of the Philippine Islands promises were made to the farmers from many stumps that one of the beneficent results to them would be cheaper binder twine. Since then, owing to the increase of price in raw material under our management of the Philippine Islands, the price of binder twine has doubled, and if this bill passes it will further increase in proportion to the increase in freight charges.

The first embarrassment of increased prices in the United States will fall upon the American manufacturers of Philippine products—chiefly hemp—but they will be more than human if they do not pass the burden along to the consumers. In a less degree, though in proportion to his dealings with the Philippines, the American manufacturer who sends his wares to the Philippines will suffer. And so with contractors for public works and other improvements in the Philippines and with all others concerned in Philippine-American enterprises.

HAWAII AND PORTO RICO AS EXAMPLES.

The extension of the coastwise laws to the Hawaiian Islands has been attended with much inconvenience and great increase in freight rates. A number of protests have on this account come to the War Department from Hawaiian interests. William O. Smith, representing Hawaiian sugar interests, in a letter to the Secretary of War, read at the hearing before the Secretary and published on page 14 of that hearing (S. Doc. 182), emphasizes the difficulties already experienced by Hawaiian interests, shows that if this bill should pass a number of the vessels now in the Hawaiian trade would be removed to the Philippine trade, and expresses this emphatic conclusion:

"It is safe to say that for the next few years the annual loss would be from one million to one million five hundred thousand dollars or more."

The Porto Ricans, to whom the coastwise laws have been extended, have recently memorialized Congress in opposition to the embargo thereby placed upon their trade. They say that these laws restricting them to American vessels entail great inconvenience, annoyance, and loss; that there are only two lines of steamers in the trade; that they are not prepared to meet the requirements of the trade; that they have a monopoly and therefore unreasonably high rates; that all efforts to overthrow the monopoly have proved fruitless, and that the lack of medical assistance on their vessels, such assistance not being required under the coastwise laws, endangers the lives of passengers.

If Porto Rico, so near to our shores and enjoying free trade with the United States, fares so badly as this, what will become of the Filipinos, 10,000 miles away and subjected to a tariff of 75 per cent of the Dingley rates?

The Philippines are in another class even from Porto Rico and Hawaii in their relation to the proposed legislation. Their very distance makes it absurd to embrace them in the coastwise trade. Vessels going to them via Suez have to coal at foreign ports, and this fact alone removes them from a fair application of the coastwise laws. Their situation prevents any check whatever upon the monopoly granted in the extension of the coastwise laws to them. In the coastwise laws as ordinarily applied there is competition with the railroads which acts as some check upon the steamships, and the railroads are subject to control through the Interstate Commerce Commission. In this

Philippine trade there is no possibility of competition, and in this bill there is no stipulation as to restriction or control of any character.

THE BILL LOOSELY DRAWN.

The looseness of the bill as reported is shown by the fact that no special provision was made in it for medical service. Further, its first section provides that merchandise between the United States and the Philippines shall not be carried in any vessel other than a United States vessel "directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage." Does this mean that Philippine products shipped by a foreign vessel to a foreign country can not thereafter be brought to the United States, and that United States products which may go by a foreign vessel to foreign countries can not thereafter be shipped to the Philippines? If so, this is the last nail in the coffin of any possible competition in trade either way between the Philippines and the United States. Section 2 places a similar restriction upon passenger transportation, making it debatable as to whether a passenger to or from the Philippines can go or come by a foreign port upon a foreign vessel. The language in these two sections should at least be changed so as to make it apply to passengers or merchandise in continuous transit.

CHARACTER OF THE TRADE.

Last year the trade from the Philippines to the United States amounted to about \$13,000,000; the trade from the United States to the Philippines to \$4,000,000. The imports came mainly to Atlantic ports; the exports went mainly from Pacific ports. The trade this way consists nearly altogether of hemp, which is a very bulky cargo. The trade the other way consists mainly of manufactured articles, which form a very compact cargo. It would take at least three times the tonnage to bring the imports that would be necessary to carry the exports. The trade in this direction is too small to employ regular lines; the trade in the other direction will not begin to furnish return cargoes for even the few vessels that come this way. The trade both ways amounts to so little that competition for it is out of the question, and combination under which a few ships will be set apart for it is the only possible result. And the trade can not be increased by the stifling process.

The trade is now conducted at very close rates by foreign tramp steamers. The Philippines are but one port in a chain of ports around the world. It is therefore utterly impossible for American vessels or for regular liners of any nationality to compete with tramps in a trade of the character or volume involved. In consequence American vessels have heretofore made no effort whatever to get into this trade. They will make no effort to get into it unless they can substitute combination for competition in conducting it.

As to available vessels to do the business, the advocates of the bill have positively claimed that they have them. They have even claimed that they have available four times the tonnage necessary. If this be true, we fail to see how the merchant marine will be materially benefited by the passage of the bill.

The opponents of the bill have contended with equal positiveness that there are not enough available American vessels to do the business in a way that will be satisfactory to the trade or at rates at which the trade can live.

The hearings before the House committee elaborate both sides of this question. The weight of evidence is stronger that there are enough American vessels to do the business in some fashion, but that there are not sufficient vessels to insure sailings of anything like the frequency or the rates that have obtained in the past.

A BACKWARD AND FORWARD GLANCE.

This legislation has been prematurely precipitated by a paragraph in section 3 of the Philippine tariff act of March 8, 1902, which was inserted by the Senate in conference and adopted by the House without debate and without knowledge on the part of the House of what it meant. This paragraph was based on the assumption or the presumption that under the Porto Rican decision by the Supreme Court in the *Huus* case the coastwise laws would automatically extend to the Philippines, and it therefore specified that these laws should not so extend "until July 1, 1904," leaving the inference that they should so extend after this date. The proposed legislation is designed to make this negative inference a positive fact, with the time extended, after a hard contest in the Senate, to July 1, 1905.

The ideal solution of the difficulty would be to repeal this unconsidered paragraph inserted in conference by the Senate and leave to the discretion of Congress the application of the coastwise laws to the Philippines, if such application should ever be deemed wise. If in the judgment of this House such action is too indefinite, then we submit that postponement should be provided, as recommended by the Philippine Commission, until July 1, 1909, so as to allow time for further reduction of the Philippine tariff, further increase in the volume of trade between the Philippines and the United States, and further growth of the merchant marine, to the end that American vessels may be able to do the business at reasonable rates and with reasonable satisfaction to the trade.

The majority insist that the Philippines are ours and that they are pursuing a policy of benevolent assimilation; that their party desires to improve their condition by promoting agriculture, by educating their children, increasing their trade, and advancing their prosperity. It will perhaps be conceded that this bill is professedly not in the interest of the Philippines or their trade, but in the interest of the shipowners. It will confine this trade to American vessels; that is, such trade as shall be left and not diverted to London and other foreign ports.

Why not, then, make it to the interest of the Philippines to trade with us? Why not remove the tariff barrier and make free the interchange of products? The inconsistency is apparent; the insincerity of the professions of the Republican party is laid bare. It demonstrates their desire and only purpose to retain these islands for exploitation and plunder—to take all and yield nothing. No matter how earnestly anxious anyone may be to aid our merchant marine, this bill involves too grave a sacrifice of common fairness and justice.

THO. SPIGHT.
JNO. H. SMALL.
ROBT. W. DAVIS.
ALLAN L. MCDERMOTT.
J. A. GOULDEN.
ALFRED LUCKING.

Mr. LUCKING, of the minority of the committee, concurring in the foregoing, desires to add the following:

NO LEGISLATION AT ALL IS NECESSARY AT THIS TIME—AS A MATTER OF LAW, COASTWISE ACT DOES NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1904.

Friends of this bill urge its passage on the ground that some legislation is necessary else the coastwise laws will become applicable to the Philippine trade (transoceanic and interisland) on July 1, 1904.

It is admitted that this would be a calamity, and so it is sought to coerce Members into passing this law which does affirmatively enact the obnoxious legislation, although none has heretofore passed.

It has been asserted and assumed that on July 1, 1904, the coastwise laws would go into effect, and it has passed current around the Capitol, but I have been unable to find the responsible author of any such opinion and a careful

examination of the question has convinced me that such opinion is without any foundation whatever.

The act of March 8, 1902, contained the following clause, which was not in the original act, but crept in as a Senate amendment, namely:

"Provided, however, That until July 1, 1904, the provisions of law restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise from one port of the United States to another port of the United States shall not be applicable to foreign vessels engaging in trade between the Philippine Archipelago and the United States or between ports in the Philippine Archipelago."

It is not contended, nor will it be contended by any lawyer, that this clause serves to put the coastwise laws into effect after July 1, 1904, but only to postpone such operation until that date, in case they otherwise would be in effect; nevertheless this language has served to create the impression that the laws would be operative after July 1, 1904.

It is said the above clause in the act of 1902 was inserted because a doubt was raised by certain language in the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Huus v. New York Steamship Company* (182 U. S., 332). The words said to create the doubt are:

"At the same time trade with that island is properly a part of the domestic trade of the country since the treaty of annexation and is so recognized by the Porto Rican or Foraker Act."

That case simply called for a decision of the question whether in 1901 a vessel coming into New York from Porto Rico was engaged in the coastwise trade under the statute of the State of New York relating to pilots. Held, that it was, since Congress in April, 1900, had already enacted that "the coasting trade between Porto Rico and the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the law applicable to two great coasting districts," etc., which is the technical language employed to apply the coastwise act.

No other question was before the court, and it is idle to assert that the fugitive expression above quoted lends any color to the idea that the coastwise laws went into effect automatically, since they had been put into effect by express act of Congress.

But if, standing alone, it could be said to raise a doubt, this doubt is dispelled (1) by the express decisions of the Supreme Court covering the question; (2) by the unbroken practice of this Government in the cases of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska, and (3) by a recent decision of the Attorney-General holding that the coastwise laws do not apply to Guam.

The coastwise law in question reads: "No merchandise shall be transported by water, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port of the United States to another port of the United States * * * in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States."

The sole question, then, is whether ports of the Philippine Islands are "ports of the United States" under this law, by virtue of the cession of the islands by Spain and without any legislation by Congress.

(1) This precise question is covered by the United States Supreme Court in the insular cases. They hold that the Philippine Islands are not part of the United States, although belonging to the United States, and that ports of the Philippines are not ports of the United States. We quote a few extracts from the opinion of Mr. Justice Brown, speaking for the court in *Downes v. Bidwell* (182 U. S., pp. 256, 278, 287).

"The very treaty with Spain under discussion in this case contains similar discriminative provisions, which are apparently irreconcilable with the Constitution, if that instrument be held to extend to these islands immediately upon their cession to the United States. By article 4 the United States agree 'for the term of ten years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, to admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States,' a privilege not extending to any other ports. It was a clear breach of the uniformity clause in question, and a manifest excess of authority on the part of the commissioners, if ports of the Philippine Islands be ports of the United States."

"In determining the meaning of the words of article 1, section 8, 'uniform throughout the United States,' we are bound to consider not only the provisions forbidding preference being given to the ports of one State over those of another (to which attention has already been called), but the other clauses declaring that no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State, and that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any imposts or duties upon imports or exports, nor any duty on tonnage. The object of all these was to protect the States which united in forming the Constitution from discriminations by Congress, which would operate unfairly or injuriously upon some States and not equally upon others. * * * Thus construed together the purpose is irresistible that the words 'throughout the United States' are indistinguishable from the words 'among or between the several States,' and that these prohibitions were intended to apply only to commerce between ports of the several States as they then existed or should thereafter be admitted to the Union."

"We are therefore of opinion that the island of Porto Rico is a territory appurtenant and belonging to the United States, but not a part of the United States within the revenue clauses of the Constitution."

(2) The unbroken practice of the executive department of this Government in the cases of Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico was not to treat any of their ports as ports of the United States under the coastwise law until Congress by special act in each case made such law operative, which was done as to Alaska in July, 1868, as to Hawaii April 30, 1900, and as to Porto Rico April 12, 1900.

(3) By a decision of Attorney-General Knox rendered March 10, 1904, it is held that the coastwise laws do not apply to the island of Guam, and that foreign vessels may engage in trade between the United States and Guam. As Guam was acquired under the same treaty and is relatively located precisely the same as the Philippines, this opinion may be said to be directly in point on the question here considered.

It is clear therefore that no Member should feel constrained to vote for this bill, as it is or as it may be amended, under the fear that if no law is passed the coastwise law will be effective July 1, 1904, and serious disaster follow.

ALFRED LUCKING.

APPENDIX.

[From the reports of Philippine officials.]

Governor Taft, in his report as civil governor of the Philippines, says:

"In respect to the trade between these islands and the United States, I concur fully in the remarks of Collector Shuster in his annual report, in which he says:

"At the present time the greater part of the freight traffic between the Philippines and New York is carried on in foreign bottoms. So far as indications go, any law which prevented the continuance of that trade in foreign bottoms until an equal tonnage of cheaply operated American freighters are actually available to take up that trade and maintain healthy rate competition would result in a decided increase over the present rates of freight. This additional burden would fall on the already weakened resources of these islands, and such a result would be more than lamentable from every standpoint. The tonnage plying between these islands and the Pacific coast is

about equal to the present freight supply, and no change in the present law seems desirable as far as trans-Pacific routes are concerned.

"It is therefore earnestly recommended that the present laws, so far as they permit foreign bottoms to trade between these islands and the mainland territory of the United States, be not changed for a period of at least five years from July 1, 1904, and that positive legislation to that effect be had by Congress at an early date."

The report of Mr. Shuster, the collector, to which Governor Taft refers, says:

"No course should be adopted which will place any additional burden in the way of freights on Philippine products, shipped either locally or to the mainland territory, for some years to come. For a similar reason no law should be passed which will appreciably increase the freight rates from the mainland to these islands. Cheap and adequate transportation between the mainland territory and these islands and between Philippine ports is vitally necessary to successful development here."

The report of the Philippine Commission contains the following statement:

"The operation of the coastwise-trade laws of the United States in respect to trade between the islands of the Philippine Archipelago and to trade between those islands and the mainland of the United States have been suspended by act of Congress until July 1, 1904. If Congress were to take no action and to allow the coastwise-navigation laws to become applicable to the interisland trade of these islands and to the trade between the islands and the United States, as they now are, most disastrous results would follow. It is earnestly recommended that the regulation of the coastwise trade, so far as it relates to the trade between the islands of the Philippine Archipelago, be left wholly to the discretion of the Philippine Commission, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War and the President of the United States, and that the trade between the islands and the mainland of the United States be continued as at present by suspending the application of the trading laws of the United States for five years longer, to wit, until July 1, 1909."

Then again, referring to the very bill that is before Congress, the report says:

"Since the above was written it has come to the knowledge of the Commission that a bill has been introduced in Congress applying the coastwise law to trade between the islands and the mainland of the United States. The danger from this of increasing the freight rates and thus imposing an additional burden upon the trade of the islands must be obvious to anyone who has examined the facts with respect to the percentage of the business now done between the islands and the mainland of the United States in American bottoms. The Commission of course can not present any objection to legislation which shall unite more closely the Philippine Islands with the United States in bonds of amity and mutual beneficial business relations, but it most urgently and earnestly invites your attention and that of Congress to the great injustice which will be done to the islands if the law which limits the means of communication to American bottoms between the United States and the Philippine Islands does not at the same time, and as a consideration for this interference with the natural laws of trade and the necessary increase of freight rates, strike down the tariff wall made by the Dingley tariff in the matter of the importation of sugar and tobacco from the islands to the mainland. The people of the islands may well ask, 'What advantage are we to get out of association with the United States in a business way if our trade is to be used only for the purpose of increasing the business of American ships, while the limitation of the coastwise laws by increasing the freight rates will reduce the business that we now have with that country.'"

PLEDGES OF THE OPEN-DOOR POLICY.

Under date of November 23, 1899, Secretary Hay, in referring to the treaty of peace in an official communication to the British ambassador, said:

"So far as the Philippines are concerned, the principle to be followed by the United States is expressed in annex 2 to protocol 16, of which your excellency doubtless has a copy."

"Annex 2 of protocol 16 is a statement made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States to the Spanish plenipotentiaries, preliminary to the signature of the treaty of Paris, in explanation of the provision of that treaty giving to Spanish ships and Spanish goods equal rights with American ships and American goods for a period of ten years. The language of this protocol referred to by Mr. Hay in his note to the British ambassador is as follows:

"The declaration that the policy of the United States in the Philippines will be that of an open door to the world's commerce necessarily implies that the offer to place Spanish vessels and merchandise on the same footing as American is not intended to be exclusive. But the offer to give Spain that privilege for a term of years is intended to secure it to her for a certain period by special treaty stipulation, whatever might be at any time the general policy of the United States."

"It is true that the language of this protocol expressly recognizes the power of the United States to change its general policy with regard to the Philippines at any time, but a change with regard to the Philippines can not be inconsistent so long as the State Department is strenuously insisting upon the general policy of maintaining the open door in the Orient."

In the annex to the preceding protocol, No. 15, are these words: "And it being the policy of the United States to maintain in the Philippines an open door to the world's commerce, the American commissioners are prepared to insert in the treaty now in contemplation a stipulation to the effect that for a term of years Spanish ships and merchandise shall be admitted into the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as American ships and merchandise."

Secretary Root's letter to Senator FRYE (S. Doc. 94):

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 14, 1904.

SIR: Referring to Senate bill 2263, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, in response to your request for suggestions touching the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage, I have the honor to transmit a report by the Quartermaster-General of the Army to the Secretary of War, dated December 26, 1903, a further report by the Quartermaster-General to the Secretary of War, dated January 9, 1904, in response to a request for detailed information, and a report from the same officer to the Secretary of War, dated January 13, 1904, in response to further specific requests for information.

The great bulk of freight shipped by the War Department to the Philippines goes upon the transports owned by the United States. The remainder goes chiefly in foreign bottoms, because the owners of foreign vessels uniformly underbid the owners of American vessels. Every opportunity has been given to American vessels to compete, and the standing instructions of the Department are to prefer American vessels wherever there is such substantial equality between the bids as to make it lawful to do so.

I have no doubt whatever of the wisdom of a provision which shall make it possible to do this business through the employment of American ships. I think, however, that there is great danger that the passage of this bill in its present form would involve the Government in serious difficulty and unwarranted expense. The number of American vessels available for shipment from the Atlantic coast to the Philippines is so small that a rigid requirement that shipments should be made in American vessels only would put the Government entirely at the mercy of a very few individuals, who could charge any price they wished. The only alternative to the possible

payment of exorbitant prices for shipments from New York to Manila would be sending the freight by rail to the Pacific coast and thence by ship to Manila.

Your committee will observe, by examining the Quartermaster-General's report of January 13, that the average cost of transporting all classes of freight from New York to Manila during the calendar year 1903 has been \$11.61 per ton of 2,000 pounds, while the average cost of transporting all classes of freight by rail from New York to San Francisco has been \$28.70 per ton of 2,000 pounds; that is to say, it now costs two and one-half times as much to get freight from New York to the Pacific coast as it now costs to get it from New York to Manila. Under these circumstances, if we were confined absolutely to American bottoms for this business we would have no way of escaping from the payment of at least three times as much as we now pay for this class of transportation.

I think the same result can be accomplished and this danger avoided by changing the form of the bill so that it will authorize a preference to American shipping, providing the charge made does not exceed the prices bid by the owners of foreign vessels more than a specific percentage.

A bill providing for such a preference in respect of shipments on the Pacific was introduced in the House in the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress (H. R. 1441). It was favorably reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs (Report No. 248). It had the warm approval of this Department, but was defeated on the floor of the House upon the avowed ground that it would amount to a kind of a ship subsidy. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 35, pt. 7, pp. 6887-6891.)

For greater convenience, I take the liberty of inclosing a copy of that bill as indicating the form of the provision which, it seems to me, would best accomplish the desired object of doing the Government business in such a way as to promote American shipping. I should be in favor of increasing the preference to, say, 25 or 30 per cent.

Very respectfully,

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE,
Chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

ELIHU ROOT, Secretary of War.

Secretary Root's second letter to Senator Frye:

"I am sorry you were dissatisfied with my letter about the bill limiting the transportation of Government stores to American vessels. I very much desire that business should be done by American vessels, and I have been for several years trying in various ways to get from Congress authority to prefer our own ships to foreign ships. It has seemed to me that the simplest and best way was to give our ships a preference. Two years ago I tried to get authority to give them a preference of 10 per cent, and the bill was beaten in the House. I said in my letter to you that I would be in favor of increasing the percentage to 25 or 30 per cent. I would be perfectly willing to see you go further than that and extend the limit of the preference to 50 or even 100 per cent if necessary, but I do not think that there ought to be an absolute prohibition imposed upon the officers of the Government when it is not imposed upon any of the rest of the business community.

"I have no objection to the business of the Government being subjected, in common with the business of the citizens of the United States generally, to the operation of a general policy such as embodied in the navigation laws regarding our coastwise trade. Such laws, wisely I think, make all American business tributary to American shipping, and the result is, naturally and necessarily, to induce an adequate supply of shipping to do the business. But a statute which limits Government freightage alone, separate and apart from the business of the community at large, to American shipping, under a hard and fast rule which prohibits to the managers of the Government business the same facilities and opportunities which are afforded to the rest of the community, will not be adequate to attract American ships and lead them to engage in the business of which the Government freight forms a small part. There is not enough Government business to justify any such expectations. The result of such a special provision would therefore naturally be either that the Government must pay whatever the casual American vessel chooses to ask or must operate its own transports on the Atlantic at great loss, or must ship all of its stores by way of the Pacific, imposing upon the material going from the Atlantic coast the very heavy railway charges across the continent. The result of such provisions, tying the hands of the Government officers, is not merely to cause greater expense in specific cases, but it is to dishearten the officers and lead them to feel that it is useless to try to conduct business economically.

"While I think that the best way to accomplish what the American shipowners and shipbuilders desire, and what I desire equally with them and with you, is to authorize the preference, stated in terms of a percentage, I do not mean to say that this is the only way. I think you could accomplish substantially the same thing by the present bill by adding at the end of section 2 a clause something like the following:

"That any head of a Department may suspend the operation of section 1 in regard to any particular contract for the transportation of such articles whenever, after due public advertisement, no bids for the transportation of the articles specified therein, in a vessel of the United States, shall have been received at rates which shall be deemed to be reasonable, in view of the policy of the Government to promote the employment of vessels of the United States for public purposes."

"Section 2, as it now stands, apparently contemplates the general suspension of section 1 under circumstances of special exigency such as to justify appeal to the President for the protection of the interests of the Government. I should think it would hardly justify going to the President in matters of detail, such as are constantly arising in letting contracts for transportation of comparatively small quantities of stores."

THE HAWAIIAN VIEWPOINT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 13, 1904.

SIR: Referring to our recent conversation relative to the bills now before Congress to extend the United States coastwise laws, I would state, on behalf of the commercial interests of Hawaii:

Should these laws be so extended it will have a very injurious effect upon the commercial interests of the Territory of Hawaii.

These laws were extended to Hawaii in 1900, and in spite of all the efforts which have been put forth to obtain suitable American ships to carry cargoes to the Atlantic ports, we have been unable to obtain sufficient tonnage for the current year. Of the 400,000 tons of sugar to be shipped, not less than 100,000 tons will have to be sent from San Francisco overland by rail at a cost double that by sail around the Horn.

The inclosed copies of correspondence with the San Francisco and New York branches of the house of Alexander & Baldwin (Limited), sugar factors of Honolulu, together with the accompanying lists furnished by them of all available American vessels suitable for the trade, will give the facts in that regard.

It should be borne in mind that ships suitable for carrying cargoes around the Cape have, of necessity, to be of great tonnage and strength. The smaller vessels plying between Hawaii and San Francisco would be unsuited for the purpose.

Should the laws be extended to the Philippines the inevitable result would follow of taking many, if not the greater part, of the deep-water fleet away from Hawaii, and compelling the shipments to be made, to a very large extent, by the very much more expensive overland method.

If, after four years' trial, and with the Hawaiian freight rates by sail being higher than from other foreign ports, as shown in the accompanying correspondence, available American ships are so greatly inadequate for the Hawaiian trade, it is manifest that sufficient time should be given before extending these laws to the Philippines or a great loss and hardship will result.

