

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of James Moore and others, against repeal of the canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIVES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Dallas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of Paul G. Mehlen & Sons, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Mining Congress, for Government aid for State school of mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the American Mining Congress, for a Department of Mines and Mining—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the American Mining Congress, for a law regulating working of mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, for a law repealing private car line companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National Piano Manufacturers' Association of America, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Association for the Protection of Commerce, of New York, for an appropriation to deepen Coney Island channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Edward G. Janeway et al., for a pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Society of Medical Jurisprudence, for reform of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Union League Club of New York, for repeal of duty on art works—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Commercial Law League of America, for reform in the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, for increased power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Commercial Law League of America, for reform in the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCROGGY: Petition of citizens of Mount Carmel, Ohio, and Xenia Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 10 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Bernard Quinn—to the Committee on War Claims.

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

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary Christopher, heir of Lowell G. Spaulding—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of O. De Witt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Bridgewater, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: Petitions of Bozman Council, of Bozman; Ashbury Council, of Lawtonia; Harmony Council, of Cecilton; Parrieville Council, of Habnab, and South Mountain Council, of Boonsboro, all in Maryland, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Schenectady, N. Y., against sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of J. J. Koare et al., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, for legislation in control of railway traffic—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Byron Grange, No. 375, Patrons of Husbandry, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Grange No. 2, Patrons of Husbandry, of Upper Providence, Pa., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Council No. 240, Order United American

Mechanics, of Pottstown, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 658, of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of the Wesleyan Methodist Church Conference, at High Point, N. C., relative to the evils of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Virgin Spring Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Center Point Council, No. 139, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 24, 1906.

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

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

LIST OF JUDGMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to \$19,963.19, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF MIDSHIPMEN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, for inclusion in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, an estimate of appropriation to pay the amounts found due by the Auditor for the Navy Department for traveling expenses of midshipmen from their homes to the Naval Academy in June, 1905, etc., \$6,478.57; 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 has passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8994. An act to provide for a land district in Yellowstone, Carbon, and Rosebud counties, in the State of Montana, to be known as the "Billings land district;" and

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to authorize use of transport *Sumner* to convey members of Santiago Battlefield Commission and others to Cuba and return.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 321. An act to provide for the extension of time within which homestead settlers may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Uinta Indian Reservation, within the counties of Uinta and Wasatch, in the State of Utah; and

S. 2159. An act authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of Eleanor G. Swan and 52 other citizens of Independence, Iowa, 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.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the congregation of the Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Hinsdale, N. H., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law, and also 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 Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of E. C. Lewis, of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the present pension law, increasing pensions for partial deafness; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate child

labor in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of Potomac Post, No. 11; of Frederick Douglass Post, No. 21, of the Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, and of the Legion of Loyal Women, all of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a temporary home in the District of Columbia for ex soldiers and sailors of the late wars; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PILES (for Mr. ANKENY) presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Walla Walla, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Columbia and Snake rivers in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. ANKENY) presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the maintenance of the Farm Management Bureau of the Department of Agriculture; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented a petition of Local Division No. 238, Order of Railway Conductors, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 238, Order of Railway Conductors, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DRYDEN presented the petition of Daniel E. Ridge, of Gloucester City, N. J., praying that he be granted relief for injuries sustained during the late civil war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Elizabeth, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Haddonfield, N. J., and a petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Haddonfield, N. J., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the New Jersey State Horticultural Society, of Mount Holly, N. J., praying that increased appropriations be made for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of the Society for Organizing Charity, of Salem; of Industry Council, No. 50, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Jersey City, and of Local Council No. 290, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Martinsville, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 146, Cigar Makers' International Union, of New Brunswick, N. J., and a memorial of the Trades and Labor Federation of New Brunswick, N. J., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars and tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 3, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of Carpenters' Local Union No. 668, of Palo Alto; Abraham Lincoln Council, of San Francisco, and U. S. Grant Council, of San Francisco, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring that the fineness of gold or silver in goods made of those metals and used in interstate or foreign commerce be stamped thereon; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reestablishment of the Army canteen; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the board of supervisors of Cochise County, Territory of Arizona, remonstrating against the