The 100,000 tons of cargo to be shipped by rail under present conditions will entail an additional cost of one-half a million dollars to Hawaii, and should the laws be extended to the Philippines it is safe to say that in the next few years the annual loss will be from one million to one million five hundred thousand dollars or more.

Thanking you for giving me the opportunity to submit these considerations to your attention, I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM O. SMITH.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

PROTEST FROM PORTO RICO.

The Ponce branch of the Porto Rico Chamber of Commerce, in the course of a memorial to Congress, says:

"By the declaration of free trade between Porto Rico and the United States there is no doubt that great advantages were derived, but at the same time it is unquestionable that some drawbacks also followed. One of the latter is that in order to enjoy the full benefits of the measure the products of the island must be shipped in American bottoms, which condition entails at times great inconvenience and annoyance, and in many cases considerable loss. At the present time, for instance, there are only two lines of steamers under the American flag carrying on the freight and passenger traffic between Porto Rico and the United States, and said lines, in addition to not being properly equipped with a sufficient number of boats to meet the requirements of the trade during the crop season, virtually exercise a monopoly, and consequently their rates of freight are unreasonably high.

"This condition of things handicaps the exporter, not only by the lack of adequate means of transportation and excessive rates, but by being put to considerable expense in the handling of his goods at New York, such as light-erage, wharfage, etc., because the said lines only receive and deliver freight at their own docks. The lines referred to have such an absolute control of the carrying trade of this island to the United States that all efforts to overthrow their monopoly have proved fruitless, for no sooner has any attempt been made to employ outside bottoms for this trade at reasonable rates than they cut theirs to such a ridiculously low figure as to shut out all competition, and after attaining their purpose resume the old rates.

"As regards the passenger traffic it may be mentioned that, owing to their trade being considered as coastwise, these steamers are not compelled to carry, under the law, a medical officer, and the lack of medical assistance, at a given moment, might seriously endanger the lives of those who have to travel by them on a voyage of the no mean distance of 1,400 miles."

REPORTS OF THE BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT.

The following quotations show some of the difficulties experienced in getting convenient service at reasonable rates in the regular coastwise trade.

From report of 1898, page 270:

"The Department was still in desperate straits for transportation of coal, and the only alternative was to purchase steamers, arm, and man them with the naval forces. There were but few vessels in this country suitable for the transportation of coal and available for immediate use. When these were found, their owners knew well the necessities of the Government and generally demanded exorbitant prices."

From page 41 of the report of 1901:

"At present, owing to the scarcity of American freight vessels, the best screened admiralty Cardiff coal can be laid down at Mare Island, duty paid, for considerably less than American coal mined on the Atlantic coast, although the latter at tide water costs about half as much as the former. With the exception of an occasional steamer which is built on the Atlantic coast for use on the Pacific, no steam coal freight from the Atlantic to the Pacific is offered to the Bureau."

From the report of 1902, page 50:

"The freight on coal from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific ports remains at a high figure. Cardiff coal can be purchased at San Francisco, duty paid, at considerably less than coal can be shipped from the Atlantic coast. But few American vessels are offered for coal freight."

Admiral Converse, Chief of the Bureau of Equipment, in testifying before the Naval Committee of the House, January 12, 1904 (p. 229 of hearings before that committee), said:

"Cardiff coal is stored on the Pacific coast. The freight rates have been so high that we have not been able to send coal from the Atlantic coast."

Again he said (p. 231 of the same hearings):

"The Bureau recently wished to replenish the supply of coal at Honolulu. But one offer was received from an American vessel, and the freight to Honolulu was \$8 per ton. From Lamberts Point, about the same time, the Bureau chartered an English vessel to carry out coal to Yokohama from the same port for \$5.13 per ton, and bought Cardiff coal to be laid down at Honolulu for \$7.95 per ton."

He further said (p. 234):

"While I much prefer to see American coal carried in American ships, I do not believe that the American ships available are sufficient to meet the demands of the Navy Department. I do not think the Navy Department should be the one to pay all the subsidy for building up the American merchant marine, and I do not think the Bureau of Equipment should have to increase its estimates for coal transportation beyond a reasonable amount simply to carry coal in American ships. It is my opinion, therefore, as previously stated, that there should be a means provided for carrying American coal in any vessel, giving preference to American bottoms whenever they can be obtained at a reasonable advance over the price offered by foreign ships, said advance to be limited by a certain percentage."

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION.

The Commissioner of Navigation, in his report for 1903, says, on page 44:

"Section 3 of the act of March 8, 1902, can not go into effect automatically on July 1, 1904, without almost destroying interisland trade and disturbing the trade between the United States and the archipelago. There are practically no 'vessels of the United States,' in the statutory sense, in the Philippines."

He says further, on the same page:

"The trade between the United States and the Philippines is now conducted almost entirely in foreign bottoms. * * * American vessels in 1902 thus carried only about 3 per cent of the merchandise transported in trade between the Philippines and the United States. To confine this trade entirely to American vessels after the 1st of next July will involve a complete reversal of existing carrying conditions. This reversal will disturb trade relations unless American tonnage can be adjusted promptly to this new line of trade."

Further, on page 45, he says:

"Considerations of treaty obligations, of our general trade policy in the East, and our peculiar relations to the people of the Philippines raise this

question considerably above the plane of an ordinary application of the coastwise-trade law, such as was promptly and properly made in the case of Hawaii and Porto Rico."

Mr. Speaker, I desire to be informed when I have occupied ten minutes of my time, because I wish to yield the balance.

Mr. Speaker, it is well for the House to understand that unless the House votes down this rule there will be no opportunity to amend this bill. I am opposed to the adoption of the rule for several reasons. First, because of the drastic nature of the rule itself. There were amendments proposed in committee and amendments proposed in the Senate which will be cut off if the rule is adopted.

One of the amendments that would be offered if the rule were not adopted—and I want to call the attention of the friends of American labor in this Hall to it—would be an amendment to force these ships admitted to American register, and over which the ægis of protection, the coastwise laws of the United States, would be extended, to employ American sailors instead Chinese, as they now do.

Another thing that would be proposed would be a recommendation of Governor Taft—the man who knows more about the affairs of the Philippine Islands than any other one man now in the United States—to the effect that if you exclude under the coastwise laws foreign ships trading between the Philippine Islands and the United States, you would cause such a large increase of freight rates to shippers and consumers to be affected by it that there ought to be a reduction of at least 50 per cent in tariff rates between the Philippines and continental America in order to offset the new freight tax going into the pockets of the shipowners. In other words, if you are going to tax Philippine producers and the people engaged in commerce to and from the Philippine Islands a large amount of money to go into the pockets of the shipowners, you ought at least to take out of the pockets of the manufacturers, or out of the Treasury, as the case might be, an equivalent amount of the present taxation which they now pay for tariff and protectionism purposes.

That amendment would be offered. Now, if the rule is adopted, there will be no opportunity to offer any amendment whatsoever except an amendment as to the time when this legislation would take effect upon the shipping interests of the country and upon the consumers. I am opposed to the adoption of this rule for another reason, and that is because of the lack of necessity for the legislation at all from the standpoint of one who, like myself, does not want to see the commerce between the Philippines and the United States taxed for the benefit of the shipowners. If the present legislation is undisturbed, the coastwise shipping laws will not take effect on June 1, 1904, or at all. I have not time to argue that, but I refer the House to the case of *Huus v. The New York and Porto Rican Steamship Company*, which was decided upon the statute which had been passed by the Congress for Porto Rico. This statute expressly included trade to Porto Rico within the meaning of the coastwise trade of the United States. The Supreme Court settled that case upon the statute, the inference being that but for the statute Porto Rican trade in steamships would not have been considered a part of the coastwise trade.

Mr. Speaker, I am more opposed to this rule, however, for another reason than any other, viz, the injustice of the bill, the unjust exploitation of the Philippines upon the European colonial system, as a thing under the flag and yet not subject to any consideration from the Congress of the United States, except the consideration of being exploited for the benefit of American industries or American interests. Now, Governor Taft said, and the testimony is universal, that if this bill passes it will result in an enormous increase of freight rates for quite a while at any rate—how long, nobody can tell. Every effort was made to try to find out about how much that increase would be, but nothing definite could be ascertained. The shipowners themselves could not be induced to bind themselves down within any figure. I desire to say this, and then I am going to close, because I do not want to discuss the merits of the question generally.

I just want the country to understand the nature of this proposition, a proposition to exploit the producers in the Philippine Islands and to exploit the commerce from the Philippine ports our way and the commerce from us toward them, by making freight rates 30 or 40 per cent higher than they are now for an indefinite period, the exact period being something not to be fixed by me or by anybody else, as near as I can understand. I desire to warn the shipowners and the shipowning industry of this country, the most highly protected industry in the country, enjoying a monopoly of all the trade on the Great Lakes and the rivers and along the coasts of the United States, that they may perhaps have occasion at some time to regret that they have been quite as greedy as they are now. If they keep catching at every shadow that appears as they cross the stream, they may finally lose the meat that they are now carrying in their mouths. I protest, Mr. Speaker, against the drastic nature of this rule.

I shall not spend time on that, however, because, as I have previously said on this floor, a majority is charged with the responsibility of legislation and with the responsibility of the methods of legislation, and a minority can not plead the baby act when they exercise the powers which they have, but the country will watch to see whether they exercise those powers in the interests of justice and right, and whether the methods to which they resort are fair or unfair; whether they give a proper opportunity to the representatives of the people to perfect legislation that comes to the House. As it now is this is the legislation of the majority of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries plus three gentlemen upon the Committee on Rules—three most estimable gentlemen, three very nonpartisan gentlemen, but at the same time gentlemen who are now undertaking to represent you as a party, and who in this particular case are taking the place not only of you as a majority, but of the people whom you represent here as representatives of a majority.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed nine minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING].

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Speaker, I want time at this moment merely to refer to the inequitable character of this rule, and to what I consider to be a breach of agreement on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in reporting this rule to the House. This rule limits debate to one hour on a side. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], will not leave the room at this time.

This rule limits debate to one hour. The idea of one person thoroughly discussing this bill in less than one hour is absolutely ludicrous. The questions involved are of very great importance, and there are many of them. One prominent question is whether any legislation at all is necessary on this subject. The principal reason offered in the report of the majority for this bill is that unless the bill passes the laws regulating the coastwise trade will go into effect on the 1st of July of this year, which they admit will be a great calamity, because there are not enough vessels to do the trade between America and the Philippines, and none at all between the islands.

That is simply one question. There are, besides, the question how it will affect the Filipinos; how it will affect the trade of the Americans, and the general importance of the bill as affecting the shipping interests.

Having that in mind at the time it was agreed to report this bill from the committee, I had a distinct agreement with the chairman of that committee that we should have ample time for debate and ample opportunity to offer amendments. Now, we have neither under this rule.

One of the amendments which I offered in that committee was that if it were proposed to limit the carrying trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands to American vessels, at least the laboring men of the United States should have a little benefit out of it, and those vessels should be manned by American or Filipino sailors. Every American vessel now engaged in that trade is manned by Chinese sailors—every one of the seventeen.

That amendment was voted down in the committee, but having that in mind and in view of the general importance of this question I had a deliberate agreement in the presence of all the members of the committee that we should have ample and abundant time for debate and full opportunity of offering amendments. Now, I want to put this question directly to the chairman of this committee, who is also a member of the Committee on Rules—whether an agreement, a verbal agreement, between gentlemen of the committee is to be adhered to. He may have forgotten that understanding, but it was deliberate, and was had in the presence of everybody who was there on that day.

Now, we desire to offer an amendment to cure what is claimed to be the principal reason for this bill, and to cure that alone, namely, to say that the coastwise laws shall not apply until Congress shall otherwise decide. I desire to offer also the anti-Chinese-labor amendment, and it does seem to me that the chairman of the committee, who did not consult any of the minority members about this rule before it was submitted to the Committee on Rules this morning, when his attention is called to the fact that there was this understanding in our committee will agree that this rule should be modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the reasons which have been given against the adoption of this rule by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING], who stated that an agreement had been entered into by which ample time for debate should be given upon the bill which we are to take under consideration, I desire also to call the attention of the Members of the House to

the conditions under which this rule was brought before the House for consideration.

I doubt whether there was a single member of the committee, outside of the chairman, who also happens to be a member of the Committee on Rules, who had notice prior to this morning that the Committee on Rules would be asked at this particular time to consider such a resolution or that they would be asked so precipitately to bring it before the House and ask the House to adopt it.

I am quite sure that no minority member of the committee had any such notice; and I think it may be stated with equal emphasis that no majority member of the committee had notice of any such sudden action on the part of the chairman or on the part of the Committee on Rules.

This is an important question, involving the trade and commerce between the United States and the Philippine Islands. It should be considered deliberately. It should be considered by this House with ample opportunity for debate, so that not only members of the committee, but Members of the House who are interested in this really important question should have an opportunity to discuss it. Under the rule as it is presented now only one hour upon a side is given for this discussion. That is not sufficient time for even members of the committee to present their views; and there is absolutely no opportunity offered under the terms of the rule for others than members of the committee to discuss it. I think Members of the House should understand the situation, and for that reason, if not for others, should vote against this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield the remainder of my time—five minutes—to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I take it there is no controversy about the matter of fact stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], that there was a distinct agreement and understanding in the committee, the chairman being present and being a party to the understanding, that there should be given ample time for the discussion of this bill. In view of that fact, I think that the chairman of that committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who is also a member of the Committee on Rules, will take pleasure in asking the House to enable him to keep good faith with his colleagues by voting down this rule.

Not to do so would be to put him in the position of making an agreement with his colleagues, and then, as a member of the Committee on Rules, distinctly and deliberately violating it. I take it that the gentleman from Ohio will not put himself in that position.

As to the merits of the matter, the rule permits one hour's discussion upon each side. It must be evident to anyone who has dipped into the subject at all—anyone who has glanced at the bill or at the report upon either side—that that time is wholly insufficient; that the measure is an important, far-reaching measure; that there is no occasion for urgency concerning it; that if there be no legislation now no harm will come from the lack of it; that by such legislation as is proposed—without the opportunity for amendment, without the opportunity for understanding—very great harm may come.

Everybody knows that so far as the party in power is concerned and so far as the Government is concerned the Philippine Islands are treated as not being part of the United States. The tariff law is made to apply to them as to foreign territory, with a little modification that the rates of duty shall be somewhat less, which modification does not affect the principle. In view of that, with legislation by the Congress recognized to-day by the powers that be as law, it must be absolutely true, going by the decisions and going by the conduct of the Government, that these coastwise laws do not apply and that this act will apply them.

The effect will be to create a monopoly in the few American shippers who may provide themselves with vessels for this trade. The effect will be also to increase upon the American consumer the price of every article brought from the Philippine Islands. The effect further will be to lessen to those who produce the articles in the Philippine Islands the reward of their labor and take from them a part of the value of their products.

The gentleman who votes for this rule votes distinctly and positively for Chinese seamen upon the ships instead of American or Filipino seamen. He votes distinctly and directly for preventing consideration of an amendment which, if this shipping is to be American exclusively, will give the American seamen or the Filipino seamen, or both, a chance, and neither has any chance in competition with the Chinese seamen under this law. To vote for this rule is to prevent consideration of amendments distinctly American, which not one out of five gentlemen upon either side of this House could afford to vote against and go to his constituents for their approval.

In adopting this rule those amendments are voted against, in

being denied consideration, far more effectually than they would be if they were voted on directly.

Vote down the rule and let the measure be considered on its merits. Confine the debate strictly to it, if you please; do not waste time, if you choose not to do so, in the discussion of outside matters, but give this important measure, this measure of far-reaching importance to the American consumer, the American seaman, the Filipino producer, to the people of both countries, fair consideration, and give the House a fair opportunity to offer and to consider amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to corroborate what has been said by my colleague on the committee the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING], as well as my colleague on the committee the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], as to the understanding we distinctly had with the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. If the chairman of the committee is desirous of adding evidence to further satisfy himself, he can do so by asking the majority members for their views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] desire to be heard?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to certain dates and facts which will settle the attack made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING] upon me in regard to any agreement that ever I made. There is not a member upon any committee of which I was ever a member who ever even intimated before that in the remotest degree I varied from an agreement which I had made.

Now, let me give the House the facts. The hearings upon this bill began before the committee on the 26th day of February last, and they were carried along from time to time. A long series of hearings had been had before the Senate committee, and we had the benefit of them. Finally the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries voted to report this bill favorably, and I filed my report immediately, on the 25th day of March. There was not one word said at the time about any time being given for speeches or amendments. The gentleman is perfectly honest in his recollection of it. Something was said, but he has got the wrong bill in his mind. I have consulted with three or four members of the committee around me who were present when this bill was reported, and they say that nothing of the kind took place; but I did say that in regard to two of the bills, about which there was some doubt and hesitation, there should not only be ample time for discussion, but for amendment, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] took the bills until the next meeting and then said he was satisfied with them, and they were reported, and both of them have been passed.

Now, I will show the gentleman how easy it is to be mistaken. After I had filed my report, which took place, as I said, on the 25th day of March, nearly twelve days ago, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT], the ranking member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, came to me and asked me when I was going to get this bill up. I told him I was going to get it up as quickly as I could get a rule for it. I appealed to him to consent to its coming up; but finally I told him I should call it up as quickly as I could get a rule for it. Thereupon he said to me that he wanted a longer time to file his report. One week was the time he had asked for at the time the bill was reported. He asked for one week, and I consented without a word of hesitation to that. Then he came to me and said to me last week that he must go down to Mississippi with some of his family. He explained to me a very good reason why I thought he ought to go, and then he asked me if I would postpone calling up this bill until he could get back, and I said to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT] I would not call it up until Wednesday. He then went away entirely satisfied. He said to me he did not want to hurry his report or file his report until he came back.

On the 5th day of this month—the day before yesterday—that gentleman, in compliance with his agreement had, and in good faith with the arrangement that he and I had made, filed his report, and to-day I have called up the bill. And let me say that if the gentleman from Michigan had been mistaken, or if I had been mistaken, the subsequent arrangement had with the gentleman from Mississippi and myself got rid of the whole of that question about the delay and amendment and everything else, and the new arrangement went into effect.

Mr. LUCKING. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. SPIGHT. I want to say just one word.

Mr. GROSVENOR. In a moment I will yield to you.

Mr. LUCKING. The chairman of the committee referred to the bills that did pass. Did not those two bills pass this House the other day without question, unanimously?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have said so.

Mr. LUCKING. Well, is it true that I asked for debate, and ample time for debate, on bills that nobody objected to at all?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think you would.

Mr. LUCKING. Well, that may be a smart answer. Is it true that I offered any amendment to those bills in the committee? Did I offer the Chinese amendment that I referred to in this bill in the committee?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not remember that. I think not.

Mr. LUCKING. Well, I will ask you to consult the other gentlemen of the majority here who were present. I do not wish to mention them by name; but will you ask members of the majority of the committee, especially the gentleman from Michigan, what his recollection is about that?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do recollect that the gentleman made a motion to amend this bill, or said he wanted to make a motion of that character. It is enough to say that the amendment, if offered, would not have been germane to the bill, and could not be offered here; and then I remember distinctly the statement was made to the gentleman that an amendment such as he proposed to this bill offered to any other bill would drive out of the ports of the Pacific slope every ship carrying the American flag.

Mr. LUCKING. That might be an argument to make against the amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is a good argument not to be bothered by the amendment. Now, if the gentleman from Mississippi wants a little time.

Mr. SPIGHT. The gentleman has stated accurately the agreement between himself and me, and the only difference between us is that I understood when the bill was before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that we were to have ample time for discussion. The gentleman has stated our agreement correctly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, what I wish to get at is that this attack that is made upon me by the gentleman from Michigan has no foundation in the first place, and I have no doubt he believes, and possibly has the right to believe, that that was so; but it was all changed by the agreement which was made between myself and the senior member of the minority, and which I have carried into effect in perfect good faith. So, Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit jealous about the matter.

Mr. SPIGHT. I would like to say to the gentleman that we made no agreement about the time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No. How much time have I left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I shall not refer for a moment to the argument of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. That will come in properly at the time when the bill comes fairly before the House. It will be seen by the Members of the House that a long time has been exhausted in trying to bring this bill before the House. Patiently and carefully I have labored in season and out of season to give everybody an opportunity to come here and be heard on this bill.

I have not any feeling of interest about the bill. It is a matter of some importance. It is all in a nutshell—

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. LUCKING. Will not the gentleman from Ohio admit that he did not file his majority report, which he now relies upon, until last Saturday; that it was not printed until Tuesday of this week?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Let me state to the House how easy a matter it is to be mistaken even about that. I filed the majority report, upon which I relied and rely now, but later a minority of the Republican side of the committee filed a minority report in favor of a further extension of the time, and in compliance with the request that was made of me I rejoined to that, but I did not rejoin to the report of the minority of the committee because it had not been filed, and the gentleman from Mississippi will bear me out in saying that all these reports had been filed before he filed his minority report.

Mr. SPIGHT. That is true.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And it was done out of the ordinary way in order to accommodate the gentleman from Mississippi.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must act if we are going to act at all. If this legislation is not acted upon, there will be a difference of opinion between the best lawyers of the country whether or not the coastwise laws of the United States do not shut down upon this traffic on the 1st day of July next, and I wish to say this much in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, who said that Secretary Taft was opposed to this bill. Let me read this much, and then I will close:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, April 5, 1904.

MY DEAR GENERAL GROSVENOR: My impression is that it would probably be held by the Supreme Court, under decisions it has already made and the language of section 3 of the act of Congress approved March 8, 1902, that the coastwise trading laws, in the absence of any amendatory legislation, will come into full force July 1 as to the trade between the United States mainland and the Philippine Islands, and as to the interisland trade in the

Philippine Islands, and that, in order to avoid the application of the coastwise trading laws in this way, it is necessary that there be amending legislation.

The disaster which would follow the application of the coastwise laws to the interisland trade in the Philippine Islands I attempted to describe to you when under examination before the shipping committee. The interisland trade is the arterial circulation of the archipelago. The people of many of the islands are dependent for their food stuffs on the continuance of that trade as it is. If the coastwise trading laws applied to it, then nearly all the vessels now engaged in it would be excluded therefrom, and the condition of the islands, if the law were enforced, would be pitiable. For that reason, I think, the passage of the present shipping bill, postponing the operation of the coastwise laws to the transoceanic trade for one or two years, and committing to the discretion of the Commission the regulation of the interisland trade, is very important in the interest of the Philippine Islands.

I have the honor to inclose herewith a written opinion of Judge Magoon, the law officer of the Department, on the question of the application of the coastwise laws to the Philippine trade after the 1st of July. You will observe that he does not state positively an opinion that such laws will apply to the Philippine trade, but after an examination of the statute and the opinion of the Supreme Court he is strongly inclined to think that they will. Naturally should there be no legislation, the Department would be anxious to avoid the operation of the law by construction, but I very much doubt the possibility of doing so and have grave fears that the court would reverse any other decision by the Department.

I have no objection to your using this letter as you choose.

Very sincerely, yours,

WM. H. TAFT, Secretary of War.

HON. C. H. GROSVENOR,
House of Representatives.

This, gentlemen, was day before yesterday.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. BURKETT. I would like to ask the gentleman—he states that now by reason of the law that has been passed the coastwise laws will not go into effect until July 1, 1904, but as I understand from the letter of the Secretary of War he does not recommend this bill, but he says unless some similar legislation be passed these coastwise laws will go into effect on the 1st of July.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Exactly.

Mr. BURKETT. But does he anywhere in that letter—I have read it over and I did not find it—recommend this particular bill?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have the interview in which he does that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. He was misrepresented in the newspapers and consented to an interview in order to get rid of a wrong impression. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote upon the rule.

Mr. GOULDEN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOULDEN. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does the gentleman from Ohio consider one hour on each side sufficient to debate this important question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I am the instrument from the Committee on Rules, but I do think, with all the learning and literature that has been laid before the House during the last three months, that two hours—one hour to a side—is ample time, more than time enough to discuss all that legitimately belongs to this question involved here.

Mr. GOULDEN. It shows how great minds differ.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; yours.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we had better have the yeas and nays, to save time.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 122, nays 100, answered "present" 6, not voting 153, as follows:

YEAS—122.