enactment of legislation providing for the admission of New Mexico and Arizona into the Union as one State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Santiago Orange Growers' Association, of Orange, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the Cigar Makers' International Union, No. 332, of San Diego, and of Cigar Makers' International Union, No. 228, of San Francisco, in the State of California, remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on cigars and tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying that Congress provide for proper representation of the United States at the Milan exposition; which was referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Santa Clara, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Oklahoma Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the unrestricted entrance into the United States of Chinese merchants, professional men, travelers and students; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Riverside, Cal., praying that adequate appropriation be made for certain improvements in the Yosemite Valley; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of the governing board of the Commercial Club of Lewiston, Idaho, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the navigation of Clearwater River, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rupert, Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation providing that the lots in the town site of Rupert be sold for cash; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Swanton, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and also for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 3285) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Hull; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAY. I present certain memorials from citizens of my State, relative to a railroad-rate bill. They are very brief, and the memorialists request that the memorials be printed in the RECORD. I ask that the body of the memorials be printed in the RECORD, and that they be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia presents certain memorials, and asks that they be printed in the RECORD, excepting the signatures, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The memorials are as follows:

MACON TRADES AND LABOR LEAGUE, No. 5,
Macon, Ga., January 18, 1906.

Whereas bills are pending in Congress and Senate of the United States to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission with authority to fix freight rates on all railroads in the United States; and

Whereas rate making means rate reduction, which will have to be met by the railroad management, reducing expenses, and as they can not reduce the interest on their bonds, price of steel rails, cross-ties, bridge iron, etc., then the reduction must come off of the wages of their employees, thus taking it from the wage-earning class and giving it to the rich shippers: Now, be it

Resolved by the Macon Trades and Labor League in regular session, That we are opposed to this class legislation and pray our Senators and Congressmen to vote against it, believing it to be for the best interest of a large majority of the people.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senators Bacon and Clay, and Congressman Bartlett, with a request that they read them before their respective bodies, and we spread them on our record for future reference.

We certify that we represent and voice the wishes of 3,500 wage-earners.

Atlanta Labor League, composed of the following crafts: Machinists, blacksmiths, boiler makers, carpenters, carmen, engineers, conductors, clerks, firemen, flagmen, trainmen, coppermiths, tinsmiths, laborers.

Whereas we are opposed to any rebates or favoritism in freight rates, we are equally opposed to any law which would empower any Government commission with arbitrary power to make rates, believing it to be dangerous to our form of government; and

Whereas we feel confident that said commission would reduce rates, compelling the railroads to reduce expenses, which would first come off of the wages of the employees: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Atlanta Labor League in regular session on January 10, 1906. That we are opposed to any bill becoming a law which would clothe the seven men with such gigantic power.

Be it further resolved, That the secretary mail Hon. A. O. BACON and A. S. CLAY and Hon. L. F. LIVINGSTON each a copy of these resolutions, with a request that they have them read before their respective bodies, and a copy to be sent to the chairman of the committee of the Senate and House of Representatives on Interstate Commerce, and the same to be spread on our record for further reference.

Unanimously passed January 10, 1906, at a regular meeting held at Atlanta, Ga.

These resolutions represent 1,350 employees.

SAVANNAH TRADES AND LABOR LEAGUE, No. 6,
Savannah, Ga., January 20, 1906.