Acheson,	Crumpacker,	Grosvenor,	Littlefield,
Adams, Pa.	Currier,	Hamilton,	Longworth,
Adams, Wis.	Cushman,	Haskins,	McCleary, Minn.
Alexander,	Dalzell,	Haugen,	McLachlan,
Allen,	Daniels,	Hemenway,	McMorrin,
Ames,	Davidson,	Henry, Conn.	Mahon,
Bates,	Davis, Minn.	Hermann,	Mann,
Birdsall,	Dixon,	Hill, Conn.	Marsh,
Bishop,	Doyener,	Hogg,	Marshall,
Bonyng,	Draper,	Howell, N. J.	Martin,
Bowersock,	Driscoll,	Howell, Utah	Miller,
Bradley,	Dunwell,	Huff,	Mondell,
Brandeege,	Dwight,	Hull,	Morgan,
Brick,	Esch,	Humphrey, Wash.	Mudd,
Brooks,	Evans,	Jones, Wash.	Murdock,
Brown, Pa.	Foster, Vt.	Kennedy,	Needham,
Brown, Wis.	French,	Ketcham,	Norris,
Burke,	Fuller,	Kinkaid,	Olmsted,
Butler, Pa.	Gibson,	Kyle,	Otis,
Caldrehead,	Gillet, N. Y.	Lacey,	Otjen,
Campbell,	Gillet, Cal.	Landis, Frederick	Palmer,
Conner,	Gillett, Mass.	Lanning,	Parker,
Cooper, Pa.	Graff,	Lilley,	Payne,
Cousins,	Greene,	Littauer,	Perkins,

Porter, Powers, Me. Powers, Mass. Prince, Reeder, Rodenberg, Seatt,	Sibley, Smith, Ill. Southard, Southwick, Sperry, Steenerson, Sterling,	Stevens, Minn. Tawney, Tirrell, Van Voorhis, Volstead, Wachter, Warnock,	Weems, Wiley, N. J. Williamson, Wilson, Ill. Woodyard.
---	--	--	--

NAYS—100.

Aiken, Badger, Bassett, Beall, Tex. Bell, Cal. Benny, Bowers, Brantley, Breazeale, Brundidge, Burgess, Burleson, Byrd, Candler, Cassingham, Clark, Clayton, Cockran, N. Y. Cowherd, De Armond, Denny, Dinsmore, Field, Finley, Fitzgerald,	Flood, Gaines, Tenn. Garber, Garner, Glass, Goldfogle, Goulden, Granger, Grege, Gudger, Hamlin, Harrison, Hitchcock, Hopkins, Humphreys, Miss. Johnson, Kehoe, Kellher, Kitchin, Claude Kitchin, Wm. W. Kline, Kluttz, Lamar, Fla. Lamar, Mo. Lamb,	Legare, Lester, Lever, Lind, Little, Lloyd, Lucking, Macon, Maddox, Maynard, Moon, Tenn. Padgett, Page, Patterson, N. C. Pierce, Pinckney, Pou, Pujo, Raine, Randell, Tex. Ransdell, La. Rider, Rixey, Robb, Robinson, Ark.	Robinson, Ind. Rucker, Russell, Ryan, Scarborough, Sheppard, Sherley, Sims, Slayden, Small, Smith, Ky. Smith, Tex. Spight, Sullivan, Mass. Swanson, Thayer, Thomas, N. C. Underwood, Van Duzer, Wallace, Webb, Wiley, Ala. Williams, Miss. Wynn, Zenor.
--	---	---	---

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Adamson, Cassel,	Cromer, Howard,	Lewis,	Miers, Ind.
---------------------	--------------------	--------	-------------

NOT VOTING—153.

Babcock, Baker, Bankhead, Bartholdt, Bartlett, Bede, Beidler, Benton, Bingham, Boutell, Boutie, Broussard, Browlow, Buckman, Buckett, Burleigh, Burnett, Burton, Butler, Mo. Caldwell, Capron, Castor, Cochran, Mo., Connell, Cooper, Tex. Cooper, Wis. Crowley, Curtis, Darragh, Davey, La. Davis, Fla. Dayton, Deemer, Dickerman, Dougherty, Douglas, Dresser, Emerich, Fitzpatrick,	Flack, Fordney, Foss, Foster, Ill. Fowler, Gaines, W. Va. Gardner, Mass. Gardner, Mich. Gardner, N. J. Gilbert, Gillespie, Goebel, Gooch, Griffith, Griggs, Hardwick, Hay, Hearst, Hedge, Henry, Tex. Hepburn, Hildebrandt, Hill, Miss. Hinshaw, Hitt, Holliday, Houston, Hughes, N. J. Hughes, W. Va. Hunt, Hunter, Jackson, Md. Jackson, Ohio James, Jenkins, Jones, Va. Knapp, Knopf, Lafean,	Landis, Chas. B. Lawrence, Lindsay, Livernash, Livingston, Lorimer, Loud, Loudenslager, Lovinge, McAndrews, McCall, McCarthy, McCreary, Pa. McDermott, McLain, McNary, Mahoney, Metcalf, Meyer, La. Minor, Moon, Pa. Morrell, Nevin, Overstreet, Patterson, Pa. Patterson, Tenn. Pearre, Reid, Rhea, Richardson, Ala. Richardson, Tenn. Roberts, Robertson, La. Ruppert, Scudder, Shackelford, Sherman, Shiras, Shober,	Shull, Slemp, Smith, Iowa Smith, Samuel W. Smith, Wm. Alden Smith, N. Y. Smith, Pa. Snapp, Snook, Southall, Spalding, Sparkman, Stafford, Stanley, Stephens, Tex. Sullivan, N. Y. Sulloway, Sulzer, Talbot, Tate, Taylor, Thomas, Iowa Townsend, Trimble, Vandiver, Vreeland, Wade, Wadsworth, Wanger, Warner, Watson, Weisse, Williams, Ill. Wilson, N. Y. Wright, Young.
--	--	---	---

So the resolution was agreed to.
The following additional pairs were announced:
For this day:
Mr. CURTIS with Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri.
Mr. FOWLER with Mr. GILLESPIE.
Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. HARDWICK.
Mr. HITT with Mr. HAY.
Mr. CROMER with Mr. GRIFFITH.
Mr. JENKINS with Mr. LINDSAY.
Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. HOUSTON.
Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. MCLAIN.
Mr. CONNER with Mr. SPARKMAN.
Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey.
Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. TRIMBLE.
Mr. CONNELL with Mr. JAMES.
Mr. FOSS with Mr. HENRY of Texas.
Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. WADE.
Mr. SHIRAS with Mr. CALDWELL.
Mr. CASTOR with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.
Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.
Mr. JACKSON of Ohio with Mr. SNOOK.
Mr. NEVIN with Mr. REID.
The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

SHIPPING BETWEEN PORTS OF UNITED STATES AND PORTS IN PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, ETC.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the rule, I now call up the bill (S. 2259) to regulate shipping in trade between

ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes.

The bill was read, as follows:
Be it enacted, etc., That on and after July 1, 1905, no merchandise except supplies for the Army and Navy shall be transported by sea, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States. But this section shall not be construed to prohibit the sailing of any foreign vessel between any port of the United States and any port or place in the Philippine Archipelago: *Provided*, That no merchandise other than that imported in such vessel from some foreign port which has been specified on the manifest as for another port, and which shall not have been unloaded, shall be carried between a port of the United States and a port or place in the Philippine Archipelago.

SEC. 2. That on and after July 1, 1905, no foreign vessel shall transport passengers between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, either directly or by way of a foreign port, under a penalty of \$200 for each passenger so transported and landed.

SEC. 3. That sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not apply to the transportation of merchandise or passengers between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago. Until Congress shall have authorized the registry as vessels of the United States of vessels owned in the Philippine Archipelago the government of the Philippine Islands is hereby authorized to adopt, from time to time, and enforce regulations governing the transportation of merchandise and passengers between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago.

SEC. 4. That sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not apply to the voyage of a vessel between a port of the United States and a port or place in the Philippine Archipelago begun before July 1, 1905.

SEC. 5. That sections 1 and 2 of this act shall not apply to vessels owned by the United States.

SEC. 6. That on and after the passage of this act the same tonnage taxes shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all foreign vessels coming into the United States from the Philippine Archipelago which are required by law to be levied, collected, and paid upon vessels coming into the United States from foreign countries: *Provided, however*, That until July 1, 1905, the provisions of law restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from one port of the United States to another port of the United States shall not be applicable to foreign vessels engaging in trade between the Philippine Archipelago and the United States: *And provided further*, That the Philippine Commission shall be authorized and empowered to issue licenses to engage in lightering or other exclusively harbor business to vessels or other craft actually engaged in such business at the date of the passage of this act, and to vessels or other craft built in the Philippine Islands or in the United States and owned by citizens of the United States or by inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

SEC. 7. That this act shall not be construed to impair or affect any privilege guaranteed to Spanish ships and merchandise by the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain signed at the city of Paris on December 10, 1898, and ratified April 11, 1899.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall, from time to time, issue regulations for the enforcement of this act, except as otherwise provided in section 3: *Provided*, That such of the navigation laws of the United States as are in force in the Philippine Archipelago in regard to vessels arriving in the Philippine Islands from the mainland territory and other insular possessions of the United States shall continue to be administered by the proper officials of the government of the Philippine Islands.

Passed the Senate March 3, 1904.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:
Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to offer an amendment. I wish to strike out the word "five," in line 6 on page 2, and insert the word "nine" in lieu thereof.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded the floor.
The SPEAKER. The bill is not amendable at this stage, the Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi, unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why, Mr. Speaker, I thought the understanding was, and I thought the rule recited, that the bill was amendable so far as changing the year stated in the bill was concerned.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, but the amendments are in order after the debate expires, and there is an hour on a side for debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the Chair will notice the rule particularly, I think he will find it recites that such amendments as are offered shall be considered pending and shall be voted on after the two hours' debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule, or that portion of it:

And after two hours of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and pending amendments to its passage—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But the Speaker will notice that there could be no amendments pending unless they had been previously offered.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair complete the reading of the rule—

without intervening motion or appeal: *Provided*, That amendments as to the date when said act shall take effect, changing the year therein mentioned, may be offered and considered as pending at the time the previous question becomes effective.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The first thing in order is to read the bill. We are not now operating under the five-minute rule, as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I desire only to determine the proper time to offer the

amendment. Would the amendment be in order immediately after the Clerk had finished the reading of the bill? I do not want the offering of amendments to interfere with the time for debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is clear that unless the special order changes the ordinary practice of the House amendments would not be in order until after debate is closed, but the rule says that amendments "may be offered and considered as pending at the time the previous question becomes effective." The Chair is inclined to think that that means at the expiration of the debate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded the floor for the purpose of having amendments offered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk was reading the bill, and the gentleman had yielded the floor for the purpose of having the bill read.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the regular order is to read the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill is read as a matter of right, and is certainly not subject to be amended while being read. The Chair is inclined to the view that on the expiration of the time for debate amendments within the rule will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not care particularly when it is offered, but I was under the impression this was the proper place.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will resume the reading of the bill. The Clerk then resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that one hour of the time for debate may be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT] and one hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time for debate may be controlled one hour by himself and one hour by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT]. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. What is the request, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. That the time shall be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and one-half by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before the commencement of the debate, I desire to ask unanimous consent that speeches be limited to this question and that all speeches made on the question may be extended in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill is here in the House and not in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman's point is well taken, but the point of order could be made against anyone who attempts to go outside of the subject-matter of the debate.

Mr. SPIGHT. I do not intend to yield any time to anybody except upon this question, and I ask that all speeches on the question may be extended in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the House will protect itself in debate by any Member of the House making the point of order, if an attempt is made to go outside the subject-matter of the bill.

Mr. SPIGHT. But the Speaker has not put my request, I think.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman's request to be for unanimous consent that debate during the two hours upon this bill be confined to the bill. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the rules of the House so provide, and unanimous consent is therefore unnecessary.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to impress upon the Chair that what I am insisting on now is the request I make for unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that gentlemen may print in the RECORD upon this bill for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand that request, it is for general leave to print, that leave to be limited only to gentlemen who make remarks upon the bill.

Mr. SPIGHT. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that gentlemen who make remarks upon the bill may have leave to print upon the bill for five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I regret to be obliged to half apologize for any remarks that I submit upon this bill, because some of us were not notified until this afternoon that this measure would come before the House for consideration to-day. I was one of those who, when the bill was first presented to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was prejudiced against it, but after attending the various meetings of the committee and listening to the testimony, I have become

thoroughly convinced that this bill not only ought to pass, but ought to pass in its present form.

The bill is but an extension of the historic policy of our Government for nearly a hundred years in extending the navigation laws of our country to the outlying possessions. In 1817, under the Administration of President Madison, Congress first provided that commerce between all the territories and possessions of the United States should be regarded as coastwise and confined to American vessels built in the United States, officered by United States citizens, and flying the American flag. This policy has continued through all Administrations since that time without any serious attempt to change it, and whenever we have had territories annexed to the Union, Congress in due time by suitable legislation has extended this historic policy to embrace the trade with those territories.

In 1868 our navigation laws as to transportation of merchandise were extended to Alaska. In 1898 the same laws were extended to Hawaii, and in 1900 to Porto Rico; and under a construction of the Constitution and the laws applicable to this subject by the law officers of the Government and of the Insular Bureau having charge of these matters, it has been considered that these laws by their own force extend to the Philippines, so that in the act of March, 1902, it was provided that until the 1st of July, 1904, the navigation laws should not extend to the Philippines. As to whether those laws will necessarily extend at that time, if this act should not go into operation, I confess I do not know. I have not had time to examine that question carefully. The officers of the War Department and of the Insular Bureau are of the opinion that they do extend.

But whether they do or not, it is of the utmost importance to the people of the Philippine Islands, it is of the utmost importance to the trade between those islands and the United States, that that matter shall be definitely settled, because if it be not settled a condition of hardship would ensue. Traders would not know whether they could charter American vessels or not. Owners of vessels would not know whether they could coast between one island and another or between the United States and the various islands and carry merchandise. The business would be demoralized beyond measure and possibly fraught with peril of punishment and forfeiture provided by our laws. That would mean that there would be a great decrease of business and decrease of facilities for doing business and an increase of rates for all sorts of freightage. This would produce a condition of hardship and disaster which no one desires to visit upon the struggling people of the Philippine Islands, and for that reason, if for no other, it is of primary importance to them and a primary duty to this Congress to pass this or some similar bill.

We can not postpone consideration of this question. We must now at this session definitely determine whether or not the navigation laws of this country should apply; and that is what this bill definitely and affirmatively does.

It contains two principal provisions: First, extending the navigation laws as to the transportation of merchandise alone, not of passengers, to the islands, so that the old navigation laws of 1817 should apply to that extent. It provides, secondly, that as to the trade between the islands, the interisland trade, the whole matter is left entirely to the Philippine Commission, so they can make rules and regulations which shall not in the least oppress or embarrass the trade between these islands, but, on the contrary, provide in every possible way for their best and fullest development. These are the two principal provisions of the bill.

Now, I notice that our friends on the other side lay especial stress on the proposition that the passage of this bill would work hardship upon the Philippines. As I have stated at first, before I heard the testimony I was prejudiced on that very account against the bill, and I state now that if I believed that this bill would work the slightest hardship to the Philippine people, I should oppose it; but, on the contrary, I believe it will be of benefit to the Philippine people. I believe that it will work untold blessings to the Philippine Islands, and for that reason I am in favor of the passage of the bill.

Now, bold and positive statements, either of myself or of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, prove nothing. What are the real facts? The principal product of the Philippines for export is hemp, or "abaca," so called, in truth. Now, the hemp that is produced in the Philippines can not be produced anywhere else in the world. The Philippine Islands have a monopoly in the production of that particular product.

There is a great demand for the Philippine hemp. England and Germany and France and Italy and the United States are all bidding for that hemp. And the price obtained by the producer in the Philippine Islands is consequent upon all that competition for his hemp. The result is that if the United States does not buy the Philippine hemp, England or Germany or France or Italy will buy it and pay practically the same price for it. It makes no particular difference to the Philippines whether we buy it or

not. They get the same price for their hemp anyway, whether this bill passes or not, on account of the great and wide competition for that valuable article. So that I think you can safely assume that this bill will not in the slightest degree affect the price of Philippine hemp to the Philippine producer. Indeed, Governor Taft, in his testimony before the Merchant Marine Committee, expressly stated that the hemp producer would not be adversely affected by this bill.

Mr. BURKETT. Will it cost the Americans any more when the hemp gets here?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I will come to that in a moment.

Now, as to sugar and tobacco. The amount of these articles produced last year and exported was less than 10,000 tons—9,200 tons of sugar and about 150 tons of tobacco. So that there is no question that the passage of this bill will not affect in the least, as you can see, the producers of sugar and tobacco. On the contrary, Governor Taft testified before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries that he believed that by the passage of this bill American capital will be enlisted in the Philippine Islands, will become interested in the islands, and that a trade will be established there on account of it.

He believed that because of this very act the tariff will necessarily be reduced, and I believe this will contribute pressure toward it, and that with the capital coming into the islands and with the improved facilities of communication bringing that sugar and tobacco to the greatest and really the only market of the world for such articles, the tendency will be to increase the production of these articles in the Philippine Islands, develop its resources by American enterprise, capital, and labor, and to benefit the people of those islands on that account. That is, the desirable thing now to do is to have something which will tend to draw the best class of the American people there, so they will use their capital, their brains, and their energy, and upbuild and encourage the native peoples with their own activities and prosperity.

I believe this as much as any one thing will contribute toward that result. American ships will not run on partial cargoes. They will always endeavor to get full cargoes in order to make a profitable business. To do this they will adopt the usual American methods of making business—encouraging production, establishing manufactories, developing resources, employing the people, stimulating their wants and necessities, and in these manifold ways creating wealth, prosperity, and happiness. I verily believe we may truly anticipate this beneficent result of this legislation before us.

Now, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] asked if the people of the United States will be injured by the passage of this bill. If they were to be injured I should not vote for it. I believe that they will not be injured, but that, on the contrary, they will be benefited by the passage of this bill. It will be remembered that all of the material for binding twine and binding twine itself are admitted free; that a large proportion of the binding twine used in our country comes from Yucatan and is sisal; that this twine is made by two different classes of manufacturers—one, the cordage trust, which produces a very large proportion; the other, the independent producers, in large part the State prisons in the West, in the State of Minnesota, and in North Dakota; and I know other States are considering the establishment of these binding-twine factories at public expense in the State prisons to utilize their convict labor and to supply the best quality of binding twine at a minimum expense to the people.

Now, this to me is significant. The cordage trust bitterly and vehemently oppose the passage of this bill, because they know it will tend to encourage the establishment of new factories by public or private means in the West, near the place of consumption, where there can be had cheap freight rates direct to the farmer who consumes it.

A large part of these institutions use sisal from Yucatan. They use a smaller proportion of the hemp from the Philippines. If this bill should pass, it would mean that as to those institutions in the West, that affect the farmer, the sisal or abaca used instead of coming to the Atlantic ports would come to the Gulf or Pacific ports, and this very competition not only of materials—as there is an abundance of sisal—but of rates and localities, would completely insure the smallest possible prices to the consumers. The passage of this act would mean that Philippine hemp from Pacific ports would compete with Philippine hemp from Atlantic ports, with sisal from Gulf ports as well as the finished product from Canada. This fourfold competition will tend to prevent increase of prices. It would mean that on the Pacific coast there are right now probably American ships under the American flag of more than 100,000 tons capacity ready to bring the whole crop of the Philippines in one voyage to the United States.

Last year there were only exported from the Philippine Islands to the United States about 63,000 tons. One estimate is 65,000 tons and another estimate is 63,000 tons; and, as I said, there are

enough ships right now on the Pacific coast alone to bring all this hemp to the United States in one voyage and land it, so that the American people can get hold of it and manufacture it.

There is an abundance of capable tonnage right now on the Atlantic coast ready and glad to do this business if they can get it, and at rates not burdensome to the cordage trade.

The ships are ready, owned, and manned by Americans, and they know they can not get the business unless their rates are reasonable. Too high rates on their part will drive the business to London and Hamburg. This of itself will keep the rates reasonable, so that all possible business may be done as usual in the Atlantic States.

Now, it may be asked, What difference will it make to the American shippers?

This trade now is controlled by foreign steamship companies of two different classes, from the Atlantic coast, by foreign lines controlled in London, Hamburg, and Bremen. These lines between New York and the Philippines are offshoots of the great English and German lines, branches of those great foreign lines. They do business only as dictated by those lines, and are subordinate in their ownership and interests to the central authority in England and Germany. They have no particular interest in the general development of American trade with the Philippines. The principal interest of the owners of these lines is to build up the English or German trade, as the case may be. This American trade is only secondary and only sought to use their old, cheap, and worn ships. They do not and will not give as good rates and facilities as they do to Europe, and this of itself will tend to prevent development of general American trade with the Philippines. Now, the foreign lines on the Pacific, like the Japanese line and the Canadian-Pacific line, are highly subsidized lines, and they will underbid our steamship companies on every single cargo.

They can afford to do it to starve our ships and drive them from the ocean, and then the United States will only get the poorer and meaner part of their facilities. The home countries granting the subsidies will get the best possible rates and facilities, as they desire to. But this all injures our trade and helps their trade. It injures us in our dealings and relations with the Philippines and helps our competitors. For my part, and for this reason, I favor trading with the Philippines by American ships. It helps them; it helps us. In the long run it will make toward the greatest good of both peoples.

If this bill should pass, it would mean that in order to prevent this hemp going to Germany, England, or France our people would have to pay enough for the hemp, would have to get freights sufficiently low so that the hemp could be landed on the American coasts. It would mean that our steamship companies would have to compete in rates and facilities with the steamship companies going to Germany and to England, and in order to compete they would have to bring their rates down low enough. Now, they can do that and they have done that. The latter part of last year steel rails were taken from Cleveland to Hongkong at \$8 a ton, flour was taken from Minneapolis to Shanghai and Hongkong at \$8 a ton, and that is about the rate that is now being paid. It is even cheaper than the rate that is now being paid for the transportation of this hemp from the Philippines to New York. We know those rates have been obtained and will be again, and rates one way will be cheaper when there are good freights both ways, and this bill will accomplish just that result. As you see, freight rates will not be much, if any, increased. Now, conceding that they are increased slightly at first—

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I have only fifteen minutes. I should like to yield, but my time is so limited that it is not possible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, these rates will be but slightly, if any, increased. It would mean that if these lines were once established ships best fitted to carry and do that trade would be employed in the trade, and those types of ships would be operated in the best manner to do that business.

When that business is done by the right kind of a ship, operated in the right kind of a way, with cargoes both ways—from the Philippines to the United States and from the United States to the Philippines—there will be an increase of facilities and a reduction of rates. That is exactly what would come by the passage of this bill. It has happened with Porto Rico, it has happened with Alaska and with Hawaii, and in due time will surely come to the Philippines. It will not settle inside of six months. It may not come down inside of a year to a permanent basis, but just as soon as the business does become stable and dependable, so that there will be cargoes both ways—from the Philippines to the United States and from the United States to the Philippines—

freight rates will be lowered, because improved facilities will be offered, and that is just exactly what is contemplated by this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, it is manifest that if we go on and close debate, it will end between 5 and 6 o'clock, and there will be no time for amendments or a vote upon the passage of the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that at 5.30 o'clock the House shall adjourn until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at 5.30 the House stand adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from North Carolina will now occupy some of his time.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that we take no vote until to-morrow at 12?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is right.

Mr. MADDOX. And no vote on amendments either?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No vote on any amendments; but debate will go on until 5.30 o'clock, and then cease at that point until to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMALL. In the absence of the ranking member of the minority of the committee, I yield such time to the gentleman from Michigan as he agreed upon. What was the time the gentleman from Michigan desired?

Mr. LUCKING. Thirty minutes.

Mr. SMALL. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Speaker, in substance this bill provides that after July 1, 1905, all commerce between the United States and the Philippine Islands shall be carried only in American vessels.

It is evident that nothing but the most cursory running discussion of the various propositions involved in this bill can be had in thirty minutes. The representative of the cordage interests who appeared before our committee, simply to show how detrimental and injurious this bill would be to the cordage manufacturers and the farmers of the United States, took nearly an hour and a half, and did not feel that he had been given reasonable consideration. There are among other things to be considered the interests of the cordage manufacturers. There are the interests of the Filipinos, the shipping interests of the United States, the exporting interests of the United States, the American farmers' interests, and the policy of the home country, the mother country toward her colonial possessions, or more appropriately, as judged by this bill, the stepmother country toward her colonial possessions.

Last year the trade from the Philippines to the United States amounted to about \$13,000,000; the trade from the United States to the Philippines to \$4,000,000. The imports came mainly to Atlantic ports; the exports went mainly from Pacific ports. The trade this way consists nearly altogether of hemp, which is a very bulky cargo. The trade the other way consists mainly of manufactured articles, which form very compact cargo. It would take at least three times the tonnage to bring the imports that would be necessary to carry the exports. The trade in this direction is too small to employ regular lines; the trade in the other direction will not begin to furnish return cargoes for even the few vessels that come this way. The trade both ways amounts to so little that competition for it is out of the question, and combination under which a few ships will be set apart for it is the only possible result. And the trade can not be increased by increasing freight rates, which will be the result, as nobody denies.

The trade is now conducted at very close rates by foreign tramp steamers. The Philippines are but one port in a chain of ports around the world. It is therefore utterly impossible for American vessels or for regular liners of any nationality to compete with tramps in a trade of the character or volume involved. In consequence, American vessels have heretofore made no effort whatever to get into the Atlantic hemp trade. They will make no effort to get into it unless they can substitute combination for competition in conducting it.

You propose by this bill to pronounce the Philippine Islands home territory so far as compelling them to carry their merchandise in American vessels; but you say they are foreigners so far as getting admission to our markets is concerned. They are foreigners so far as selling us anything, but fellow-countrymen when we wish to exploit them. They are foreigners when any favors are to be granted to their trade and commerce, but they are our very own when it comes to the levying and laying of burdens upon their backs. Why, at this very hour we are discriminating in the hemp export trade against all other countries of the world, contrary to our solemn declarations at the time we accepted possession of those islands, in favor of our American industries and injuriously to the Filipinos.

As has been said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STREVENSON], there is an unlimited market for their hemp product, because they have an absolute monopoly of it. They levy an export tax of \$7.40 a ton upon all the hemp that is exported from their islands except that which is exported to the United States; and we take from their treasury, Secretary Taft declares, from \$300,000 to \$500,000 a year which they otherwise would receive and which we filch and rob from their treasury in order to gratify the demands of private interests of this country. So the Filipinos get the worst of it both ways by the laws we enact. They are our fellow-countrymen when we want their hemp or their trade in American ships, but they are foreigners when they want to sell us sugar and tobacco.

The American cordage and binding-twine manufacturers appear here in opposition to this bill, because they say it would raise the freight rates so high as to drive the hemp business back to London. That subject is fully and carefully treated by the two Republicans of the minority in part 2 of the report on this bill, and I will not take time to discuss it.

Secretary of War Root declared to the Senate January 14, 1904, that if we were confined to American vessels for carrying Government supplies "we would have no way of escaping from the payment of at least three times as much as we now pay for this class of transportation." So it may be taken as proved that freight rates would be raised enormously.

But that is simply a sample of this legislation. We propose to exploit the Filipinos for our own benefit. We propose to return to the eighteenth-century policy of England in regard to her colonial possessions. Why, when we took these islands we solemnly declared to foreign nations, in public correspondence over the seal of the Secretary of State, that we would practice the "open-door" policy, giving every country free commerce with the Philippines; and yet, as I have said, by our own legislation we get hemp out of the islands free, while the Filipinos get \$7.40 a ton on every ton exported to any other country, and by this discrimination, which violates our agreement with foreign countries, the struggling Filipinos lose from \$300,000 to \$500,000 per annum.

Now we propose to confine to American bottoms all their commerce. So far as it affects foreign countries we might not care about it; but we have the authority here of our chief official, former Governor Taft, who has been governor of the islands and is now Secretary of War, that the effect would be injurious and disastrous to the Philippines. We have heard the pleading of the American cordage manufacturers, and all the exporting interests of the United States, that it would sacrifice their interest in the trade of the Philippine Islands. How does it happen here—it seems incomprehensible—that with the President and the Secretary of State opposed to this policy, so far as we can judge by their "open-door" declarations; with the governor of the Philippine Islands—now Secretary Taft—opposed to this legislation, as shown in state documents; with the Philippine Commission protesting against it; with the collector of customs of the Philippines declaring that it will be injurious and disastrous; with the administrative officers of our Navy fighting it; with the cordage interests here opposed to it, and the merchants who are selling anything to the Philippine Islands opposed to it, and the American farmers opposed to it—how does it happen that this bill is jammed through Congress so unceremoniously? In whose interest is it being done; at whose command?

Nobody, so far as I know, no interest, is in favor of it except this infernal ship lobby which has been pestering Congress, both branches of it, for the last seven years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They are hanging around the doors and sending in for Members here to-day, and they have been here all this winter; their faces are everywhere through the Capitol. They have intimidated officers whom I shall not name, who were decidedly opposed to this bill in the beginning and who now in a faltering, stammering kind of way half withdraw their opposition. As to the effect of this bill upon the Filipino interests, let me read a few words from the minority report submitted by the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from New York, Republican members of this committee:

We do not believe it is a wise policy to build up a special industry in this country at the expense of another industry [the farmers] upon which the burden of Government is now so heavily cast. Nor do we believe that it is a wise policy to treat our island possessions as legitimate prey for commercial pirates. If our merchant marine can not be fostered in any other manner, it deserves to fail.

Now, I am not opposed to building up the shipping industry of this country. In a report prepared by me upon another bill (the Gardner shipping bill) the Democratic members of the Committee on Merchant Marine have submitted a plan, constitutional, reasonable, practical, successful, just, and wise, for building up the merchant marine, namely, the discriminating-duty plan which worked like magic in the early days of the Republic; but we are opposed to everything in the nature of a subsidy, and we certainly

are opposed to this bill, which will sacrifice the interests of the Filipinos and the Philippine Islands, if we can believe the officers who have submitted their reports here. Now, upon that proposition let me read a few words from Governor Taft's report, who has never changed his position here, gentlemen's statements to the contrary. In his report as civil governor of the Philippines, he says:

In respect to the trade between these islands and the United States, I concur fully in the remarks of Collector Shuster in his annual report, in which he says:

"At the present time the greater part of the freight traffic between the Philippines and New York is carried on in foreign bottoms. So far as indications go, any law which prevented the continuance of that trade in foreign bottoms until an equal tonnage of cheaply operated American freighters are actually available to take up that trade and maintain healthy rate competition would result in a decided increase over the present rates of freight. This additional burden would fall on the already weakened resources of these islands, and such a result would be more than lamentable from every standpoint. The tonnage plying between these islands and the Pacific coast is about equal to the present freight supply, and no change in the present law seems desirable as far as trans-Pacific routes are concerned.

"It is, therefore, earnestly recommended that the present laws, so far as they permit foreign bottoms to trade between these islands and the mainland territory of the United States, be not changed for a period of at least 4 years from July 1, 1904, and that positive legislation to that effect be had by Congress at an early date."

He says the burden will fall on the backs of our struggling subjects and that the result will be more than lamentable. If we can not rely upon his statement, where can we go for information? Whom shall we trust?

Now, my friends of the legal persuasion upon this floor, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the particular reason urged here in the majority report for passing this bill is that the coastwise laws confining the trade to American vessels will take effect on the 1st of coming July if this bill is not passed. Now, I submit there is no reasonable foundation for any such belief. I have hunted in vain to find a man who has examined the question who will venture any such opinion. I have not time to discuss the legal question; but if it is of interest to any gentleman, and he will send for part 3 of the report upon this bill, he will find the authorities there collected, and it seems to me they are perfectly plain. I will insert as an appendix to my remarks the legal discussion from the report. If anything further were needed than the citation of the authorities upon the subject, let me call your attention to the fact that within a few days Attorney-General Knox has given an opinion that the coastwise laws do not apply at the present time to the island of Guam. That island was acquired at the same time as the Philippines and under the same treaty.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. LUCKING. Certainly.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I think it ought to be stated further to the House, and I know you can inform us, by what right and authority were the coastwise laws extended to Alaska, Porto Rico, and Hawaii?

Mr. LUCKING. That is all discussed in the minority report. The executive department of this nation never held the coastwise laws applied to the traffic with Alaska, Porto Rico, or Hawaii, until an express act of Congress in each case put them in force. The decision of the Attorney-General in the Guam case is a direct decision on the point involved here, unless it should be held that the act of 1902, which uses the language "that until July 1, 1904, the coastwise laws should not apply"—unless that language applies them to the Philippines.

These words are simply words of permission and not of command. If you say to your son, "You shall not go to New York until the 1st of July, 1904," that is first a prohibition against his going before that date, then it might be held to imply a negative permission to go after that date, but in no sense is it a command upon him to go on or after that date; and so the words in question simply prohibit the coastwise laws from taking effect before July 1, 1904, in case they otherwise might take effect, but do not put them into force after that date.

Hence the argument which is used that it is necessary to extend the time beyond July 1, 1904, or else they will go into effect, is not true and is made for the purpose of coercing Congress into this legislation. They say, "Pass this law and put off the date until 1905, else the law will go into effect this year." That argument is a two-edged sword, and, I might say, if there were such a thing, a four or five edged sword. They admit thereby that it would be a calamity to have them go into effect at the present time. They know that we have not the ships to do the trading between the places except at exorbitant rates. They know that it would destroy the traffic among the Philippine Islands themselves, which is all done by boats.

I would like to see a lawyer who is an honest man look at the authorities on that proposition and say that there is anything in it to justify their argument.

But let us assume that there is. Why do you insist upon putting into force these dangerous and unwise laws after July 1, 1905? Why not simply bring in a bill saying until Congress shall so en-

act the coastwise laws shall not apply? Why have you not permitted us to offer an amendment to that effect? Why not do that if your honest reason is that the laws will go into effect on the 1st of July, 1904, which you know would be a great calamity to everybody, American and Filipino, except the ship monopoly?

Now, my time is running very rapidly, and I want to call your attention to other features of this bill. We simply have not time to do it properly, so that you may vote intelligently, if your votes are at your own command in this matter. [Laughter.]

I do not mean that in an offensive sense. I know there are a number of Members on the other side who oppose this legislation. One Member from Massachusetts made a stirring speech against it, which is printed in full in the RECORD. There are others opposed to it. Nearly every argument offered by two minority Republican members of this committee is a forcible argument against any legislation of this character, and certainly they show it ought not to go into effect for a considerable length of time. Why, by this law you say to the Filipinos, "We are going to make you a home country, we are going to let everything be carried in American vessels." Are you going to let anything be carried in Filipino vessels? Do you allow a single Filipino to engage in the traffic. No; you do not. Why, that smacks of George the Third's policy, when all colonial traffic was confined to English vessels. Do you propose to let our Filipino people trade with this country freely? No; they are barred out like strangers. I want to call your attention especially to the fact that you confine this traffic to American vessels and you are not allowing a Filipino to engage in the business. It seems to me that is the most—I do not know a proper adjective which is parliamentary to characterize it. [Laughter.]

If it be true that "taxation without representation is tyranny," what is legislation of the broadest character covering all the affairs of the islands without representation at all? What Filipino has ever asked for this? What person who has ever spent a year in the Philippine Islands has asked for the legislation or said it would be for their interest? Who is here now to speak for these 10,000,000 people 10,000 miles away? Which of you has any real knowledge of their wants, their desires, or their needs? Are you utterly heedless of their good?

Ought not our first concern to be what is for their benefit, since they are helpless charges in our control across seas without representation, and too far away for their cries to reach this noisy, busy capital, where each one of us is overwhelmed with work for his own district?

But no! We think only of our own. The distant calamity makes faint impression.

We load the burdens on their backs, but give no benefits.

We practically prohibit their profitable trade with the home country and at the same time grasp for ourselves their profitable export trade—the hemp trade. We compel them to pay exorbitant freight charges to American vessels, but won't allow them to engage in the business.

They are home territory for purposes of excluding foreign vessels and a foreign country when they want to sell us tobacco and sugar.

If you were Filipinos, which one of you would vote for this measure? It would not get one single vote in your whole number. Ought not this undoubted fact to condemn it forever?

Let us pause before we take another step in the infamous policy of colonialism, in the destruction of our own moral being, of our own ideals. Let us not deliberately sacrifice "the inalienable rights" of another people.

Are they even granted the right of petition? I do not know whether they are or not, but the late governor of those islands—I admit that they have been fortunate in having such a governor, for the government of those islands would have been a disgraceful scandal by this time if we had not sent there a broad, liberal man of irreproachable character, of gigantic intellect, who set his foot firmly down and administered the government of those islands, as far as he was able, for the good of the Filipinos themselves. He has thereby drawn down upon his head anathemas and to himself the opposition of every American exploiter in the islands, as well as of these ship lobbyists who are around here to-day, and who "camped upon his trail" one day and were in his office for a whole day laboring with him to change his position. But he fought them step by step and told them distinctly that if they were going to impose these burdens upon the Filipinos they ought at least to grant them an entrance to our markets.

His position has not been relaxed except as he was crowded and crowded to say that if this law were delayed for a year or for some years, and if in the meantime Congress would take off the tariffs so that our Philippine trade would bloom and blossom and grow, he would then be in favor of it, but not until then.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCKING. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In this bill is there any provision to require the employment of American labor, or can these protected shipping interests continue to employ the cheap Mongolian labor on the seas?

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is absolutely forbidden one to reveal what transpires in an executive session of a committee or to refer to it on the floor of this House. If so, I have transgressed that rule to-day by stating—though no objection was made to it at the time—that I offered an amendment in the committee barring from these vessels which were to get this great monopoly by this law the cheap Chinese labor; but it was voted down by our Republican friends. The cordage men and merchants say there are not enough ships available to do this business except by taking them away from other profitable business, which would result in extortionate rates. Every vessel which the ship men say is fitted for the business was named, but one after another of them was thrown out by a showing that they were not fit to do the business, that they were engaged in other traffic, that they were carrying oil and could not carry hemp or other products of those islands, or that they drew too much water to go through the Suez Canal, or that they were too small or too old to get insurance. As stated before, I proposed an amendment in committee that these shipowners who were to have this privilege and whose trade was to be made profitable at the expense of the Filipinos and the American people should be required to employ none but Americans or Filipinos. If allowed, I would offer that amendment now.

To answer the question of the gentleman from Nebraska directly, there is nothing in the bill limiting the men to be employed on the vessels to Americans. Every one of the seventeen American vessels now engaged in that Pacific trade is manned by Chinese sailors, except the officers and the watch. My amendment was voted down, as has been stated, and we are not permitted by our Republican friends to offer the amendment now. It seems to me that if these vessel owners are to be benefited American labor should get some benefit from it also. It is well known that our American subsidized steamers which carry the mails are required to carry half of their crews of American citizens, and why ought not an amendment to that effect at least be adopted here, so that these vessels to be thus benefited would not be permitted to be manned by cheap Chinese laborers, who work for one-third or one-fourth of what an American sailor can live upon. [Applause.]

In conclusion, sir, it seems to me a gross outrage that we should pass a law inflicting great injury upon our own manufacturers, who employ thousands of men, and upon our farmers, who must pay higher prices for binding twine; upon our exporting merchants, whose trade will be decreased by the higher freight rates, and especially upon our struggling Filipino people, whose every interest is sacrificed, and who, thousands of miles away, have no one here to speak for them, and who in this mad conflict of American protected interests are utterly forgotten. And for whom is all this done? All for a few rich shipowners who have haunted this building all winter, and who are not willing that a part of the "swag" should go to the American sailor, but insist upon the right to employ the Chinese sailors, and they force our Republican majority here to comply with their demands. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Mr. LUCKING, of the minority of the committee, desires to add the following:

NO LEGISLATION AT ALL IS NECESSARY AT THIS TIME—AS A MATTER OF LAW, COASTWISE ACT DOES NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1904.

Friends of this bill urge its passage on the ground that some legislation is necessary else the coastwise laws will become applicable to the Philippine trade (transoceanic and interisland) on July 1, 1904.

It is admitted that this would be a calamity, and so it is sought to coerce Members into passing this law which does affirmatively enact the obnoxious legislation, although none has heretofore passed.

It has been asserted and assumed that on July 1, 1904, the coastwise laws would go into effect, and it has passed current around the Capitol, but I have been unable to find the responsible author of any such opinion, and a careful examination of the question has convinced me that such opinion is without any foundation whatever.

The act of March 8, 1902, contained the following clause, which was not in the original act, but crept in as a Senate amendment, namely:

"Provided, however, That until July 1, 1904, the provisions of law restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise from one port of the United States to another port of the United States shall not be applicable to foreign vessels engaging in trade between the Philippine Archipelago and the United States or between ports in the Philippine Archipelago."

It is not contended, nor will it be contended by any lawyer, that this clause serves to put the coastwise laws into effect after July 1, 1904, but only to postpone such operation until that date, in case they otherwise would be in effect; nevertheless this language has served to create the impression that the laws would be operative July 1, 1904.

It is said the above clause in the act of 1902 was inserted because a doubt was raised by certain language in the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Huus v. New York Steamship Company* (182 U. S., 392). The words said to create the doubt are:

"At the same time trade with that island is properly a part of the domestic trade of the country since the treaty of annexation, and is so recognized by the Porto Rican or Foraker Act."

That case simply called for a decision of the question whether in 1901 a vessel coming into New York from Porto Rico was engaged in the coastwise trade under the statute of the State of New York relating to pilots. Held, that it was, since Congress in April, 1900, had already enacted that "the coasting trade between Porto Rico and the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the law applicable to two great coasting districts," etc., which is the technical language employed to apply the coastwise act.

No other question was before the court, and it is idle to assert that the fugitive expression above quoted lends any color to the idea that the coastwise laws went into effect automatically, since they had been put into effect by express act of Congress.

But if, standing alone, it could be said to raise a doubt, this doubt is dispelled (1) by the express decisions of the Supreme Court covering the question; (2) by the unbroken practice of this Government in the cases of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska, and (3) by a recent decision of the Attorney-General holding that the coastwise laws do not apply to Guam.

The coastwise law in question reads:

"No merchandise shall be transported by water, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port of the United States to another port of the United States * * * in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States."

The sole question, then, is whether ports of the Philippine Islands are "ports of the United States" under this law, by virtue of the cession of the islands by Spain, and without any legislation by Congress.

(1) This precise question is covered by the United States Supreme Court in the insular cases. They hold that the Philippine Islands are not part of the United States, although belonging to the United States, and that ports of the Philippines are not ports of the United States. We quote a few extracts from the opinion of Mr. Justice Brown, speaking for the court in *Downes v. Bidwell* (182 U. S., pp. 256, 278, 287).

"The very treaty with Spain under discussion in this case contains similar discriminative provisions, which are apparently irreconcilable with the Constitution, if that instrument be held to extend to these islands immediately upon their cession to the United States. By article 4 the United States agree 'for the term of ten years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, to admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States, a privilege not extending to any other ports. It was a clear breach of the uniformity clause in question, and a manifest excess of authority on the part of the commissioners, if ports of the Philippine Islands be ports of the United States."

"In determining the meaning of the words of article 1, section 8, 'uniform throughout the United States,' we are bound to consider not only the provisions forbidding preference being given to the ports of one State over those of another (to which attention has already been called), but the other clauses declaring that no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State, and that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any imposts or duties upon imports or exports, nor any duty on tonnage. The object of all of these was to protect the States which united in forming the Constitution from discriminations by Congress, which would operate unfairly or injuriously upon some States and not equally upon others. * * *

"Thus construed together the purpose is irresistible that the words 'throughout the United States' are indistinguishable from the words 'among or between the several States,' and that these prohibitions were intended to apply only to commerce between ports of the several States as they then existed or should thereafter be admitted to the Union. * * *

"We are therefore of opinion that the island of Porto Rico is a territory appurtenant and belonging to the United States, but not a part of the United States within the revenue clauses of the Constitution."

(2) The unbroken practice of the executive department of this Government in the cases of Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico was not to treat any of their ports as ports of the United States under the coastwise law until Congress by special act in each case made such law operative, which was done, as to Alaska, in July, 1868; as to Hawaii, April 30, 1900, and as to Porto Rico, April 12, 1900.

(3) By a decision of Attorney-General Knox, rendered March 10, 1904, it is held that the coastwise laws do not apply to the island of Guam, and that foreign vessels may engage in trade between the United States and Guam. As Guam was acquired under the same treaty and is relatively located precisely the same as the Philippines, the opinion may be said to be directly in point on the question here considered.

It is clear, therefore, that no member should feel constrained to vote for this bill as it is, or may be amended, under the fear that if no law is passed the coastwise law will be effective July 1, 1904, and serious disaster follow.

ALFRED LUCKING.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIRDSALL]. I understand that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT] will also yield him ten minutes.

Mr. SPIGHT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Ten minutes to be charged to each side.

Mr. BIRDSALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that at the proper time I shall present an amendment to this bill, extending the time when a law shall become operative from 1905 to 1906. I will now yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I am for the bill under consideration because I think its necessity under existing conditions has been demonstrated. If I believed that the coastwise laws of the United States would not extend to the Philippine Islands under the operation of the act of July, 1902, I would oppose this bill. But the impression seems to be quite general in the country, and especially among the administrative officers of the Government, that the coastwise laws will become applicable to Philippine commerce on the 1st day of next July unless some legislation is had to further postpone the date of their operation; and my interpretation of the proviso in the act of July, 1902, is that the courts and the executive department of the Government would be justified in holding that it was the intention of Congress that those laws should become operative on that date.

The proviso is:

That until July 1, 1904, the provisions of law restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers, etc., shall not be applicable.

It is clear that in the enactment of that proviso it was the intention of Congress that the coastwise laws should be applicable after the date mentioned.

I have given this question some investigation, and I have no doubt that the precipitate extension of the coastwise laws of the United States to the Philippine Islands at this time or on the 1st day of July, 1904, would be attended with incalculable disaster. It would paralyze trade among the islands themselves, because there is hardly a craft among the thirty-five hundred that are doing the trade between the islands to-day that would be eligible to register under our navigation laws.

This bill very wisely excepts the interisland trade from the operation of the coastwise laws; and it provides that those laws shall apply to the commerce between the continent and the archipelago on and after the first of July, 1905. The gentleman from Iowa will propose an amendment further postponing the date until July 1, 1906, and I am in favor of that amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] in the course of his remarks took occasion to say that in the extension of the coastwise laws of the United States to the Philippine Archipelago we were pursuing our historical policy in relation to the American merchant marine. If I have studied history aright, Mr. Speaker, we violate in the application of the coastwise laws to the Philippine trade every precedent in our entire history. There is not up to date a single instance where we have applied the coastwise laws to a single foot of our territory upon whose commerce we imposed a substantial customs tariff—not a single instance.

The precedents cited are not in point at all. Before we applied the coastwise laws to Hawaii, Hawaii had free ports in this country. Before we applied the coastwise laws to Porto Rico, she likewise had free ports in this country. Philippine commerce is to-day taxed 75 per cent of the Dingley rates; and it is the judgment of the Philippine Commission that if the coastwise laws shall be extended under present conditions to the Philippine trade, it would practically destroy the commerce between this country and the archipelago. That is the judgment, I understand, of the Philippine Commission as expressed by Judge Taft on repeated occasions. He is in favor of this bill because it postpones for a year longer the day when the coastwise laws shall become operative. He would like it better, I have no doubt, if we should extend the term two or three or four years longer than is now proposed.

I understand his proposition to be this: That if the operation of the navigation laws shall be postponed for one year further, there will be in the meantime an attempt made—possibly a successful attempt—to either repeal the tariff rates upon Philippine commerce or to reduce them to 25 per cent of the Dingley rates.

Mr. SPIGHT. Does the gentleman understand that Governor Taft only agreed to approve the present bill with the understanding that in the meantime there would be a material reduction in the Dingley rates?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand that to be his position. It is that the coastwise laws ought not to be extended to the Philippine Islands until there is practical free trade with those islands. But in view of the fact that in the absence of legislation the coastwise laws will attach on the 1st of next July, he favors this bill because it gives a longer postponement and an additional opportunity to secure the repeal of the tariff laws or a material reduction of them. That I understand to be Judge Taft's position on the question.