Whereas several bills are now pending in the United States Senate and House of Representatives to take out of the hands of the railroads the right to make freight rates and delegate said right to Interstate Commerce Commission, appointed by the President of the United States; and

Whereas we consider this a dangerous class of legislation which would undermine the shrine of American liberty and result in chaos, where now tranquillity exists, between employer and employee, said Commissioners would justify this additional power by reducing rates and the railroads would be compelled to reduce expenses, as they can not control price of steel rails, cross-ties, bridge iron, etc. The reduction would fall upon a million and a half of employees who are not protected in any of the recent bills pending before Congress: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Savannah Trades and Labor League, No. 6, in regular session, That we are opposed to this class of legislation, and pray our Senators and Representatives to work and vote against it, believing it to be to the best interest of the majority of people in this country.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent Senators BACON and CLAY and Congressman LESTER, with the request that they be read in each of their respective Houses, and a copy be sent the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and be spread on our records for future reference.

We certify that we represent and voice the wishes of 7,500 citizens and wage-earners of this district.

Resolutions unanimously adopted. Regular session, Savannah, January 20, 1906.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsburg, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the present antievent law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsburg, Pa., 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 George W. Childs Assembly, No. 6401, Knights of Labor, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Decatur Council, No. 613, of Tarentum; Vine Cliff Council, No. 107, of Pittsburg; Shermanstown Council, No. 834, of Shermanstown; James A. Garfield Council, No. 206, of Johnstown; Bainbridge Council, No. 128, of Pittsburg; East Tyrone Council, No. 346; Banner Council, No. 310, of Cokeville; Colonel H. B. Wright Council, No. 896, of Slocum; Coatesville Council, No. 421, of Coatesville; Chatham Council, No. 235, of Chatham; Blairsville Council, No. 216; Atlas Council, No. 963, of Siegfrieds; Haner Council, No. 1013, of Spring Grove; Anna M. Ross Council, No. 553, of Philadelphia; William J. Byers Council, No. 282, of Wilkes-Barre; Crystal Council, No. 800, of Jeannette; Ashley Council, No. 149, of Ashley; Willow Grove Council, No. 139; Dawson Council, No. 75, of Dawson; Springville Council, No. 659, of Artz; Jordan Council, No. 746, of Allentown; Colonel Fred Taylor Council, No. 762, of Philadelphia; Annette Council, No. 732, of Phillipsburg; Morning Star Council, No. 29; Aurora Council, No. 304; Aspinwall Council, No. 233; John R. Marlen Council, No. 20, of Philadelphia; Painterville Council, No. 211; Wilkes-Barre Council; Aliquippa Council, No. 567, of Aliquippa; Dunmore Council, No. 1022, of Dunmore; Rockdale Council, No. 803, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Penfield Grange, No. 1240, Patrons of Husbandry, of Penfield; Mehoopany Grange, No. 1139, of Mehoopany; Columbia Grange, No. 83, of Columbia; Summit Grange, No. 1155, Patrons of Husbandry, of St. Marys; Fort Grange, No. 951, Patrons of Husbandry, of McAlevys Fort; Logan Valley Grange, No. 664, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bellwood; Tunkhannock Grange, No. 209, Patrons of Husbandry, of Eatonville, and Brandywine Grange, No. 60, Patrons of Husbandry, of Westchester, all of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the oleomargarine law

of 1886 by striking out the word "knowingly" in the sixth section thereof, and also for the enactment of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the present Chinese-exclusion law admitting Chinese merchants, visitors, and travelers into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

ROADS IN ALASKA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I present letters from the Secretary of War, transmitting a memorandum prepared by Maj. W. P. Richardson, Ninth Infantry, president of the board of road commissioners of Alaska, containing data and recommendations relative to railroad construction in the district of Alaska, and recommending that an appropriation of \$150,000 be immediately available for the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, etc., in that Territory. I move that the letters and accompanying memorandum be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2451) granting to the State of North Dakota 30,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a school of forestry, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DRYDEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2087) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, reported the following order; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Ordered, That there be printed 500 copies of the hearings before the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, 300 for the use of the Senate and 200 for the use of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 3623) to regulate interstate traffic in adulterated or misbranded articles and to permit the respective States and Territories to regulate the sale thereof within their respective boundaries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CARTER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3624) granting a pension to Martha J. Bryan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3625) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Grisvot (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3626) granting a pension to Catherine Coyle.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 3627) removing the charges of desertion, and granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin Warner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Charles Moyer (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3629) granting an increase of pension to William Hibbs.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 3630) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Barber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 3631) for the relief of Frances A. Bliss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 3632) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 3633) to erect a statue to Pierre Charles L'Enfant; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 3634) granting a pension to Thomas H. Pierce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 3635) to increase the number

of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

A bill (S. 3636) to correct the military record of Robert B. Tubbs;