Now, the application of the coastwise laws to the Philippine Islands is a natural thing under proper and historical conditions. If we put the commerce of those islands on the same footing on which we put the commerce of Hawaii and Porto Rico when we applied the coastwise laws to those islands, I would say apply the coastwise laws to the Philippine Archipelago. It would be a proper thing to do, and it would be in keeping with our historic policy, as the gentleman from Minnesota has said.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Did the Porto Rican act impose a tariff on Porto Rican products, or did it not; and did not the Porto Rican act impose the coastwise laws upon Porto Rico at the same time that it imposed a differential tariff?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not care to discuss that question. It imposed 15 per cent of the Dingley rates for sixty days, I think.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Longer than that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It was at any rate a very short period.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And it imposed the coastwise laws at the same time.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And the gentleman and myself then agreed that Congress did wrong in that respect.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I think so now.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. We did the very best we could to defeat the enactment of that law. I thought we were right then, and I still think that law did violate fundamental principles of republican government.

Now, there is no denying the fact that the application of the coastwise laws to the Philippine Islands will materially increase

the freight rates between this country and the islands. Seventy-five per cent of the Dingley rates are now imposed upon the commerce of the islands, and nobody knows how much the freight rates will be increased. What benefit in the trade of the United States will the Philippine producer have?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will allow me, I can tell him. Their exports to this country amount to \$13,000,000, and our exports to that country amount to possibly \$1,000,000, and they raise their own supplies.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Their exports to this country amount to \$13,000,000. How does that come about? They desire revenue, and they have an export tax of \$7.50 per ton on hemp as a source of revenue. In order to get that trade we have required them to rebate the export tax on all hemp that comes to the United States. We get the trade at the expense of their treasury. That is the way we get the large export trade we have. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] referred to the fact that while we might give American ships the monopoly of trade between this country and the Philippine Islands they could not abuse it, because he said that foreign boats would carry hemp to Liverpool and English ports, or other ports, and bring it into this country, and that therefore there was no danger of an abuse of that power. Is that true? Hemp is the chief article of import to this country from the Philippine Archipelago.

The cordage people, the importers to this country, have an advantage over foreign hemp dealers of \$7.50 a ton, and our local marine might charge \$4 a ton extra in freight and still give our cordage people an advantage of \$3.50 a ton. There is absolutely no protection. It is our duty to consider the interests of the people of the islands as well as the cordage combination and the shipbuilders and shipowners. We should encourage rather than retard Philippine trade, and we can not do so by adding to its burdens. I am opposed to the extension of our navigation laws until the tariff rates on Philippine trade are materially reduced.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BIRDSALL. Mr. Speaker, in the ten minutes remaining to me I desire to refer briefly to the questions involved in this bill.

Some question has been raised as to the position of the Secretary of War, the former civil governor of the Philippine Islands, upon this matter, and I desire to call attention to his testimony taken before the committee upon that subject. He seemed to be insistent that the coastwise laws of the United States should not be made applicable to the Philippine Islands until there was a condition practically of free trade between the Archipelago and the United States.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What page of the hearing are you going to read from?

Mr. BIRDSALL. Page 93. In answer to the following question propounded to Secretary Taft:

It is not probable that any law limiting the oceanic trade between the United States and the Philippines to American vessels would increase the trade between the United States and the Philippines without a reduction of tariff?

Secretary Taft replied:

No, sir; it is very certain—I say it is very certain, in my judgment—that the adoption of a law like this would practically destroy all the trade there is between the United States and the Philippine Islands, except the hemp trade, which would have the advantage of \$7.40 in rebate. I am speaking of the conditions of the coastwise laws and the application of the coastwise laws to the trans-Pacific trade. The trade is now something like \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, and the reason why I think it would destroy it is this: That trade grows up in competition with the trade between the Philippine Islands and Europe.

I am told that it is impossible for the American ships to carry goods as cheaply as European vessels. There is sharp competition, and unless the American vessels should come down to something like European rates, as they can not, I am told, then that trade will be gradually destroyed, because the Philippines have the opportunity to buy where they choose, and they are likely to buy where the things are cheapest. On the other hand, if you offer a market for the Philippine goods—that is, Philippine sugar and tobacco, and all the world is trying to get into the market of the United States—then you do offer to them a motive for using the American bottoms which you may require to be used for the transportation of tobacco and sugar.

In another place in his examination before the committee the Secretary said that if the coastwise laws were to be applied the Philippines should be treated as entitled to the same benefit of protection as the merchants, manufacturers, and producers of the United States had under the protective acts.

Now, upon the question of rates, this bill is urged, as has been suggested upon the other side, solely by one interest, the shipping interest. For myself, I do not desire to be arrayed against the upbuilding of the American merchant marine. I am ready to support any measure which, in my judgment, tends honestly and reasonably in that direction, but I do believe that the application of these laws under existing conditions would give to the shipping interest of this country a practical if not absolute monopoly of the trade between the United States and the Philippines.

It was suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] that there would be built up an actual competition which

would keep down the rate of carriage between this country and the Philippine Islands. Now, upon the hearings before the committee several of us undertook to ascertain how much of an increase, if any, there would be in the freight, and the best information that we could get upon the subject—and that from one gentleman alone, representing the shipping interests—was that there would be a minimum increase of at least \$3 per ton; and he was not willing to bind even those parties whom he represented to contract to carry hemp at that rate. Once these coast laws are applied, under existing conditions, with the volume of our export trade to the Philippines now of only three or four millions of dollars; it gives, I say, to the shipowners of this country practically if not absolutely the power to dictate the freight or the carrying charges upon the products of the Philippine Islands to this country.

Ninety-eight per cent of the export trade of the Philippine Islands last year was manila hemp. If their trade is to be made profitable to the shipowner at all under existing conditions, it must be made by an increase in the rate of carriage upon that particular product of the islands. Now, they concede that at the outset there must be an increase in the carriage rate of \$3 per ton. I say, and I honestly believe, that it will be the highest rate of carriage that the traffic will bear. The competition to be expected is a competition over a great distance of 12,000 or 15,000 miles, a competition which may be supposed, and only such in fact as will arise between people desiring a common purpose, namely, an increased rate of carriage.

I say, and I think it can be safely said, that we may expect such an increase of the carrying charges as the traffic will bear, only limited by the competition that will arise between the Philippine Islands by way of London or foreign ports. Now, the very effect, in my judgment, of the application of this law will be to drive the hemp trade from New York and Boston to London. It was there prior to the act of March 8, 1902, by which a rebate was given upon the export duty on hemp from the Philippine Islands of \$7.60 a ton. That rebate, together with the competition in the carrying trade, transferred the control of the world's market in hemp to the United States which theretofore had been in London; and while in 1901 we shipped by way of London some 225,414 bales of manila hemp, in the year 1903 it was reduced to only 13,186 bales. We now control that market; and it is important not only to the cordage interests, but important to every farmer of the United States who uses binding twine to have the control of that market maintained here. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BIRDSALL. I have set forth in a minority report my views on this subject, and I ask leave to print them as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LACEY). Leave has already been given.

The views of the minority, by Mr. BIRDSALL, are as follows:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries having reported Senate bill No. 2259, entitled "An act to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago," with favorable recommendation, and the undersigned members of said committee being unable to concur in said report and such recommendation respectfully submit to the House the following matters relating thereto for its consideration:

The bill as reported provides:

"SECTION 1. That on and after July 1, 1905, no merchandise except supplies for the Army or Navy shall be transported by sea, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, directly or by way of a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

"SEC. 2. That on and after July 1, 1905, no foreign vessel shall transport passengers between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, either directly or by way of a foreign port, under a penalty of \$20 for each passenger so transported and landed."

The effect of this bill will be to apply the coastwise laws of the United States to the trade between the islands and the mainland of the United States on and after July 1, 1905.

Whether ultimately the Philippine Islands should become and be made a great coasting district of the United States must depend upon the eventual policy of the United States with respect to them. The question is whether, under existing circumstances, it is either wise or politic to apply the coastwise laws of this country at the present time, or as early as July 1, 1905.

The act of Congress approved March 8, 1902, provided that until July 1, 1904, the provisions of law restricting to vessels of the United States transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from one port of the United States to another port of the United States shall not be applicable to foreign vessels engaging in trade between the Philippine Archipelago and the United States or between ports in the Philippine Archipelago. Congress at that time felt that it would be unwise to apply our coastwise laws to the island traffic at that time, first, because it was contrary to our announced intention of maintaining the "open-door" policy in the Orient, and, second, because the American tonnage was not deemed sufficient to insure prompt service and competition that would secure stable and reasonable rates of carriage.

We are informed, and believe it to be true, that the shipping interest which is now pressing vigorously for this bill practically gave Congress to understand that by the expiration of the time of the suspension of the act—namely, July 1, 1904—a sufficient amount of shipping would be added to the American tonnage as to secure beyond controversy the essential element of competition in the trans-Atlantic trade. Whether such an understanding existed or not, the fact remains that no increase in tonnage has been made, not a single ship's keel has been laid for this business, and the available ton-

nage is not greater, or materially greater, than it was at the date of the passage of the act of March 8, 1902.

To our minds the important elements for consideration are the effect of the pending bill upon the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands and the American consumer to which the interest of the shipowner is or should be an incident only, and in saying this we do not array ourselves against the upbuilding of the merchant marine, for the benefit of which we are ready to support any measure appealing to reason and honesty.

The inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are our wards, to the uplifting of whom we should apply the most generous treatment which wise statesmanship can invent. We must cement them to us not only by wise political action but by a generous commercial policy having their interests first at heart. Such has been the wise policy of the conduct of our civil governor and commissioners in the past; such it should continue to be until the bonds of affection and interest alike unite them indissolubly to us.

At the present time both the trade between these islands and the mainland of the United States and the trade between ports in these islands are open to the vessels of the world, irrespective of flags or owners. If this bill passes in its present form, then on and after July 1, 1905, such trade must be carried exclusively in American bottoms.

The effect will be to create in favor of the shipowner of America an absolute monopoly of the carrying trade between the United States and the Philippine Archipelago, and we call attention to the fact also that such monopoly will be without any limitation or restriction whatever, save and except such as may be supposed will be created by competition among members of a class, all equally benefited by maintaining a high rate of carriage.

Let us look at the question a moment from the standpoint of the Filipino. The archipelago contains a population, in round numbers, of 8,000,000 people, a large percentage of which consists of semicivilized tribes. Agriculture is practically the sole pursuit of the people and must remain so probably for years to come, and the future of the islands rests largely in the intelligent development of their agricultural resources. The principal exports of the islands are hemp, sugar, and tobacco. The report of the Philippine Commission for 1903 states the exports of the islands in the following proportions for the years 1902 and 1903:

Articles.	1902.	1903.
Hemp	\$15,841,816	\$21,701,575
Copra	1,001,656	4,473,029
Sugar	2,761,432	3,955,568
Tobacco and cigars	2,501,307	1,882,012
Miscellaneous	1,821,908	1,109,596

According to the same report the imports for the fiscal year 1903 amounted to a total of \$41,072,738, of which \$8,652,648 was silver coin, and gold to the value of \$278,248. Excluding silver coin and gold, the total merchandise imported for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, amounted to \$32,141,842, whereas the total merchandise exported amounted to \$23,927,679, leaving a balance of trade against the islands of \$8,214,163.

For the year ending June 30, 1903, the total imports were \$35,099,241, which included silver coin, \$2,077,137, and gold, \$50,222, leaving the total merchandise imported for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, \$32,971,882. The total exports for the year ending June 30, 1903, amounted to \$29,668,368, of which \$6,598,106 was silver and \$180,480 gold, leaving a balance of merchandise exported of \$33,121,780, a balance of trade in favor of the islands for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, of \$149,898. There is encouragement to believe that the commerce of the islands will further increase, much to their benefit, if no restrictions are put upon it. There are three great trunk lines of human industry, the producer, the transporter, and the consumer, and the element of transportation and cost of exchange are the controlling elements affecting the trade of nations.

In the Philippine Islands there is no home demand for the products of the soil which can enter in any material degree in determining the value of their products. They must dispose not only of a surplus, but practically of the entire product of the soil to foreign nations. Cheap and adequate transportation between the islands and the purchasers of their products is, therefore, vitally necessary to the successful development of their resources, and any measure tending to restrict freedom of trade in this regard should not be permitted. The United States is to-day the largest purchaser of the exports of the Philippine Islands, and the bulk of such purchases come from the ports of the archipelago to American ports without transshipment from foreign ports.

The report of the Bureau of Statistics shows that the total shipment of domestic merchandise from the United States to the Philippine Islands for seven months ending January, 1903, amounted to \$2,268,858, and for the seven months ending January, 1904, to \$2,558,788, which was carried for the periods named in the following vessels:

	1902.	1903.
American steam vessels	\$988,579	\$981,751
American sailing vessels	77,420	86,753
Foreign vessels	1,732,857	1,801,763

These shipments were made from the following customs districts:

	1902.	1903.
New York	\$1,242,042	\$1,202,021
Norfolk and Portsmouth	22,510	91,675
Hawaii	53	2,606
Humboldt, Cal	12,315	
Puget Sound	314,452	984,725
San Francisco	595,550	525,050
Willamette, Oreg	29,356	64,092
Detroit, Mich		715
North and South Dakota	50,373	37,804
Oswegatchie, N. Y	2,090	
Vermont	117	

The total imports into the United States from the Philippines for the seven months ending January, 1903, amounted to \$6,535,290, of which \$6,390,298 was manila hemp. For the seven months ending January, 1904, the total imports into the United States from the Philippines amounted to \$7,784,073, of which \$6,933,279 was manila hemp.

This merchandise was imported into the following customs districts:

	1902.	1903.
Baltimore, Md.	\$123	\$87
Boston and Charlestown, Mass.	3,340,373	2,226,042
Georgetown, D. C.		14
New Haven, Conn.		75
New York	2,746,710	4,227,547
Norfolk and Portsmouth.		14
Philadelphia	199	
Hawaii	1,051	5,683
Los Angeles	49	
Puget Sound		325,568
San Francisco	306,574	299,348
Willamette, Oreg.	140,183	131,611
Chicago, Ill.	23	527,539
Minnesota		39,216
Cincinnati, Ohio		10
Denver, Colo.		50
Kansas City, Mo.		28
Nashville, Tenn.	5	
St. Joseph, Mo.		24
St. Louis, Mo.		1,217

It will be seen that the great proportion of the imports was manila hemp, this item alone constituting 90 per cent of the total imports.

Prior to March, 1902, the world's market for manila hemp was in London. It has been transferred, under the operation of the act of Congress of March 8, 1902, to the United States, which now controls the world's market on the article. By that act a rebate of three-eighths of 1 cent per pound was allowed American importers on hemp shipped direct from the Philippines. This amounted in effect to offset the export duty levied in the Philippines of \$7.40 per ton.

In 1901 the imports of hemp direct from the Philippines amounted to 158,770 bales, and the imports for the same year from Great Britain to the United States amounted to 225,414 bales. In 1902 the imports direct were 305,790 bales and the imports from Great Britain, 112,557 bales. In 1903 the imports direct were 529,984 bales and the imports from Great Britain, 13,186 bales.

The current rate of freight from Manila to Boston or New York during the year 1903 has been on the average 45 cents per hundred pounds, or \$9 per ton. This rate, with the rebate of three-eighths of a cent per pound—practically equivalent to the export duty levied in the Philippines—has enabled the United States to control the world's market in manila hemp. The Canadian government has passed a bill authorizing the payment of a bounty to any corporation, firm, etc., manufacturing binding twine in Canada, such bounty to be equal to the amount paid as export duty in the Philippine Islands on manila fiber produced in those islands and used in the manufacture of binding twine in Canada, providing the bounty shall not exceed three-eighths of 1 cent per pound on manila fiber. This places the Canadian importer upon practically the same footing as the American and will enable the manufacturers of that country to enter our market as seller of binding twine the moment the market here will afford them any advantage in so doing.

The desire of the American shipowner to secure this monopoly of the Philippine trade rests in the prospect of an increase in freight rates over existing rates, with which it is claimed they can not now compete.

Upon the hearing before the committee a representative of ship interests was questioned in regard to the probable increase in freight rates and stated there must be at least \$3 per ton immediate advance over present rates, but refused to bind the shipping interest or even those he had authority to act for to contract at that rate. We believe that we are safe in assuming that the rate will be increased considerably beyond \$3 per ton to all Atlantic ports, and at least to a point equal to the rate now made by way of the Pacific coast and transcontinental railroads to Chicago, which is 75 cents per ton.

That we may expect shipowners to make the best of their bargain is demonstrated in the statement made before the committee by Mr. Luckenbach, one of their number, in response to the following queries:

"Mr. BIRDSALL. You in the shipping business anticipate an increase in the current rate of freight to your advantage if these coastwise laws are extended, do you not?"

"Mr. LUCKENBACH. Yes, sir.

"Mr. BIRDSALL. Can you give me any idea of the percentage of that increase?"

"Mr. LUCKENBACH. No, sir; I can not do that. There are a good many conditions there to be considered. We have got to figure against almost 5 tons of vessels offering for every ton of merchandise. The competition will be very great. I do not anticipate much of an advance.

"Mr. BIRDSALL. Where is the compensating advantage to you in this law?"

"Mr. LUCKENBACH. There will not be any very great advance.

"Mr. BIRDSALL. Who pays that advance?"

"Mr. LUCKENBACH. I think that comes out of the consumer.

"Mr. BIRDSALL. But you can not give me any idea of what this percentage of increase will be?"

"Mr. LUCKENBACH. No, sir; we will have to meet American competition.

"Mr. BIRDSALL. It will depend entirely on the competition?"

"Mr. LUCKENBACH. Yes, sir; among American vessels.

"Mr. MARVIN. I would like to ask you, Mr. Luckenbach, whether, besides the possible increase in freight rates, it is not an advantage that you are guaranteed a certain employment. The point was made here yesterday by other shipowners that what they valued most was not higher rates, but employment and the volume of trade.

"Mr. LUCKENBACH. No, sir; I do not agree with our friend. He represents a stock company and I do not. We are not in this business for our health. We do not receive large salaries as presidents, or secretaries, or treasurers, and so on. We do this business for our living, not for love."

It is also to be regarded as a significant fact that while an increase in freight charges would unquestionably ensue, not a shipowner was willing to make an estimate thereof with the exception of one gentleman, who named a minimum of at least \$3 per ton over current rates.

In fact, with the only element of competition voluntarily resulting from a monopoly in the business we should expect to see as high a rate of freights as the traffic would bear. Any material advancement in freight would naturally and inevitably result in the shipment of hemp by other than American ships to foreign ports, presumably to London, which would again secure control of the world's market. It is of the greatest importance to the American manufacturer and consumer that the control of the world's product of manila hemp be retained in this country. The cost of cordage used in commerce and binding twine to the farmer of this country depends upon the cost of the raw material, and the largest single element of such cost is the item of transportation. Any advancement in this item will immediately be reflected in

the burden cast upon the consumer. Indeed, it has been one of the arguments used by the shipowners in favor of this bill that the price to the producer in the Philippine Islands would not be affected; that the manufacturers of cordage and binding twine would not be affected, because they could add the increased cost of transportation to the cost of the manufacture and increase by so much the cost to the consumer, thus securing their usual profit.

The net result of this reasoning, the conclusions to be drawn from which are irresistible, is that the "man with the hoe" must bear the burden of furnishing profitable employment to the shipping industry of the country.

The great per cent of binding twine used in the country is made from sisal grass imported from Mexico, but the production is not sufficient to supply all the twine needed, and about 240,000 bales of manila hemp are annually manufactured into binding twine to supply the deficiency. In consequence of this fact the price of all binding twine is ruled by the price of manila hemp, and an advance in the cost of that article means an additional burden upon every farmer throughout the country who uses binding twine.

We do not believe it is a wise policy to build up a special industry in this country at the expense of another industry upon which the burden of government is now so heavily cast. Nor do we believe that it is a wise policy to treat our island possessions as legitimate prey for commercial piracy. If our merchant marine can not be fostered in any other manner, it deserves to fail.

As we have seen, the principal import from the Philippines is manila hemp, used in the manufacture of cordage and binding twine. The districts of manufacture may be approximately stated as follows: On the Pacific coast, 5 per cent; in Chicago and adjacent territory, 20 per cent, and on the Atlantic coast, 75 per cent. It is claimed, and we believe with good reason, that the enactment of the pending bill and the resultant increase in freight rates would operate to the material disadvantage of the cordage manufacturers of the Atlantic coast. Upon this subject the facts can be tersely stated.

Our imports from the Philippines under the system of duties which we impose are almost confined to manila hemp, which is imported free of duty and exempt from an export tax imposed upon that going to other countries. Under this discrimination, in regard to the export tax, the hemp trade has been largely transferred to this country direct instead of being carried by way of England, and by dint of low freights our cordage and twine makers are able to supply the country and to export their product.

It is their plea, and it seems to be irrefutable, that to give to American vessels the monopoly they ask for would of necessity so raise the cost of transportation as seriously to injure, if not to destroy, their business on the Atlantic coast. The only competition would be by the Pacific route and across the continent by rail, and on that a rate has already been made with which the American ships could in all probability not successfully compete on the Atlantic and by way of the Suez. If continued, while cheaper rates by Suez and Atlantic were removed, it would be calculated to draw the cordage manufacturing to the West, while so increasing its cost as to curtail it materially. Relieved from foreign competition, the Pacific as well as Atlantic rates would be increased. The increased freight charges would more than offset the rebate of the export tax and send the hemp trade that has been coming to New York and Boston back to London. The material would in that case be shipped from Manila and Cebu to Europe in foreign vessels, and such as we used here would be bought in London and shipped here in foreign vessels.

But, however American industries may be affected by the intended legislation, we believe the controlling question should be the consideration of the Philippines themselves. Anything else implies a cold-blooded indifference to their well-being and their relation to our Government. Their productions being tropical, their development depends upon foreign trade. An increase in their production means an increase in surplus for exportation, for which they must take products of other countries. As we have already stated, nothing affects the course of foreign trade to increase or diminish its volume or change the course of its direction so much as the cost of transportation and exchange. If the rate of transportation be increased to this country, it will tend strongly to repress the trade and discourage any American influence in developing the islands. The inevitable result, in our opinion, will be to confine their industries, and internal trade and foreign commerce as well, in the hands of Europeans, who virtually control them now.

We believe a broad and liberal policy should prevail; that commerce should be as free and unrestricted as possible between the islands and the United States, now the parent Government; that as soon as practicable the burdens of our tariff should be made as light as possible upon the products of the islands. Such a policy will, in our judgment, tend to the upbuilding of our dependency, to its advantage and our own benefit. It will tend to cement the bond which Governor Taft and the Commission have studiously cultivated. Any other policy, and especially such as is contemplated in this bill, will amount to a sacrifice of duty toward our helpless dependency. We believe the judgment and opinion of those men who are now and have been upon the ground and in touch with affairs should have great force in determining the question involved, and beg to call attention thereto.

We quote the following extract from the second special report of Mr. Morgan Shuster, collector of customs for the Philippine Islands, for the period ending October 8, 1903. He says:

"In seeking a basis for immediate legislation by Congress on this subject it may be safely premised that no course should be adopted which will place any additional burden in the way of freight on Philippine products shipped either locally or to the mainland territory for some years to come. For a similar reason no law should be passed which will appreciably increase the freight rates from the mainland territory to these islands. Cheap and adequate transportation between the mainland territory and these islands and between Philippine ports is vitally necessary to successful development here. At the present time the greater part of the freight traffic between the Philippines and New York is carried on in foreign bottoms. So far as indications go, any law which prevented the continuance of that trade in foreign bottoms until an equal tonnage of cheaply operated American freighters are actually available to take up that trade and maintain healthy rate competition, would result in a decided increase over the present rates of freight. This additional burden would fall upon the already weakened resources of these islands, and such a result would be more than lamentable from every standpoint. The tonnage now plying between these islands and the Pacific coast is about equal to the present freight supply, and no change in the present law seems advisable so far as trans-Pacific routes are concerned.