A bill (S. 3637) to correct the military record of George H. Keating; and

A bill (S. 3638) providing for the retirement of noncommissioned officers, petty officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 3639) granting an increase of pension to William Coxton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3640) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Brenton;

A bill (S. 3641) granting an increase of pension to William P. Marshall; and

A bill (S. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. C. Jones.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 3643) granting an increase of pension to Seth Raymond; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 3644) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3645) to correct the military record of Edwin H. Moyer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 3646) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Zimmerman;

A bill (S. 3647) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan S. Crawford;

A bill (S. 3648) granting an increase of pension to James Jaermiah;

A bill (S. 3649) granting a pension to Sarah Agnes Sullivan;

A bill (S. 3650) granting an increase of pension to William W. Archer;

A bill (S. 3651) granting an increase of pension to John H. Martens;

A bill (S. 3652) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Noble;

A bill (S. 3653) granting an increase of pension to Francis J. Keffer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3654) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Jones (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3655) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Good (with an accompanying paper).

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

A bill (S. 3656) for the relief of William Mays;

A bill (S. 3657) for the relief of Joseph A. Kerbey (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3658) for the relief of Matthew H. Elder (with an accompanying paper).

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

A bill (S. 3659) for the relief of the legal representatives of John H. Sothoron (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3660) to pay Lot Flannery and Martin C. Flannery for extra work on the terraces of the United States Capitol;

A bill (S. 3661) for the relief of the Corporation of Roman Catholic Clergymen of Maryland;

A bill (S. 3662) for the relief of Milton F. Colburn, administrator of the estate of Gilbert Colburn, deceased; and

A bill (S. 3663) for the relief of Gottleib Feldmeyer.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 3664) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas Saville; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3665) for the relief of Col. P. H. Ellis, of the United States Army, retired; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3666) granting a pension to Alice O. Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3667) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Brisco; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3668) to authorize the Washington Spa Spring and Greta Railroad Company, of Prince George County, to extend its street railway into the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 3669) providing for the resurvey of certain townships of land in the county of Baca, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3670) for the relief of David M. Pearson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 3671) granting an increase of pension to Louis Castinetti (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3672) granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Emery (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3673) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wicks; and

A bill (S. 3674) granting an increase of pension to Louis Dufraine.

Mr. TELLER. I introduce a bill providing for an exchange of certain public lands, which I do by request, without committing myself to the bill in any manner.

The bill (S. 3675) to provide for exchanging certain public lands of the United States with the owners of lands heretofore granted in aid of the construction of any railway was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3676) granting an increase of pension to James M. McCorkle; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 3677) to pay S. W. Peel for legal services out of Choctaw funds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 3678) to correct the relative rank of Lieut. Frederick S. L. Price, Fourteenth Regiment of Infantry, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON WATERS AT NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. PLATT. I introduce a joint resolution which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution (S. R. 24) authorizing the President of the United States to invite the Government of Great Britain to join in the formation of an international commission to examine and report upon the diminution in the volume of water passing over the falls of Niagara was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the Government of Great Britain to join in the formation of an international commission, to be composed of four members from each country, whose duty it shall be, from time to time, to report upon the conditions and uses of the waters adjacent to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, and particularly the waters of the Niagara River above the falls of Niagara, and also upon the effect upon the shores of these waters by reason of their diversion from their natural flow, and further to report upon the necessary measures to regulate such diversions, having in view the protection of the falls of Niagara against such diminution of the flow of water over said falls as to impair their natural beauties.

The President is authorized to appoint the United States members of such commission, and said commission is authorized to employ such surveyors, experts, and other persons as it may deem needful in the performance of the duties hereby imposed.

The sum of \$20,000 is hereby appropriated to pay the portion of the expenses of said commission chargeable to the United States, including the compensation of the commissioners representing the United States and of surveyors, experts, and other necessary services.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5976) to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOSTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$215,820.89 to pay the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana the amount due it by the Court of Claims, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill;

which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$450 to pay Charles G. Phelps for extra services as clerk of the select committee appointed to consider the message of the House of Representatives relating to the impeachment of Charles Swayne, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

On motion of Mr. GORMAN, it was

Ordered, That 300 copies of House Document No. 226, Fifty-eighth Congress, third session, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 8994. An act to provide for a land district in Yellowstone, Carbon, and Rosebud counties, in the State of Montana, to be known as the Billings land district, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

BATTLEFIELD MONUMENTS IN CUBA.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) to authorize the use of the transport *Sumner* to convey members of the Santiago Battlefield Commission and others to Cuba and return was read the first time by its title.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to employ the United States Army transport *Sumner* to convey, from New York to Santiago de Cuba and return, the members of the Santiago Battlefield Commission and the representatives of the President and of the State and War Departments, to enable them to attend the ceremonies to be held at the dedication of battle monuments at El Caney, Fort San Juan, San Juan Ridge, and San Juan de Mayaras Hill, in the immediate vicinity of Santiago de Cuba: *Provided*, That the total additional expense shall not exceed \$10,000.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

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

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

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. BLACKBURN was, on his own motion, relieved from further service upon the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MALLORY was, on his own motion, relieved from further service upon the Committee on the District of Columbia.

On motion of Mr. GORMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BLACKBURN was assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia and Mr. MALLORY was assigned to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PURE-FOOD BILL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the Calendar is in order.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 88 be laid before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 88) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes.

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

MOROCCAN CONFERENCE AND RELATIONS WITH SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am entirely conscious of the great difficulty involved in following the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] in the discussion of the important subject upon which he spoke to the Senate yesterday. I quite realize that, after the manner in which he dealt with those questions, anything that I may say is in great danger of being an anticlimax. Where the Senator from Wisconsin has reaped there is very little left for anyone else to glean. But I was referred to so frequently in the course of the debate in connection with the attitude of the Administration in regard to Santo Domingo, that it seemed to me I owed it to myself to say a few words at least upon that subject.

Moreover, Mr. President, I think both questions discussed by the Senator from Wisconsin are of such importance that even reiteration, which is always valuable in bringing important mat-

ters home to the public mind, will not be wholly misplaced. I can not hope to throw much new light upon the subject. Neither can I hope to change personal or partisan prejudice or alter a stolid determination not to look at the facts as they are. But even the most imperfect presentation of the case may help to make it clearer than it now seems to be in certain quarters.

I do not myself think it is a wise practice to discuss matters affecting foreign relations in open Senate. I believe most thoroughly in the wisdom of the practice of the Senate, which has always been to treat such questions in executive session. It is very well, and perhaps within certain limits desirable, that in the House of Representatives, as in the House of Commons in England, subjects relating to our foreign relations should be at times publicly discussed. But the Senate occupies toward our relations with other countries a wholly different attitude. We are a part of the executive government in the administration of foreign affairs, and that which would be an impropriety on the part of the Executive, or on the part of our ambassadors or our Cabinet officers, would be an impropriety on our part, because what is said here carries necessarily greater weight than what is said anywhere else.

But, Mr. President, it is useless to attempt to keep such subjects within the executive session or in secret session unless all Senators are themselves agreed as to the wisdom of doing so. No matter what the practice of the Senate may be, no matter what action it may take on any specific case, it is always perfectly possible for any Senator, by a general resolution, to disregard custom or order and discuss the subject in public if he chooses to do so.