"It is therefore earnestly recommended that the present laws, so far as they permit foreign bottoms to trade between these islands and the mainland territory of the United States, be not changed for a period of at least five years from July 1, 1904, and that positive legislation to that effect be had by Congress at an early date."

The following appears in the report of the Philippine Commission, Fourth Annual Report, 1903, on page 10, among the recommendations made for legislation by Congress:

"Sixth. That the application of the United States coastwise-navigation laws to the trade between the Philippine Islands and the mainland of the United States be postponed by Congressional action until July 1, 1909, or in the alternative, that the coastwise laws of the United States be not made applicable to the trade between the islands and the mainland of the United States except with a proviso or condition that the rates upon imports from

the Philippine Islands into the United States shall not pay duty in excess of 25 per cent of the rates on such merchandise imposed by the Dingley tariff."

On pages 7 and 8 of the same report we find the following:
"The operation of the coastwise-trade laws of the United States, in respect to trade between the islands of the Philippine Archipelago and to trade between those islands and the mainland of the United States, have been suspended by act of Congress until July 1, 1904. If Congress were to take no action, and to allow the coastwise-navigation laws to become applicable to the interisland trade of these islands and to the trade between the islands and the United States as they now are, most disastrous results would follow. It is earnestly recommended that the regulation of the coastwise trade, so far as it relates to the trade between the islands of the Philippine Archipelago, be left wholly to the discretion of the Philippine Commission, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War and the President of the United States, and that the trade between the islands and the mainland of the United States be continued as at present by suspending the application of the trading laws of the United States for five years longer, to wit, until July 1, 1909. The reasons for this recommendation will be found set forth in the report of the civil governor, and still more in detail in the reports of the secretary of finance and justice, and the reports of the insular collector of customs, Mr. W. Morgan Shuster."

"Since the above was written it has come to the knowledge of the commission that a bill has been introduced in Congress applying the coastwise law to trade between the islands and the mainland of the United States. The danger from this of increasing the freight rates and thus imposing an additional burden upon the trade of the islands must be obvious to anyone who has examined the facts with respect to the percentage of the business now done between the islands and the mainland of the United States in American bottoms. The commission, of course, can not present any objection to legislation which shall unite more closely the Philippine Islands with the United States in bonds of amity and mutually beneficial business relations, but it most urgently and earnestly invites your attention, and that of Congress, to the great injustice which will be done to the islands if the law which limits the means of communication to American bottoms between the United States and the Philippine Islands does not at the same time and as a consideration for this interference with the natural laws of trade and the necessary increase of freight rates, strike down the tariff wall made by the Dingley tariff in the matter of the importation of sugar and tobacco from the islands to the mainland."

"The people of the islands may well ask, 'What advantage are we to get out of association with the United States in a business way if our trade is to be used only for the purpose of increasing the business of American ships, while the limitation of the coastwise laws by increasing the freight rates will reduce the business that we now have with that country?'"

"Does not every consideration of justice require that if the Philippine Islands are to be treated as a part of the United States and subject to the coastwise laws, they should enjoy the same freedom of trade with the United States which is enjoyed by every other part of the United States to which those coastwise laws are made applicable?"

"We respectfully urge, therefore, that as a condition and as a consideration for making the trade between the islands and the United States coastwise trade, the duty on sugar and tobacco should be reduced to not more than 25 per cent of the Dingley rates."

That Secretary Taft has not changed his views upon the subject since returning to this country is shown by his statement before the committee in the hearings on the pending bill, from which we quote the following (on p. 101 of the hearing):

"Mr. SMALL. Then, in your opinion, the extension of the coastwise laws should be delayed until 1909, and in the meantime Congress could pass legislation reducing the tariff down to 10 per cent or removing the tariff?"

"Secretary TAFT. I want to avoid this act going into effect until we have a chance at the tariff. I talked with Senator LODGE about it, whose bill this is, I think. I tried to get all I could and said to him, 'Give us until 1905, and give us an opportunity to make an appeal on the subject of the tariff and we would try to be satisfied.' I do not want to be regarded as breaking any agreement that I may have had with him as to my attitude in the matter, if that has any importance at all, but what I am very anxious to do is to present to Congress—to both Houses—the fairness of a give-and-take proposition; that if you are going to apply the protection theory to us you give us the benefit of the protection theory. I am aware that gentlemen think that we will never get a reduction of tariff through Congress. I do not know whether we will or not, but I believe in the fairness of Congress and the American people, and we are going to keep agitating it from our Philippine standpoint as long as we can."

On page 93 of the hearing:

"Mr. SMALL. It is not probable that any law limiting the oceanic trade between the United States and the Philippines to American vessels would increase the trade between the United States and the Philippines without a reduction of tariff?"

"Secretary TAFT. No, sir; it is very certain—I say it is very certain, in my judgment—that the adoption of a law like this would practically destroy all the trade there is between the United States and the Philippine Islands, except the hemp trade, which would have the advantage of \$7.40 in rebate. I am speaking of the conditions of the coastwise laws and the application of the coastwise laws to the trans-Pacific trade. The trade is now something like \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, and the reason why I think it would destroy it is this: That trade grows up in competition with the trade between the Philippine Islands and Europe. I am told it is impossible for the American ships to carry goods as cheaply as European vessels. There is sharp competition, and unless the American vessels should come down to something like European rates, as they can not, I am told, then that trade will be gradually destroyed, because the merchants in the Philippines have the opportunity to buy where they choose, and they are liable to buy where things are the cheapest. On the other hand, if you offer a market for the Philippine goods—that is, Philippine sugar and tobacco, and all the world is trying to get into the market of the United States—then you do offer them a motive for using the American bottoms which you may require to be used for the transportation of tobacco and sugar."

We therefore recommend that the pending bill be so amended as to postpone the application of so much thereof as applies the coastwise laws of the United States to the trade between the Philippines and the United States mainland to a date not earlier than July 1, 1906, or to a later date, if conditions seem to require it.

Respectfully submitted.

B. P. BIRDSALL.
WM. H. FLACK.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, in the two minutes yielded to me I will barely have time to express my convictions on one point, and that is as to the disastrous effect this legislation will have upon the interests of the farmers of our State. The farmers of Minnesota use annually in the neighborhood of 10,000,000 pounds of binding twine, sometimes much more and never less. I differ with

my friend and colleague from the Fourth district about the proportion of manila twine they use. As I am informed, I venture to say that in ordinary seasons, and with normal prices, about one-third of the twine consumed is manila twine, sometimes not more than 25 per cent. The inevitable effect of this legislation—which will necessarily double the freight charges—will be to increase the cost of the manila fiber not less than a dollar a hundred. We manufacture binding twine in our State prison. We can buy manila in the Philippine Islands and lay it down at Stillwater at from 95 cents to \$1.05 per hundred for freight; but I venture the prediction that if this bill becomes law, and when it goes into operation, the freight on that same hemp will cost us at least \$1.75 to \$3 per hundred. I want to serve notice now—and I say this for the benefit of the farmers of our State—that when they find that they have to pay 75 cents to a dollar more for their twine they can trace the source of the increased price to the monopoly granted by this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIND. Can I have one minute more?

Mr. SPIGHT. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. LIND. I am not representing a farming constituency now, as I was when I battled for free binding twine before in this House, but I am representing part of the great State of Minnesota, and the State of Minnesota in its sovereign capacity, or rather in its capacity as the business manager of the industry of one of its most important institutions, is interested in this question. So I am justified in speaking. We manufacture from six to seven million pounds of binding twine annually; in fact, we are the only competitor in the Northwest, and I presume in the land, of the cordage trust. I can not help feeling that this resolution is wholly and solely and inevitably for the benefit of the vessel owners and the cordage trust, and no one else. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman had only happened to mention that about 90 per cent of the binding twine used in the United States is not made out of manila hemp, but made out of sisal grass, he would have shown a better knowledge of the situation. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD].

Mr. LIND. Before the gentleman sits down, will he yield for a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. LIND. Is it not true that the prices of manila hemp, jute, and sisal rise and fall sympathetically; that they are competing products used for the same purpose? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Send up manila hemp, and up go jute and sisal.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; it is true that the question of the importation of manila as binding twine has no perceptible effect upon the price of binding twine in this country.

Mr. LIND. But, Mr. Speaker, continuing under the leave granted me by the House, I shall elaborate on the proposition contained in the pending bill more fully. Recurring to the question of binding twine, it is a well-known fact that the twine manufactured from the manila fiber is not only the best, but it establishes the price standard for all twines in the market. If manila is high, as suggested a moment ago, sisal and other twines are high. If manila is low, the price of the other fibers is lowered accordingly. Hence any condition that raises the price of manila raises the price of all binding twines.

The Philippine government imposes an export duty of 75 cents per 100 kilos on all hemp exported from the Philippine Islands. This amount of duty is equivalent to about \$7.60 per ton. Before the Philippine planter can sell his manila hemp he must pay \$7.60 per ton export tax for the privilege of doing so. This, however, applies only to exports to other countries than the United States. By an act of Congress this export duty is remitted on sales to the United States; consequently citizens of the United States buying manila in the Philippines have the advantage over those of other nations to the amount of \$7.60 per ton. This has been of vast benefit to the cordage trust in the United States, which is the principal—I might almost say the sole—purchaser of manila fiber in the United States, and as a result the greater share of the manila trade of the world has been transferred from England to New York.

I will not say that the people of the United States have not had some portion of the benefit of this rebate, for I think they have, although the trust has undoubtedly appropriated the "lion's share," but under this bill, which prohibits the vessels of all other nations from engaging in the carrying trade between the United States and the Philippines, American vessels are given an absolute monopoly, and it is conceded even by the advocates of the bill that it will raise freight rates, variously estimated, from 30 to 75 per cent. The cordage trust, notwithstanding its advantage of \$7.60 per ton in buying the fiber, was not wholly reconciled to the plan of conferring this monopoly upon American vessel

owners, but Governor Taft, in his testimony before the committee in answer to questions put by Members of the House, demonstrated how the trust could protect itself by adding the increased freight rates to the price of the product.

I quote from the testimony the following:

Mr. BIRDSALL. Suppose there should be a material increase in the freight from the Philippines to the United States, would not that have the effect of transferring the trade to London?

Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir; but there is a margin of from \$8 to \$12 by which the trade might be retained.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Then it would not be expected to go to London until that margin had been reached?

Secretary TAFT. No, sir.

Thus, it will be seen that by the monopoly granted by this bill there is a margin of \$7.60 per ton to be appropriated by the vessel owners and the cordage trust on such terms as they may agree upon before the point of outside competition is reached. The fact that the interests of the Philippine treasury, as well as our own farmers, are ignored does not seem to influence the advocates of this measure.

One can not read the testimony taken before the committee without being impressed by the deplorable fact that the only interests that received any consideration at the hands of the committee were the vessel owners and the cordage trust. The rights and interests of the Filipinos and the American consumers were not taken into account and barely referred to.

I shall print with my remarks the first three sections of the pending bill, which relate to the subject under discussion.

If our legislation were such that we could reasonably expect to develop our trade relations with the Philippine Islands, if Congress had shown the least disposition to comply with the recommendations of Secretary Taft to remove or at least reduce the tariff against Philippine products, I should vote for this bill with pleasure. There would then be some justification for extending our coastwise navigation laws to the Philippines.

When we extended our coastwise laws to Alaska, to Hawaii, and to Porto Rico, we had already established free trade between the United States and those outlying possessions, or conferred it by the same act that extended our navigation laws; but by this bill, without reducing or repealing the tariff on Philippine products, we say that such trade as may exist in spite of the tariff (and it will necessarily be confined largely to the importation of manila fiber), shall be monopolized by the American vessel owners.

We prohibit the Filipino vessel owner from carrying the products of his own industry, of his own country, to our shores. No such enormity has been proposed by the legislation of any governing country since the days of the American Revolution.

This bill is in effect a ship-subsidy measure, except that instead of paying the subsidy out of the United States Treasury it is taken in part from the Philippine treasury and in part to be borne by the American consumer.

Had this bill provided a direct subsidy to American vessel owners, I doubt very much whether the Republican leaders would have ventured to bring it forward just before the Presidential election. The other subsidy propositions, we have been informed, are to rest until the short session of Congress.

But I want to embrace this opportunity to reiterate my oft-expressed conviction that there is no justification for any form of ship subsidies, at least so long as we pursue our present policy of trade restriction. If I have heard it once, I have heard it a score of times from the lips of Republican members on this floor during the present session that every importation of foreign products or foreign goods, although taken in exchange for our own products, is a misfortune and a calamity.

One may well ask if it be a national misfortune for a vessel to bring a cargo of foreign products or of foreign goods to our shores to be exchanged for our own productions. Then, why tax the people by subsidies to invite misfortune? Upon what "stand-pat" principle can you justify a policy that, if it effects any result, it will be to put more vessels in commission and to bring more foreign products and more foreign goods? How can our Republican friends escape the inconsistency of advocating more vessels and more cargoes when they deprecate as a national calamity every cargo that is landed? Do they intend paying subsidies for carrying ballast? Their position makes logical the generous solicitude of the fond mother in the song of our boyhood days:

Mother, may I go out to swim?

Yes, my darling daughter.

Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,

But don't go near the water.

If we want to make it profitable for American ships to engage in the Philippine trade, let us give them work to do; let us give them cargoes to carry. We could well use the Philippine sugar, tobacco, and other products against which we now maintain an insurmountable tariff wall.

If we owed obligations of duty to Cuba, we owe such obligations in an infinitely greater degree to the Filipinos. While

colonists of Spain the Filipinos had untrammelled access to the Spanish market with their sugar, with their tobacco, and their other products. They have been excluded from that market and are deprived of access to ours. If we would make them customers for our products, our flour, our meats, and our industrial goods, we must take theirs. They have no stores of cash to pay for our goods. They can only take them by exchanging their own, and that, as was well expressed by the late President McKinley, is the law of all trade.

In its first annual report the Philippine Commission had hoped that the 25 per cent reduction of the Dingley tariff would help Philippine trade. The second annual report, in 1901, demanded of Congress a 50 per cent reduction.

In its third annual report, 1902, the commission urged "the reduction of at least 75 per cent of the Dingley rates of duties upon goods imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands."

On pages 6 and 7 the commission presents the following argument in support of its position:

Second. We urge the reduction of the duties imposed on goods and merchandise imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands so as to make them not more than 25 per cent of the duties imposed by the Dingley law. The reduction of only 25 per cent, and the absurdly small effect of that reduction upon the trade between the islands and the United States, shown in the collection of little more than \$11,000 of duties in five months, demonstrates that if any benefit at all is to be conferred upon the Philippine Islands by such action the percentage of reduction must be largely increased.

We feel confident that a reduction of 75 per cent will not result in a dumping upon the American market of either tobacco or other commodities so as perceptibly to affect that market; while, on the other hand, the ability to sell in the markets of the United States will be of the greatest encouragement to the woefully depressed agriculture of the Philippine Islands, under the conditions which we have described. The reduction of 25 per cent, instead of being an aid to us in winning the good will of the Philippine people, if it is not followed now by further reductions, will lead them to believe that we are merely going through the form of a concession, which amounts in fact to no concession at all; that the United States is merely "keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope."

Listen to the commission again as to the amount of the reduction required to give urgent relief:

We think that a 50 per cent reduction will not give any substantial relief, and that nothing short of 75 per cent will accomplish a useful purpose. It is a mistake to suppose that the severance of these islands from Spain has made no difference in the markets to which their tobacco and sugar growers may look. On the contrary, with the separation from Spain, the sugar and tobacco growers have been deprived of markets which were of great assistance to them, and it seems only fair and just that the United States should substitute its own markets for the Spanish markets.

That was the condition in 1902. Civil Governor William H. Taft, chairman of the commission, furnishes in a separate report the following facts touching the depths of the industrial depression for which relief was prayed: War and pestilence had destroyed 90 per cent of the carabaos, the draft animals of the islands, with which agriculture, and rice culture in particular, was conducted. The rice acreage was therefore reduced 75 per cent, and a people who at one time produced rice enough for their own food consumption, and more, were "compelled to spend about \$15,000,000 to buy food with which to live." The price rose from \$4 to \$7 a picul of 137½ pounds. In the footsteps of war cholera swept the islands, with a record of 100,000 deaths. Whole villages and agricultural districts were depopulated by cholera, smallpox, the bubonic plague, and beriberi, and agriculture and business were demoralized. With agriculture, the only industry, prostrated, ladronism was a powerful temptation in order to escape famine. Said Governor Taft:

It is not certain whether in the present depressed state of agriculture, with the temptations to ladronism, the constabulary will be able without the aid of the military to stamp it out. Were there any attractions to agriculture, were there prosperous conditions in the country, it would not be a troublesome matter to deal with; but when want and famine are staring people in the face the life of the freebooter offers to the desperate and the weak a very great attraction.

Finally Congress was importuned for \$3,000,000 with which to cope with pestilence and famine, while bond issues were resorted to for internal improvements.

The commission now comes forward with its fourth annual report, detailing conditions in 1903 and praying Congress for the fourth time for tariff relief. In its recommendations to Congress, under date of December 23, 1903, it places tariff reduction as the first requisite in the bill of relief measures. The commission begins its statement to Congress as follows:

The commission therefore has the honor to recommend that Congress be requested to enact legislation as follows:

First. Legislation which shall reduce the tariff on sugar and tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands to not more than 25 per cent of the present Dingley rates on tobacco and sugar imported from foreign countries.

Discussing the agricultural conditions and the necessity for tariff relief, the commission says, on page 4:

The conditions with respect to sugar and tobacco continue to be very unfavorable, and the arguments in favor of a reduction of the Dingley tariff upon these articles to 25 per cent of the rates of that tariff on sugar and tobacco from the Philippines grow stronger instead of weaker.

In taking up the subject of the coastwise trade the commission

protests against the application of the coastwise-trade law of the United States to the Philippines on the ground that to give a monopoly of the carrying trade to American bottoms will increase the carrying rates, already too high; but if Congress is bent on applying the coastwise-trade law the commission falls back on tariff concessions, and demands as a consideration for this "necessary increase of freight rates" that Congress shall "strike down the tariff wall made by the Dingley tariff in the matter of the importation of sugar and tobacco from the islands to the mainland."

In this connection the commission says (page 8):

The commission, of course, can not present any objection to legislation which shall unite more closely the Philippine Islands with the United States in bonds of amity and mutually beneficial business relations, but it most urgently and earnestly invites your attention, and that of Congress, to the great injustice which will be done to the islands if the law which limits the means of communication to American bottoms between the United States and the Philippine Islands does not at the same time and as a consideration for this interference with the natural laws of trade and the necessary increase of freight rates strike down the tariff wall made by the Dingley tariff in the matter of the importation of sugar and tobacco from the islands to the mainland. The people of the islands may well ask, "What advantage are we to get out of association with the United States in a business way if our trade is to be used only for the purpose of increasing the business of American ships, while the limitation of the coastwise laws, by increasing the freight rates, will reduce the business that we now have with that country?"

Does not every consideration of justice require that if the Philippine Islands are to be treated as a part of the United States and subject to the coastwise laws they should enjoy the same freedom of trade with the United States which is enjoyed by every other part of the United States to which those coastwise laws are made applicable?

We respectfully urge, therefore, that as a condition and as a consideration for making the trade between the islands and the United States coastwise trade the duty on sugar and tobacco should be reduced to not more than 25 per cent of the Dingley rates.

The disaster that has befallen the sugar industry of the Philippine Islands during American occupancy is shown in the fact that during the last six years of Spanish rule the exports of Philippine sugar averaged more than 500,000,000 pounds per annum, as compared with an average of 120,000,000 pounds during five years of American rule, a shrinkage of over three-fourths. In 1893, under Spanish rule, the exports reached the high mark of 585,800,000 pounds; while in 1901 they were shrunken to 77,000,000.

During the past year there was some increase in volume, but Governor Taft states that, far from this being an index of increasing prosperity, "the planters are more deeply in debt at the close of the 1903 season than at any previous time in their history."

Bad as was the condition immediately after the close of the Spanish-American war, it is apparent from the picture drawn by Governor Taft and the Philippine Commission that the condition of the sugar and tobacco planters under American rule and Dingley tariff walls has been yearly growing worse. Says Governor Taft, on pages 53 and 54 of the recent report:

The planters have been steadily losing ground since 1899, and have only been encouraged to continue the operation of their estates by the hope each year that their products would be admitted to the markets of the United States at a much more favorable rate of duty than is now imposed. The shipments to the United States have been very small; 71,000,000 pounds of sugar were exported last year in vessels which cleared for the Delaware Breakwater "for orders."

A very small proportion of this was shipped into the United States, the larger portion being carried into Canada or England, and all the sugar entering the United States, except one cargo which was allowed to enter free during the brief period when there was no import tax on imports from the Philippine Islands, resulted in a heavy loss to the shippers. The islands of Panay and Negros are among the most thickly populated, and the inhabitants and business interests depend directly or indirectly upon the sugar industry, which is at this time in an exceedingly precarious condition, and unless something is done by Congress to relieve the situation there must be a total industrial collapse in those provinces.

Were there admitted to the United States three or four hundred thousand tons—and there is no likelihood that in the near future the exports of sugar from the islands to the United States will reach any such sum—it would not have any effect upon the price of sugar in the United States, but it would greatly increase the prosperity of the two important provinces named. Sugar is also raised in Pampanga, Cavite, and Laguna, but not so successfully as in Negros and Panay. The conditions prevailing in the islands of Negros and Panay are typical of those throughout the islands. The growth of sugar in Formosa is apt to interfere very largely with the sugar trade of Japan, which already is hampered by a heavy duty.

TOBACCO.

The falling off in the production of leaf tobacco has already been alluded to, as well as the causes for the same. I can not too strongly urge the necessity for the reduction of the Dingley tariff in its application to goods imported from the Philippine Islands to 25 per cent of the rates therein imposed. I am confident that neither in the sugar market nor in the tobacco market will the effect of the amount to be introduced be materially injurious to any interest in the United States, while at the same time it will be of the greatest importance to the prosperity of the islands, and will be a most convincing argument with the people of the archipelago to show the real interest that the people of the United States feel in the welfare of the Filipino people.

When the United States is compelled to import from three-fourths to four-fifths of its sugar consumption—something like 2,000,000 tons a year—it is strange, indeed, that it can not permit even 10 per cent of those imports to be furnished by its own colony to keep the latter from ruin and famine.

As to the fear of competition, because of a possible low cost of labor in the Philippines, we find on page 176 of the 1903 report of the commission, in the testimony of Captain of Engineers Robert

McGregor, United States Army, relating to an investigation of labor conditions, the following statement:

At present, considering wages and efficiency, work costs about 20 per cent to 25 per cent more than in the United States.

How completely we have removed from the Filipino his Spanish sugar market is shown in the fact that in 1900 not a pound of Filipino sugar found a market in Spain, while in 1901 the exports to Spain were just 149 pounds, valued at \$12. Were it not for the more liberal treatment and welcome markets of Great Britain, Hongkong, China, and Japan, our sugar planters in the Philippines would have no market for their sugar. Of 163,000,000 pounds exported in 1900, over 58,000,000 went to Hongkong, 52,000,000 to Japan, nearly 30,000,000 to Great Britain, 16,000,000 to China, and even 6,000,000 to Egypt; whereas just 311,782 pounds got over the bristling Dingley tariff wall of 80 per cent ad valorem into the United States.

Refusing to admit from the Philippine farms the sugar product, we are unable to market in the Philippines our breadstuffs, provisions, hardware, machinery, clothing, and dry goods. We have not only done what we could to destroy the planter's ability to buy, but we have so completely alienated him that he has no desire to trade with us. Governor Taft states on this last point that the trade of American merchants in the islands is confined almost exclusively to the Army and the handful of American civilians, whereas the foreign merchant has the entire Filipino trade. The number of Americans upon whom the American merchants can rely he estimates at not more than 20,000, whereas the "number of Filipinos whose trade might make a most lucrative business in these islands is 7,000,000," and this trade goes to foreigners.