I think too often also we abandon the morning hour, which should be reserved for legislative business, to the discussion of foreign affairs and of general resolutions which rise but little beyond the discussions of a moot court.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the subject, or rather the two subjects, upon which I desire to speak are here. They have been brought before the Senate and their discussion can not be avoided. I shall endeavor, however, in what I have to say not to travel out of the public record or to discuss anything which is more properly to be considered behind closed doors.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], in his interesting speech a day or two ago, devoted all his eloquence and earnestness to the preservation of the principles laid down by Washington in his Farewell Address. If salvation were needed by the principles laid down by Washington, I have no doubt that the Senator from Georgia would then and there have saved them. But I do not myself apprehend that the principles laid down by Washington in the Farewell Address are in the slightest danger.

The conference at Algeciras in regard to Moroccan affairs is the incident which has excited the alarm of the Senator from Georgia, and yet it is the most natural thing in the world. As was pointed out by the Senator from Wisconsin yesterday, this is by no means the first time that, in common with other nations, we have dealt with the affairs of Morocco. We made a treaty with Morocco herself in 1787. In 1865 we made another treaty with Morocco in company with the principal powers of Europe. That treaty was for the erection of a light-house at Cape Spartel and for its neutralization and protection. In 1880 we made another treaty with Morocco in which all the European powers joined, not strictly commercial, but for the protection of foreigners and defining the rights of foreigners in Morocco, and that treaty was ratified by the Senate in 1882. Our representative at the conference was General Fairchild, who was appointed to perform that duty by the President.

When the present troubles began in Morocco we were invited, as a matter of course, as one of the signatories of both these prior conventions, to take part in the new conference. It would have been impossible for Morocco to do otherwise. We have commercial interests there, and in that semicivilized State we have found it necessary to join with other countries in suitable provisions for the protection of our citizens. Now, when questions have arisen which may alter very much the commercial relations of Morocco, it becomes not only our right, but our duty, to see that those interests are still protected.

Senators will remember that last June the German Emperor made a protest against the agreement of the French and English Governments in regard to Morocco, basing his objections upon the maintenance of the open door, which he considered to be in danger. If I am correctly informed and the press is correct about it, he invited us to join in that protest, and we declined. Then subsequently came this invitation to the conference, and this conference was the method by which the danger of war at that period, if it existed, was avoided. The President, of course, appointed delegates. They are now there, and I have no doubt that their presence will be of very great value. We have no right to assume that their instructions are in any way in

conflict with the provisions of the Constitution or with the traditions of the Government.

It is not necessary for me again to go over the ground which the Senator from Wisconsin traversed yesterday. No one, I think, can doubt the absolute power of the President to initiate and carry on all negotiations; and after a treaty has been returned to him with the ratification of the Senate to withhold it from ratification if he sees fit so to do. There is no doubt that the Senate can by resolution advise the President to enter upon a negotiation, or advise the President to refrain from a negotiation; but those resolutions have no binding force whatsoever, and the action of the Senate becomes operative and actually effective only when a treaty is actually submitted to it. We have no possible right to break suddenly into the middle of a negotiation and demand from the President what instructions he has given to his representative. That part of treaty making is no concern of ours. As was suggested to me by a distinguished Senator the other day, it would be just as if the President were to send word to us that, if not incompatible with the public interest, he would be obliged if we would send him our secret journals.

He is entitled under the Constitution to come here and join with us in the consideration of treaties or other executive business. As a matter of fact, that was never done but by Washington, and it has been abandoned ever since, although the right remains recognized by our rule to-day. Yet I think we should be disposed to resent it if a request of that sort was made to us by the President of the United States.

We are rightly jealous in the maintenance of our prerogatives. I use the word as the Senator from Wisconsin correctly used it yesterday, for prerogative is not necessarily a royal prerogative. Meaning merely a special privilege or inherent right it may appertain to anything or to anybody. In looking up the word in order to confirm my own memory I found a quotation from Burke in which he referred to the prerogative of a freeman, and we speak of the prerogative of Parliament, or the prerogative of a court, or the prerogatives of the Senate.