Says Governor Taft, page 50 of the report, in regard to the relations between the American merchant and the Filipino consumers:

The sale of cotton goods is almost wholly with the English houses to-day. The handling of hemp, which is the largest export of these islands, is almost wholly confined to foreign houses. There is not the slightest reason why this business should not be done largely by Americans, especially in view of the fact that the United States is the largest purchaser of hemp in the world. It requires the investment of a very considerable capital, the construction of warehouses in the various hemp provinces, and the establishment of friendly relations with the hemp growers and buyers in each province. The American business man in the islands has really, up to this time, done very little to make or influence trade. He has kept close to the American patronage and has not extended his efforts to an expansion of trade among the Filipinos. Until this is done and more American capital is brought here for the purpose, we can not hope that the imports from the United States to the islands will be increased in very large proportion.

Such is the picture drawn by leading Republican officials of the commercial and industrial conditions brought about under Republican rule, and in a large measure the result of Republican partisan policies. Is the prospect any better for the future under the régime of "stand patism?"

The only gratifying feature of our recent Philippine discussions, to my mind, is the fact that our Republican friends are more and more eliminating hypocritical references to destiny and the discharge of Christian duty in their consideration of pending measures. They now justify their Philippine régime—for it can hardly be said that they have formulated any policy, if they have, they refrain from disclosing it—on the score of necessity to maintain our prestige in the Far East, and for the profit that will inure to our commerce.

On the score of profit much might be said. In addition to the original cost of the investment, which is conservatively estimated at \$500,000,000, we have an annual charge on the Treasury of upward of \$50,000,000 on account of Philippine expenditures direct and indirect. And what have we to show on the other side of the ledger for this terrible drain upon our wealth and industry?

We have some twenty millions of commerce, four millions of exports in round numbers, largely for the use of our Government officials and employees; some fifteen millions of imports, principally manila fiber. Our statistics show by comparison that we would probably have had this or a larger trade had the Philippines remained Spanish; certainly if we had permitted and conserved their independence.

The questions which now confront us are not the wisdom or unwisdom of past action, but how we, charged with the present responsibility of administering public affairs, can best alleviate the intolerable conditions that exist, retrieve the errors of the past as far as may be, and inaugurate a policy that will redound to the credit of our own people and to the benefit of the Filipinos. To me it seems that this can be accomplished, not by imposing further shackles to trade, but by removing the barriers which now prevent that commercial intercourse which, to my mind, presents the only hope for the amelioration of present conditions.

As to the Democratic side of this House, I need hardly say that we stand ready by voice and vote to further any proposition brought forward by the majority for furthering friendly intercourse between the Philippine people and our own. You have tried the methods of war—repression—and now you propose monopoly. We ask you to give the instrumentalities of peace and

good will a trial. These are my individual views, and I repeat that I believe them in accord with the membership of this side of the House.

Instead of granting the tariff relief which would revive Philippine industry and extend the market for our own products, it is the deliberate aim of this bill to further hamper the trade and to impose additional burdens upon the two peoples. Congress last year voted \$3,000,000 with which to save the victims of our tariff policy from famine, ladronism, and starvation. Three millions more are now asked for to relieve industrial distress during the present year. Congress is asked to vote a bond issue of \$5,000,000 with which to undertake internal improvements for the relief of the Philippine people.

When Governor Taft frankly tells us, "Of course if the Dingley tariff were reduced and an impetus given to the business in the islands by the increased production of sugar and tobacco and other sales in the United States, the increase in the revenues would probably keep pace with the increase in expenditures," then why do we deny such relief? Why do we burden the Filipino with monopoly instead of extending him the means of self-help? I know you are determined to "stand pat." You may ease your conscience by occasional charity from the National Treasury, but sooner or later the good people of the United States will repudiate the policy that imposes intolerable burdens upon us and tends to perpetuate a condition of pauperism and crime in the unfortunate islands.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I want to say, further, in relation to the apprehension entertained, and no doubt honestly entertained, by the distinguished gentleman who has just taken his seat—I refer to the gentleman from Minnesota, not to the gentleman from Tennessee—that his conception of the increase of the rate of freight that this bill is likely to produce is about as well founded as his apparent idea of the whole operation of this bill. Now, he says that he thinks it will result in \$2 a hundred freight. The present freight is only 45 cents a hundred, and upon his theory, the rate now being \$9 a ton, he would have an increase of about \$33 a ton.

Mr. LIND. The gentleman is in error, if he will permit an interruption.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, certainly.

Mr. LIND. I said from Manila to Stillwater, Minn., in the center of the continent.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Well, it is all the same. You said the increase would be a dollar a hundred; that is what you said. That would be \$20 a ton, and the rate now from the Philippines to this country is only \$9; but I will not stop to analyze.

Mr. LIND. Will you permit another interruption?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIND. I will reduce that statement. I do not think that the rate will increase more than the present bonus to the cordage trust, which is \$7.60 a ton.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is a shrinkage of about 75 per cent in the gentleman's proposition. Now, if he will pare down his whole proposition 75 per cent his opposition to this bill will practically disappear.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Point out that the cordage trust is here fighting this bill.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. LUCKING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman will have to excuse me. After I have made a statement I will give the gentleman opportunity to put questions.

Mr. LUCKING. It is just on that proposition.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I want to say that the only opposition made to this bill before the committee—and made on the floor of this House now by Representatives who represent the interest—was made before the committee by the cordage trust and by people from Hawaii. That is the only opposition that appeared before the committee. I will have a little further to say about the cordage organization if I have the time in the course of debate. In the first place I want to say something about the occasion for this legislation. There is an assumption upon the part of many who have investigated this question that the coastwise laws become operative on the 1st of July, 1904, unless there is some affirmative legislation to the contrary. Now, I call the attention of my distinguished confreres on this committee to this fact that that assumption proceeds upon well-known and well-understood democratic legal propositions.

I have been in this House something like four years, and if I have heard any one thing in this House iterated and reiterated from the beginning until now it is this, that the Constitution and the laws passed pursuant thereof follow the flag. Now, I have heard that time out of mind, and I assume my distinguished friends believe that proposition when they assert it and are sincere in that belief. I stood with them on that, and I believe it now, so far as I am concerned. If the Constitution and the laws passed in pursuance thereof are operative wherever the flag floats and our jurisdiction extends, the coastwise laws will go into

operation between the Philippines and the United States on the 1st day of July, 1904. Now, whether that is so or not, whether that will turn out to be the fact or not—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman from Mississippi wish to ask a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes. The gentleman has said truthfully that he and I, with many others, contended that the Constitution and laws passed in pursuance thereof followed the flag. I concur with him still that that contention was right, but I suppose the gentleman will admit that the Supreme Court has by some sort of an authority changed the Constitution by construction—he will admit that in this particular it has changed it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I was just going on to explain that legal situation. I am not unmindful of recent history, and especially in relation to the Supreme Court of the United States. It is entirely true, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to ask the gentleman if it be true that the Constitution puts the coastwise laws into effect without any statute of Congress, notwithstanding the Supreme Court passing upon cognate questions? If that be true, then how could an act of the Congress of the United States sustain that, even if you should pass it?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have not said it was true, the Supreme Court of the United States notwithstanding, and if the gentleman will wait and listen to me, perhaps he will not be disturbed. The Supreme Court by a majority of one, with discordant reasons given therefor, have agreed that the contention made by the other side, of which I was one, was not legally sound. If my friends on the other side still believe their contention, they are driven into a position where they are bound to legislate upon that hypothesis, because it was only a majority of one, and I take it that no man can tell what the Supreme Court may hereafter say upon a proposition involving similar considerations.

Now, then, the War Department or their law officer practically holds that, in their judgment, the coastwise laws will be in operation July 1, 1904. I agree with my friend from Michigan that the case of *Huus v. The New York Steamship Company* does not hold by any means that the coastwise laws are *ex propria vigore* operative to-day between the Philippine Islands and the United States outside of the exception of this legislation. On the contrary, I agree with him that the fair intendment of that decision is the other way, because it is based on the Porto Rican statute and does not intimate what the court would hold without a statute, and the whole question is largely in doubt. The War Department has said that as far as the interisland trade is concerned—not the trade between the United States and the Philippines, but as far as the interisland trade is concerned—we have not to-day sufficient American ships to take care of it.

Every man who is well informed concedes that there is sufficient American shipping to take care of the trade between the Philippines and the United States. Now, that is the next question I am going to discuss. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIRDSALL] is in error in his minority views when he says that when this proviso was adopted in the bill that passed this House in 1902, providing that the coastwise laws should not go into operation until July 1, 1904, the shipping interests promised there would be sufficient shipping and sufficient tonnage to take care of this trade, because the shipping interests then contended, and then knew, as they contend now and now know, that there was sufficient tonnage under the American flag to take care of that trade, notwithstanding the fact that under existing conditions the American merchant marine has been driven from the foreign carrying trade of the world, and at this moment is in a greater condition of decadence and distress than at any other time during the history of this Republic.

One hundred thousand tonnage of vessels to-day are lying in San Francisco Harbor, and have been for three or four months, because they can not get profitable employment. There are two steel ships manufactured upon the Great Lakes, the *Minnetonka* and the *Minnewaska*, according to the evidence before this committee, that were shipped down in two parts and put together when they reached salt water to engage in salt-water trade, that have been lying in Brooklyn from last June until now. They have a carrying capacity of about 7,000 tons each and represent an investment of \$800,000 capital. And why? Because under existing conditions, on account of the excessive investment required in building American bottoms under the American flag and the greater expense of operation, they can not compete to advantage with foreign bottoms, especially when on the Pacific coast they have the Japanese subsidies; and upon all coasts, Pacific and Atlantic, the French ships have the French subsidies and the English transportation lines, taking care of their mail facilities, have afforded to them subsidies. This is the practical condition of our merchant marine to-day.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, I can not yield now. I shall not dis-

cuss the subject from the standpoint of a lobby, as referred to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING], because I would make it very uncomfortable and disagreeable for some people who are interested in this legislation one way or the other if I undertook to discuss this from the basis of a lobby, and I know what I am talking about. The American merchant marine comes here and asks this House to pass this bill for the purpose of encouraging that interest and aiding in its upbuilding. I desire here to call attention to this fact, that in 1902 I was cooperating with my distinguished friend the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], when this amendment was adopted by the Ways and Means Committee and became a part of the bill afterwards passed by this House—cooperating with him then for the purpose of seeing whether or not we could have the coastwise laws extended to that time.

The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] criticises the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] that we are now applying the historic policy of the United States by the extension of the coastwise laws to the Territories of the United States, but the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] is right and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is also right when he says it is the first instance when we have undertaken to extend the coastwise laws to a possession of the United States where we have imposed tariff discriminations. That is true, because for the first time in the history of the United States, except the temporary legislation in connection with Porto Rico, the United States has imposed tariff discriminations on the Philippines, and therefore you can not apply the coastwise laws with perfect and complete historical precedent for that reason.

I say that, so far as I am concerned, I believe in legislation upon an equality with the Philippines not only from the standpoint of coastwise legislation, but from the standpoint of all legislation, precisely as with trade from every part of the United States, whether construed to be within it or out of it. [Applause.] Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is correct, because there is no other similar instance in the history of this Republic. I am going to call attention to that later, and to the statement of Secretary Taft, but first let me call the attention of this House to the amount of tonnage in existence to-day that is capable of engaging in this business between the Philippines and the United States.

I hold in my hand a list which shows the vessels available for this trade.

American steamships available for trade between the Philippines and Atlantic coast of the United States.

Name.	Dead-weight capacity.	Net register.	Owners or managers.
	Tons.	Tons.	
Maine.....	12,000	5,077	International Mercantile Marine Co.
Missouri.....	12,000	5,077	Do.
Massachusetts.....	12,000	5,131	Do.
Mississippi.....	12,000	5,131	Do.
Minnetonka.....	7,000	3,860	James W. Elwell & Co.
Minnewaska.....	7,000	3,862	Do.
Northwestern.....	3,300	1,299	Do.
Northeastern.....	3,300	1,496	Do.
Northman.....	3,300	1,306	Do.
Northtown.....	3,300	1,297	Do.
J. L. Luckenbach.....	6,000	3,192	Luckenbach Towing and Transportation Co.
Lewis Luckenbach.....	5,500	2,574	Do.
Harry Luckenbach.....	4,500	1,739	Do.
Julia Luckenbach.....	4,500	1,977	Do.
Lansing.....	7,000	3,600	Michigan Steamship Co.
Roma.....	4,000	2,164	Do.
Washtenaw.....	4,250	2,003	Do.
Argyle.....	4,250	1,880	Do.
Mackinaw.....	4,000	2,005	Do.
Leelanaw.....	3,500	1,377	Do.
Edith.....	3,500	1,495	A. H. Bull & Co.
Dorothy.....	3,500	1,629	Do.
Evelyn.....	2,800	1,185	Do.
Mae.....	2,900	1,281	Do.
Pathfinder.....	4,500	1,800	New York and Porto Rico Navigation Co.
Ohio.....	4,000	2,072	International Mercantile Marine Co.
Indiana.....	4,000	2,561	Do.
Pennsylvania.....	4,000	2,567	Do.
Conemaugh.....	3,000	1,739	Do.
Hugoma.....	3,200	1,284	Scammell Bros.
Lassell.....	2,800	1,225	McCaldin Bros. Co.
Mineola.....	4,000	1,891	Pacific Improvement Co.
Hyades.....	5,500	2,932	Boston Steamship Co.
Pleiades.....	5,500	2,932	Do.
Lyra.....	5,500	3,516	Do.
Nebraskan.....	5,000	2,824	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.
Nevadan.....	5,000	2,824	Do.
Kennebec.....	4,000	1,906	James W. Elwell & Co.
Kanawha.....	4,000	1,913	Do.
(Third steamer).....	4,000	1,906	Do.
Total.....	203,400	97,589	

Forty vessels with a net-register tonnage of 97,589 tons, or, as the imports from the Philippines during the last year were only about 63,000 tons, enough to take all that trade and 50 per cent more in one voyage, and these vessels are capable of making two voyages each. In addition we have possibly available for Philippine trade:

Name.	Dead-weight capacity.	Net register.	Owners.
	Tons.	Tons.	
Texan.....	12,000	5,636	American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.
Alaskan.....	12,000	5,621	Do.
Arizonan.....	12,000	5,621	Do.
American.....	8,500	3,643	Do.
Hawaiian.....	8,500	3,651	Do.
Oregonian.....	8,500	3,651	Do.
Californian.....	8,500	3,716	Do.
Nebraskan.....	5,000	2,824	Do.
Nevadan.....	5,000	2,824	Do.
Total.....	80,000	37,187	

Sailing ships of iron or steel available for Philippine trade, Atlantic or Pacific Ocean.

Name.	Dead-weight capacity.	Net register.
	Tons.	Tons.
Abby Palmer.....	3,000	1,705
Balclutha.....	2,700	1,554
Star of Bengal.....	2,900	1,694
Star of France.....	2,600	1,523
Star of Italy.....	2,700	1,571
Star of Russia.....	3,200	1,892
Falls of Clyde.....	3,000	1,748
Marion Chilcoat.....	2,600	1,510
Acme.....	5,500	2,987
Astral.....	5,500	2,987
Atlas.....	5,600	3,006
Fort George.....	3,000	1,705
Tillie E. Starbuck.....	3,100	1,829
Hawaiian Isles.....	3,800	2,027
Nuanu.....	1,800	977
Fongh Suey.....	1,800	961
Willscott.....	3,600	1,856
John Ena.....	4,500	2,568
Homeward Bound.....	3,600	1,987
Bangalore.....	2,800	1,559
Arthur Sewall.....	5,500	2,919
Dirigo.....	5,000	2,845
Edward Sewall.....	5,500	2,916
Erskine M. Phelps.....	5,000	2,715
Kenilworth.....	4,000	2,187
William P. Frye.....	5,600	2,998
Andrew Welch.....	1,500	863
Archer.....	1,500	845
Coronado.....	1,800	1,007
Diamond Head.....	1,600	952
Euterpe.....	2,000	1,247
Himalaya.....	1,600	976
Kaulani.....	2,600	1,430
Mauna Ala.....	1,400	779
R. P. Rithet.....	1,600	1,043
Roderick Dhu.....	2,600	1,452
Thos. W. Lawson.....	8,000	4,914
Wm. L. Douglas.....	6,000	2,740
Kineo.....	3,600	1,867
Total.....	133,700	72,341

Sailing ships of wood, under 25 years old, available for Philippine trade, Atlantic or Pacific oceans.

Name.	Dead-weight capacity.	Net register.
	Tons.	Tons.
Roanoke.....	5,500	3,347
Shenandoah.....	5,400	3,154
Susquehanna.....	3,900	2,590
Aryan.....	3,500	2,017
A. G. Ropes.....	3,600	2,342
A. J. Fuller.....	3,100	1,782
Abner Coburn.....	3,200	1,879
B. F. Packard.....	3,400	2,026
Berlin.....	3,000	1,553
Chas. E. Moody.....	3,200	1,915
Charmer.....	3,100	1,881
E. B. Sutton.....	3,100	1,758
Emily F. Whitney.....	2,000	1,249
Emily Reed.....	2,400	1,505
Geo. Curtis.....	3,100	1,745
Gov. Robie.....	3,000	1,627
Helen A. Wyman.....	3,000	1,664
Guy C. Goss.....	2,900	1,534
Henry Failing.....	3,200	1,899
Henry Villard.....	2,600	1,453
I. F. Chapman.....	3,300	2,038
James Drummond.....	2,400	1,557
John Carrier.....	3,200	1,848
Kennebec.....	3,300	2,025
Jos. B. Thomas.....	3,200	1,851
Luzon.....	2,300	1,339
Manuel Laguno.....	3,000	1,650

Sailing ships of wood, under 25 years old, available for Philippine trade, Atlantic or Pacific oceans—Continued.

Name.	Dead-weight capacity.	Net register.
	Tons.	Tons.
Pactolus.....	2,900	1,585
S. D. Carleton.....	3,100	1,788
S. P. Hitchcock.....	3,400	2,178
St. Frances.....	3,200	1,890
St. James.....	2,500	1,488
Servia.....	3,100	1,773
Tacoma.....	3,100	1,759
W. F. Babcock.....	3,600	2,029
Wm. H. Macy.....	3,300	2,022
Wm. H. Smith.....	3,300	1,908
Total.....	118,300	69,759

Schooners of wood, under 7 years old, of 3,000 tons capacity and over, available for Philippine trade, Atlantic or Pacific Ocean.

Name.	Dead weight capacity.	Net register.
	Tons.	Tons.
Baker Palmer.....	4,000	2,240
Fannie Palmer.....	3,800	2,075
Marie Palmer.....	3,000	1,495
Maud Palmer.....	3,000	1,529
Paul Palmer.....	3,500	1,763
Prescott Palmer.....	4,000	2,307
Rebecca Palmer.....	4,000	2,125
Wm. B. Palmer.....	3,400	1,625
Cora F. Cressy.....	3,800	2,089
Eleanor A. Percy.....	5,600	3,062
Helen W. Martin.....	3,500	2,020
M. D. Cressy.....	3,380	1,884
Martha P. Small.....	3,400	1,903
S. P. Blackburn.....	3,200	1,537
George W. Wells.....	5,400	2,743
T. Chariton Henry.....	4,300	2,149
Van Allens Boughton.....	4,000	1,905
Henry O. Barrett.....	3,200	1,564
Jas. Pierce.....	3,200	1,520
Nathaniel T. Palmer.....	4,000	2,244
O. C. Curtis.....	3,800	2,000
Wm. C. Carnegie.....	4,300	2,380
Addie M. Lawrence.....	4,400	2,195
Dorothy Palmer.....	5,000	2,315
Gov. Ames.....	3,200	1,597
G. G. Deering.....	3,300	1,714
Total.....	99,600	51,980

Steamships available for Philippine trade between Pacific ports and the Philippines after July 1, 1904.

[Page 44, Report for 1903 of Commissioner of Navigation.]

Name.	Gross tons.	Owner.
Siberia.....	11,284	Pacific Mail Steamship Co.
Korea.....	11,276	Do.
Manchuria ^a	13,500	Do.
Mongolia.....	13,500	Do.
City of Peking.....	5,079	Do.
China.....	5,060	Do.
Peru.....	3,528	Do.
Minnesota ^a	21,000	Great Northern Steamship Co.
Dakota ^b	21,000	Do.
Tremont.....	9,606	Boston Steamship Co.
Shawmut.....	9,606	Do.
Lyra.....	4,417	Do.
Hyades.....	3,753	Do.
Pleiades.....	3,753	Do.
Victoria.....	3,502	Northern Pacific Steamship Co.
Olympia.....	2,837	Do.
Tacoma.....	2,811	Do.
Total.....	145,512	

^aLaunched.

^bBuilding.

In all a reservoir of 149 vessels, with an aggregate carrying capacity of 497,112 tons of dead weight, to draw from and take care of 63,000 tons of freight.

Now, in the face of these figures, where is the man of any degree of intelligence who can stand in the presence of any tribunal and undertake to assert, with the expectation of being believed for a moment, that there is not sufficient tonnage to take care of this trade under the American flag, with 100,000 tons unemployed in San Francisco Harbor and with these new steel steamships lying up for nearly a year, which will continue to lie up unless some possible employment can be opened for them?

It is true that a distinguished gentleman—more distinguished when I got through with his cross-examination than when I began it—stated before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that some of these vessels were not fit to engage in this trade, and he had a "cock and bull" story about their qualities

and conditions. He did not seem to comprehend the distinction between the depth of the vessel and its draft. When I cross-examined him, what did I learn? That he knew absolutely nothing about the vessels or about their draft when loaded, and nothing about their character and capacity. He simply stood there and read a statement prepared for him by a distinguished representative of the cordage manufacturers—I will not say "cordage trust," but Cordage Association—"social organization."

That is all the testimony there was before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to negative the proposition that hundreds of thousands of tons of vessels are now in existence, many of them engaged at unprofitable rates and many of them entirely unengaged, ready to go into business that may offer in connection with this trade at rates that will show a remuneration that will justify their employment.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman admit that the Philippine trade will not employ the tonnage now idle?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. "The gentleman" admits that may be so under existing conditions, with the competition of French subsidized ships that are subsidized according to the number of miles that they sail, whether they carry a cargo or not, and with the ships subsidized by the Japanese Government that have so reduced the rates of freight that American bottoms can not engage in that trade at a living rate of freight.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. But according to the statement that the gentleman has made, he has proved, if he has proved anything, that the entire Philippine trade, if it goes to these shipowners, will not employ all the tonnage now idle; and, therefore, it follows that the statement which has been made that new ships will be built is a false statement.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have not made any statement that new ships will be built.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. That statement was made before the committee.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What committee?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Before the Senate committee that had hearings on this bill.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have not read the hearings of the Senate committee, and I now learn for the first time what the gentleman states.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. It has been so stated.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It has been said that if our Democratic friends in this House, doing what they have done ever since I have been here, should vote against every proposition that tends to help the merchant marine, and if our Republican friends should join in that course of action we shall not get any encouragement for the merchant marine.

It has been said, too, that if this House will give this industry some encouragement by this bill—encouragement which so far as this is concerned will be trifling in its operation—and by other bills of a cognate character, the probability is that new vessels will be built. When you can show an avenue for the employment of American capital at a fair return, with fair rates of wage for American seamen employed upon our vessels, then there will be some encouragement and some legitimate expectation that you will secure a building up of your American merchant marine.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. But that will not happen until the trade between the Philippines and the United States increases.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The addition of 62,000 tons will aid it. It will not accomplish the whole result. Does the gentleman want to get in this attitude, that because in one act of legislation we can not rehabilitate the American merchant marine, therefore he will not do it in some degree; because the bill that he is acting upon will not accomplish the full results or achieve every success we desire nothing is to be done? Is that the attitude he wants to stand in?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman agrees with me that if tariffs are reduced the trade will increase, but I do not think he means to have this House believe that the mere building of ships will of itself increase the trade.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, no; I did not suggest or ask the House to believe that the mere building of ships would increase the trade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I should like a little more time.

Mr. LUCKING. The gentleman could have had more time if it had not been for the rule which limits him.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I want to say right now that I am in no sense responsible for the rule, except that I voted for it. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] yield me five minutes more?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes, although we will have only five minutes left on this side.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I want to say just a word as to the attitude of Secretary Taft upon this bill. I have not time to go over the various considerations involved in it. I should very much like to do it, but I can not.

The extracts that have been read from the Secretary's statements before the committee are undoubtedly correct, and his statements, from his then point of view, were undoubtedly correct, as made at that time; but this wants to be borne in mind, that when Secretary Taft prepared that report he was in the Philippine Archipelago. He had no information as to the amount of our merchant marine, the amount of tonnage that was available for engaging in this trade. He did not fully appreciate all of the practical conditions involved.

I want to call the attention of the House to this fact, that my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. BIRDSALL] need not have any apprehension about the trade in hemp going to London and being diverted from this country, because here is a question that he himself put to Governor Taft, and if he had remembered it I doubt if he would have been laboring under such an apprehension to any great degree. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIRDSALL] put this question to Secretary Taft:

Mr. BIRDSALL. Suppose there should be a material increase in the freight from the Philippines to the United States, would not that have the effect of transferring the trade to London?

Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir; but there is a margin of from \$8 to \$12 by which the trade might be retained.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Then it would not be expected to go to London until that margin had been reached?

Secretary TAFT. No, sir.

The greatest increase in freight estimated by any person was \$3 a ton, which would leave a margin of from \$5 to \$9 a ton before there could be any danger of diversion of the hemp trade to the London market, showing that there is nothing in the idea of diversion.

If the rate were increased to this extent, which is doubtful, and the price to the consumer were increased to that extent, it would only amount to between one-seventh and one-sixth of a cent a pound, a negligible amount.

Now, just a word as to what Secretary Taft said concerning the effect of this bill upon the Philippine Archipelago.

I read from his testimony before the committee:

Mr. STEVENS. So far as this bill goes the producers of hemp in the Philippines would not be adversely affected by this bill?

Secretary TAFT. No, sir. The people who would be adversely affected would be the people who sell to the Philippines from the United States.

Mr. STEVENS. And the raisers of sugar and tobacco?

Secretary TAFT. In the Philippines?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Secretary TAFT. They are not affected at all, because they have not any business now. I would not say that the shippers of hemp might not be annoyed and embarrassed and, perhaps, have some additional cost by reason of being limited to American bottoms. I am not prepared to say about that.

Now, let me read an interview prepared by Secretary Taft himself, which expresses his attitude upon this pending legislation. This interview was published after his testimony was given before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It appeared in the Washington Post of March 23, 1904:

Secretary Taft said yesterday that the impression seemed to have prevailed that he opposed the bill relating to Philippine shipping as it passed the Senate at the hearing before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The Secretary explained that the bill as it passed the Senate was the result of a compromise between Senators LODGE and ALLISON, to which he had assented, by means of which two things were accomplished: First, that complete freedom of action on the part of the Philippine Commission in respect to interisland shipping is secured; and, second, the application of the coastwise shipping laws to the trans-Pacific trade is postponed for a year, so as to give time to impress Congress with the justice and necessity of reducing the Dingley tariffs on sugar and tobacco to 25 per cent or to a much smaller figure.

The Secretary said that he is not opposed to making the coastwise shipping laws applicable to the trans-Pacific and Atlantic trade if the Philippines have the advantage of the American markets, because he thought in that way American capital would be attracted to the islands and to the development of their business.

In other words, he does not oppose the pending legislation. He does express the hope, and very naturally, coming from the archipelago as he does, that in time more favorable trade conditions will prevail between the Philippine Islands and the United States, but he distinctly states that so far as this measure is concerned he is not in opposition thereto. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7292. An act making Vinalhaven, Me., a subport of entry;

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution providing for the extension of the time for the removal of the temporary dam and construction of locks in Bayou Lafourche, State of Louisiana; and

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution amending the law relating to the printing of the statutes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon

its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1851) granting an increase of pension to David T. Towles, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PATTERSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. MARCUS A. HANNA, late a Senator from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect at the conclusion of the exercises the Senate adjourn.

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

Senate concurrent resolution No. 64.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,500 copies of the House Document No. 52, Twenty-eighth Congress, second session, including map, 500 for the use of the Senate and 1,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, the same being a report made by I. N. Nicolle of his geographical and topographical surveys under authority of the Government in the years 1836 to 1839, inclusive, of the Mississippi River and its tributaries from St. Louis to its source and of a portion of the Missouri Valley.

SHIPPING BETWEEN PORTS OF UNITED STATES AND PORTS IN PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, ETC.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will use the balance of his time now.

Mr. SPIGHT. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has twenty-three minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio has nine minutes.

Mr. SMALL. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio, if he intends to close debate this afternoon?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The order has already been made to adjourn at half past 5. There may be two or three minutes not used at that time, but the order is preemptory.

[Mr. SMALL addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. How much more time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Nine minutes.

Mr. SMALL. I suppose the gentleman could not spare me part of that time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, no. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to extend our coastwise laws to our trade with the Philippine Islands. This law is in harmony with the established policy of this country for more than a century—a policy that has kept for us practically the only trade now done under the American flag. This law extends the system of protection on land to the commerce upon the seas. The only opponents to this bill are the Democratic party, the cordage interest of the Atlantic coast, the foreign shipowners, and a few Republicans from some of the interior States or from some district containing a cordage factory.

The opposition by the Democratic party is consistent with their record and was to be expected. It is in line with the free-trade policy that that party has always advocated—a policy that has driven our flag from the foreign trade; a policy that causes us to pay to the foreigner \$150,000,000 per year for work that should be done by American labor; a policy that has always brought disaster and ruin when applied to our industries, either on land or sea. The united opposition to this law by the Democratic party is in line with its record, and, in view of the fact that it is always wrong, is in itself a sufficient assurance to the people of this country that this bill should be passed.

The cordage interests on the Atlantic coast, and only those on the Atlantic coast, are opposed to this bill—are opposed to it because it means to them strong competition from the factories on the Pacific coast. The cordage interests of the Atlantic coast have a right to oppose this measure if they see proper. No one criticizes them for so doing; they are American citizens; they are entitled to be heard, and they were heard fully by the committee. But they have no right that the same industry on the Pacific coast does not have. They are not entitled to any greater consideration than the same class of industries on the Pacific coast. These cordage companies now receive their hemp free of duty. They have the protection of \$7.50 per ton against the rest of the world,

and yet when some of the benefits by the same system of protection upon which they have grown rich and prosperous is proposed to be extended to another American industry they protest and object and lobby against it in the committees and even on the floor of this House. This may be human nature, but it is a phase of human nature that ought not appeal to the Members of this great lawmaking body.

FOREIGN SHIPOWNERS.

The foreign shipowners are protesting against this bill. Agents of foreign subsidized ship lines have written resolutions, and foreign influence has caused the passage of these resolutions protesting against this law by some of the so-called commercial bodies of New York City. I submit that effrontery can go but little further when foreign shipowners attempt indirectly and directly to influence the legislation of this country. The Democratic party, true to its ancient policy, true to its record, takes its stand with the foreigner, takes its stand under the flag of England and Germany, joined, I am sorry to say, by a few of the Republicans. Certainly we do not envy them their position. For one, I prefer to stand with American interests, to stand with those whose country is my country, to stand with the American ship under the American flag. [Applause.]

REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION.

It seems to me that those of my colleagues on this side of the House who are opposed to this bill—that the very fact of the applause and the praise they have received from the other side of the House would give them pause. I trust that it may never be my fate when discussing a question of party policy, of political faith, to be surrounded by an admiring and applauding circle of the gentlemen from the opposite side of this Chamber. My political ambition has tied to it no such questionable aspirations. Whenever my attitude on any political question is such as to call forth editorial commendation from the leading free-trade Democratic papers, whenever my utterances are quoted therein as Democratic doctrine, whenever my speeches are used as Democratic campaign documents, that moment I will begin to distrust my own position; that moment I will certainly retire into secret communion with myself to see if this approval is not given because it would injure my own party and not because it was right. Virtue may have its own reward, but it is seldom applauded by the Democratic party.

EXCUSE FOR OPPOSITION.

I have given the source of the only opposition to this bill, and now wish to give a few of the excuses advanced for this opposition. They claim that it will increase the freight upon manila hemp. This same cry in principle has been made by the Democratic party against every article upon which a protective tariff has ever been placed and has by the history of every article that has ever been protected been demonstrated to be false. The same argument was made against extending the coastwise laws to Porto Rico, but the laws were extended. American ship lines were established and the trade carried in American ships, employment given to American labor, investment given to American capital, and freight is lower to-day than ever before. The same argument was made when the laws were to be extended to Hawaii; but they were extended, and again American lines were established and employment given to American labor and investment to American capital, and the freight is lower to-day than ever before. The coastwise trade of this country to-day demonstrates the falseness of the claim of increased freights. Our coastwise trade, absolutely protected, carried exclusively in American ships, by American competition, gives the cheapest freight rates of the world, gives profitable investment for American capital, and the labor engaged therein is the best-paid labor of its class in all the world.

THE EFFECT ON THE FARMER.

Pity deep and agonizing has been wasted upon the farmer by some of the Members of the House claiming that he will have to pay more for his binder twine if this bill becomes a law. More than one-half of the great wheat fields of this country can be reached in freight rates as cheaply from the Pacific as from the Atlantic coast, and no one will contend that this bill will increase the cost of hemp to the manufacturers on the Pacific coast. The cordage men themselves admit that this bill would not increase the cost of the raw material to the manufacturers on the Pacific coast. The claim is made that there are but few cordage factories on the Pacific coast. This is true, but they are building rapidly and will be ready to fully meet the demand as soon as it comes. In Seattle, within the last few weeks, a cordage factory has been established at a cost of \$250,000.

But even if the highest increase in freight were to follow the passage of this bill, given by the opponents of this measure before the committee, and the farmer would pay the entire amount, it would be less than one-sixth of 1 cent per pound, an increase far less than these same cordage manufacturers, who are now so

mindful of the interests of the farmer, have made in twenty-four hours by combination. I have not heard any weeping by the cordage companies or by my few Republican colleagues who oppose this bill over the tariff of more than 1 cent per pound on cordage, which, if their theory is true, the American shipowners for many years have been paying. Why be so sympathetic with the farmer and so neglectful of the shipowner? In your anguish for the one do you forget that the other is also an American citizen? I commend to those gentlemen whose lachrymose nerves are so disturbed over the imaginary woes of the farmer the line in the sad song of the poet, "Tears, idle tears; I know not what they mean."

This is not a question of Philippine interest, but a question of politics, a question of applying the principles of protection. No man anywhere except in bombastic campaign talk here on the floor of this House has ever claimed or attempted to claim that this law would injure Philippine interests. The only objection urged to this law, so far as the Philippines are concerned, has been that the tariff should be reduced on Philippine products before it goes into effect. One of the gentlemen on the other side of the House, in a tone most pathetic, wailed, "Who is here representing the Philippines?" From the day that the Philippine army fired on the American flag until now the Democratic party has attempted to be the self-appointed guardian of Philippine interests and Philippine destiny. That same guardian, if you can judge by its past, if there is conflict between the interests of the Philippines and the interests of this country, regardless of the merits of the case, will do what it can in behalf of the Philippines. The Democratic party would be untrue to all its traditions, its practices, its policies, if either by accident or design it should ever array itself in any question of trade on the side of its country.

SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF SHIPS.

The objection that there is not a sufficient number of ships to carry this trade, after examination of all the testimony, has been practically abandoned by even the bitterest opponents of this bill. It has no foundation whatever. It has been absolutely demonstrated that there is much more than sufficient tonnage available for this trade. There are enough ships to-day available for this trade running between Seattle and the Orient to carry all the hemp produced in the Philippine Islands. There seems to be an impression in this House that there is no trade between this country and the Philippines. Two years ago there was practically no trade between Puget Sound and these islands, but last year Seattle alone sent to the Philippine Islands \$614,000 worth of products. There came to Seattle products from those islands valued at more than \$1,000,000. When the present law was placed upon the statute books, under the construction given it by the Departments, those engaged in shipping believed, and they had a right to believe, that the trade between this country and the Philippine Islands would go under the coastwise laws the first of the coming July.

Under that stimulus—under that hope and belief—a line of American steamers started between Seattle and the Orient. They have run for the last two years, and they have lost about \$80,000 each year. They were, until the late war, in competition with Japanese and English lines, each line heavily subsidized. They are still in competition with a line of English steamers, and may be at any time in competition again with a Japanese line. Directly on their way to the sea, at Vancouver, they meet the vessels of this English line, and these vessels are subsidized to the amount of \$300,000 annually. This American line is operating boats that cost 25 per cent more than those of the British of the same character. It costs less to operate British vessels of the same character than it does to operate American vessels.

Against such odds this American line has made a brave and determined fight, but these vessels can not long continue this contest against such fearful odds. They must soon receive some protection, go under another flag, or be driven from the seas. And this is also true of the two great ships, the two largest afloat, that have recently been launched by Mr. James J. Hill for this trade between Seattle and the Orient. I call your attention to the fact to-day, and I say it with pride, that Puget Sound is the only port in America where more foreign tonnage is carried under the American flag than is carried under foreign flags. If the opponents of this bill have their way this condition will not long continue, but the few American vessels yet engaged in foreign trade will be driven from our ports and will disappear from Puget Sound, as they have from most other ports of this country. When you are wasting your sympathy and your tears upon the Philippine Islands, I ask you to remember that their rights are not entitled to more consideration than rights of American citizens; their interests are not more sacred than our own; they are not the only ones to be considered, and I appeal to your justice, your pride, and your patriotism not to drive from the seas the few vessels that yet fly the Stars and Stripes.

The fight against this bill, when you free it from all excuses,

shams, and pretenses, is a fight against the system of protection, the old fight for free trade, a fight to keep the doctrine of free trade on the land applied to all our commerce on the seas. It is the same old doctrine of calamity, destruction, and ruin on land, urged by the same old Democratic party, to drive our flag from the few ships over which it still flies. If the doctrine of the opponents of this bill prevail, then no more ships for foreign trade will be built in this country, our merchant marine will not be built up, American capital will seek other investments, American labor other employment, and our flag will disappear entirely from the foreign ports of the world. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of half past 5 o'clock p. m. having arrived, in pursuance of the order previously made, the House now stands adjourned until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for service of the Navy Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Hazard*, Joseph Campbell, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for investigations relative to free schools in Indian Territory—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of delegate to international conferences for the protection of industrial property, to be held at Berlin and Berne—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for miscellaneous advertising—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for additional expenses of collecting the revenue—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for labor in installation of machinery at the Bureau of Standards—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of diplomatic officials in Haiti and Santo Domingo—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Attorney-General, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the United States—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 of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14376) providing for the holding of Federal court at Grand Island, Nebr., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2313); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAWNEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1231) for the relief of gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, and storekeepers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2316); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14754) providing for the restoration or maintenance of channels, or of river and harbor improvements, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2317); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1399) to amend section 1225 of Revised Statutes, so as to provide for detail of retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in schools, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2318); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1925) providing for the removal of the port of entry in the customs collection district in Alaska from Sitka, Alaska, to Juneau, Alaska, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2319); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11213) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise to various subports in the customs collection district of Puget Sound, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2321); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10425) to restrict the unlimited transfer of merchandise in bonded warehouses, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2320); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

* Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3029) granting an increase of pension to Margaret French, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2279); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4811) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Sibley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2280); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4948) granting an increase of pension to Elijah A. Peyton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2281); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1045) granting a pension of \$12 per month to Matilda Witt, widow of J. Burgess Witt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2282); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2367) granting a pension to Merton C. Sanborn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2283); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5361) granting an increase of pension to Lucilius C. Moss, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2284); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6343) granting a pension to Harry Hirschensohn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2285); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7502) granting an increase of pension to John W. Moore, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2286); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7985) granting a pension to Alice Jenifer, reported the same with amendment, accompa-

nied by a report (No. 2287); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8783) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Phipps, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2288); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9585) granting an increase of pension to Nelson McIntosh, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2289); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10270) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Kenaday, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2290); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12400) granting a pension to Ellen Cain, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2291); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13142) granting an increase of pension to William M. Lang, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2292); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13196) granting an increase of pension to Fannie A. Hutchason, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2293); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13345) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Gill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2294); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13364) granting an increase of pension to John Cook, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2295); 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. 13431) granting an increase of pension to Micajah Hill, alias Michael C. Hill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2296); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13669) granting a pension to Mary E. Wyse, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2297); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13729) granting a pension to Margaret W. Goodwin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2298); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13792) granting an increase of pension to Ellenora Clavier, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2299); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13958) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Moss, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2300); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14306) granting an increase of pension to Martha Taylor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2301); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14307) granting an increase of pension to Devernia White, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2302); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14363) granting an increase of pension to Pocahontas C. Monteiro, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2303); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14517) granting an increase of pension to Lillie A. Schoppaul, reported the same without amend-

ment, accompanied by a report (No. 2304); 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. 14518) granting a pension to Henderson Evins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2305); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14579) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Moore, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2306); 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. 14598) for the relief of Joseph Otis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2307); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14658) granting an increase of pension to Juliana H. Barry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2308); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14693) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Schell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2309); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14700) granting an increase of pension to H. C. Washburn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2310); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10344) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Gotlob Groezinger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2311); 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. 5859) for the relief of Pacific Pearl Mullett, administratrix of the estate of the late Alfred B. Mullett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2312); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 10) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Taft, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2314); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LIND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14350) for the relief of Albert Steinhauer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2315); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14860) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEARST: A bill (H. R. 14861) to protect life and property at sea—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 145) providing for the publication of 4,000 copies of a translation of the book entitled "Les Combattants Français de la Guerre Américaine, 1778-1783"—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A resolution (H. Res. 303) relative to bill H. R. 9643—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A resolution (H. Res. 304) relative to bill H. R. 7266—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENKINS: A resolution (H. Res. 305) to continue the employment of the messenger to the Committee on the Judiciary until the end of the present Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A resolution (H. Res. 306) relative to the Bonyng v. Shafroth election contest—to the Committee on Elections No. 2.

By Mr. HEARST: A resolution (H. Res. 307) relative to anthracite-coal railroads—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VREELAND: A resolution (H. Res. 308) providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7262—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 14862) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Houghton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14863) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Lauman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 14864) for the relief of the estate of Oneziphore Delahoussaye, deceased, late of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 14865) granting an increase of pension to Mercy J. Wilder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS: A bill (H. R. 14866) to correct the military record of Charles H. Kellen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 14867) granting a pension to William E. Watson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 14868) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 14869) granting a pension to Elisha C. Jennings—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 14870) granting an increase of pension to William Hougendobler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 14871) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14872) granting an increase of pension to Adam Lieberknecht—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 14873) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 14874) granting a pension to Abbie G. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 14875) granting an increase of pension to Seeley Earnest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14876) granting an increase of pension to Francis Stadler, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14877) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Wellman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14878) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hummel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14879) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Dillingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14880) for the relief of William S. Schenck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14881) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14882) granting a pension to Mary Dingler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14883) granting a pension to Charlotte Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 14884) granting an increase of pension to William Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 14885) for the relief of Lewis Dunham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 14886) granting compensation to Joseph Dawson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK: A bill (H. R. 14887) granting an increase of pension to William P. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 14888) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14889) granting an increase of pension to Alfred W. Dearborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14890) granting an increase of pension to Allen R. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14891) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14892) for the relief of A. W. Gregory—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 14893) granting an increase of pension to James W. Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14894) granting

an increase of pension to John Gideon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 14895) for the relief of Joseph A. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

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: Petition of Mrs. Lovell White, president of the Outdoor Art League, of San Francisco, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Association of Union Ex-Prisoners of War, in favor of bills S. 1716 and H. R. 5760—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of farmers of the Twenty-fourth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, in favor of bill H. R. 8678—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 13, of Philadelphia, in favor of a bill to increase the salary of the Supervising Inspector-General of Steam Vessels—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BENTON: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 14794, to pay the heirs of John Sevier, sr., for certain lands taken by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Oneziphore Delahoussaye—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of C. C. Dunton and others, of Madison, Me., and Thaxter Reed and others, of East Madison, Me., in favor of a parcels-post and post-check bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Petition of C. L. Homsher and 56 others, of Bridgeport, Okla., against the legalizing of issuance of \$22,000 of bonds, etc.—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of residents of Bacon, Plainfield, and other towns of Ohio, in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Albany, Wis., in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DANIELS: Petition of citizens of San Luis Obispo County, Cal., in favor of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Paper to accompany bill granting a pension to James W. Officer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John Looper and 55 others, of Johnson, Ark., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Brentwood, Ark., in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of residents of Troy, N. Y., in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Troy, N. Y., in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of J. R. Wilson and others, of London, Tenn., in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRANGER: Resolution of Essex Hopkins Section, No. 23, of the Navy League of the United States, in favor of bills S. 2990 and 2291—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution of Lodge No. 70, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Springfield, Mo., in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK: Petition of S. V. Brewer Post, No. 323, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 14827, providing a penalty for assault with a dangerous weapon or with intent to perpetrate a felony—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELIHER: Resolution of Lodge No. 250, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-Ship Builders, of Boston, Mass., in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Ottumwa Typographical Union,

No. 73, of Ottumwa, Iowa, in favor of an eight-hour bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of bill S. 2641, providing for removal of floating dangers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of bill S. 4505—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of General John Sedgwick Post, No. 37, Grand Army of the Republic, of York, Pa., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY: Petition of members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Ware, Mass., in favor of a bill for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of Lodge No. 250, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron-ship Builders, of Boston, Mass., in favor of bill H. R. 7056—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Mansel H. Bush, of Dorchester, Mass., in favor of increasing the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of residents of Penn Mar, Pa., in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MARSH: Petition of citizens of Warsaw, Ill., in favor of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of A. W. Gregory—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolution of Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 13, of Philadelphia, relative to increasing the salary of the Supervising Inspector-General of Steam Vessels—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of the Paul A. Sorg Paper Company and others, in favor of bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTIS: Petition of citizens of Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y., favoring passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of Mrs. Lovell White, president of the Outdoor Art League, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, in favor of bills S. 1716 and H. R. 5760—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDER: Memorial of the American Anti-Trust League, relative to the official misbehavior and misconduct of Hon. H. M. Clabaugh, chief justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and others—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to James W. Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Petition of Hensley Brothers, of Hot Springs, Ark., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUCKER: Petition of S. M. Summers and 9 others, of Clifton, Mo., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of McMahon Post, No. 208, Grand Army of the Republic, of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of Brown County, Tex., against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of residents of Colorado, Mitchell County, and Cisco, Tex., against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petitions of Charles L. Mountain and 25 others, of Blakeslee, Ohio; Theo. Hauch and 63 others, of Putnam County, Ohio, and Philip White, of Payne, Ohio, in favor of the parcels-post and post-check bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Hiram E. Loomis and Joseph J. Lewis, of Ohio, in favor of bill H. R. 5760, providing pension for all Union soldiers, ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 4385, granting an increase of pension to Thomas Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of many citizens of the towns of Crowell and Wichita Falls, Tex., against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Memorial of the American

Anti-Trust League, relative to certain misbehavior and misconduct of Hon. H. M. Clabaugh and others—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Society of Beaux Arts Architects, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Mrs. Lovell White, president of the Outdoor Art League, of San Francisco, in favor of bill S. 4845—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, against the passage of bills H. R. 11585 and S. 4062—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of the Denver Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, relative to the management of forest reserves—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the League of American Sportsmen, in favor of bill H. R. 11584—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TATE: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of G. A. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: Petition of the board of supervisors of the county of Santa Cruz, Ariz., relative to a bill to increase the number of members of the council of the legislative assembly from twelve to thirteen—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ZENOR: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 8423, for relief of Joseph Hepworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 8, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

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

EUREKA INSURANCE COMPANY, OF PITTSBURG.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of February 29, 1904, a report made by the Auditor for the War Department relative to a reexamination of settlement No. 5000 of 1894 for insurance paid by the Eureka Insurance Company, of Pittsburg, on the steamer *Champion*, payable to W. L. Jones, receiver; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REFINING OF BULLION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Mint submitting for incorporation in the sundry civil appropriation bill a provision to correct certain legislation contained in the deficiency act approved July 7, 1898, relating to the refining and parting of bullion and the by-products therefrom; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed with an amendment the bill (S. 2621) for the widening of V street NW., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10670) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes; further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill numbered 49, 50, and 51; recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agrees to the same with an amendment; agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HULL, Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, and Mr. HAY, managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 5055) granting an increase of pension to Woodson R. Daniel;