Mr. President, I repeat we are justly jealous of our own prerogatives and our own rights, but we can not maintain them or insist upon them unless we are equally observant of the prerogatives and the rights of the other departments of the Government. It is a mere invasion of the powers and rights of the President if we are to plunge in at a stage of the negotiation where we have no business whatever and demand from him the instructions which he has given to his properly appointed representatives. When the treaty made by those representatives comes before us then is the time, and not before, in which we can properly ask for information in regard to all which led up to it.

Mr. President, the idea that there is something very strange and very novel in our joining with other nations in the settlement by treaty of matters affecting commercial questions, or, indeed, other questions, is a wholly mistaken one. The famous warning against entangling alliances which is embodied in the Farewell Address, as everyone is aware, grew out of the troubles which Washington endured on account of our alliance with France. The party of opposition, the "Anti-Federalist party," as it was then called, the party of Thomas Jefferson, had opposed with the utmost bitterness the neutrality policy of Washington and his Cabinet. They had urged that we should interpret that treaty to mean that we should go to war with the enemies of France whether France was making an offensive or a defensive war. Out of that situation grew Washington's wise and judicious warning; but he was altogether too sensible and too practical a man to suppose that because we were not to engage in alliances which might involve us in the wars of Europe, with which we had no concern, therefore we were never to engage in any agreements with any nations of Europe, no matter how beneficial they might be to the world at large or to ourselves.

I have here a rough list of some of the treaties in which we have joined with other countries. In 1863 we joined with the countries of Europe in a general treaty as to tariff dues on the river Scheldt. In 1866 we joined with France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands in a tariff treaty with Japan. In 1899 we made a joint treaty with Germany and Great Britain for the settlement of the Samoan question. We joined in international conventions in 1864 relating to wounded in time of war; again in 1868 on the same subject; in 1875 on weights and measures; in 1883 as to industrial property; in 1884 as to submarine cables; in 1886 as to the exchange of official documents; in 1890 as to customs tariffs; in 1890 as to the African slave trade; in 1899 in a general treaty for the exclusion of spirituous liquors from Africa; in 1901 we were one of the signers of the protocol with China as to the Boxer trouble, and in 1899 we joined in all of The Hague conventions.

Mr. President, if the principle were carried out that we were

never to join with any other countries, that entangling alliances meant anything of that kind, most of the great and beneficial things which have been achieved by international agreement would have become impossible to us.

We have joined, as I have shown, with other countries in regard to Morocco before. We are there now properly, entirely properly, in regard to commercial interests, if nothing else. I am prepared to go further than that, Mr. President. If the influence of the United States can be exerted at that conference, if its good offices can be used toward the preservation of the world's peace, I sincerely hope they may be.

It is the policy of the United States to be at peace; but, more than that, the policy and interest of the United States alike demand the peace of the world, and it is not to be supposed for a moment that we are never to exert our great moral influence or to use our good offices for the maintenance of the world's peace.

The moral influence of the United States was exerted last summer, through the President of the United States, in such a way as to bring to an end one of the bloodiest wars of modern times. I believe there are persons who are disposed to criticize the President even for doing that. When those little criticisms have sunk into silence and been forgotten the peace between Russia and Japan, which was due to the President of the United States, representing, as he did, the moral influence of this country, will stand out as a noble and historic achievement and one of the great events of modern times.

Mr. President, in entangling alliances, of course, no man wants to engage this country; we have no concern with the wars of Europe; no one for a moment would think of engaging us in a position where we might be involved in them, the President least of all, for on the President, whoever he may be, falls the most dire responsibility in case of war; but, Mr. President, the phrase "entangling alliances" does not mean that we should not unite with other nations on commercial questions, on the settlement of the rights of commerce, as to the rights of our citizens in other countries, or in the promotion of those great and beneficent objects which are embodied in international conventions.

Mr. President, I do not care to go further into the question of our relations to the conference at Algieras. The case is really too plain to require more than a mere statement. I for one am very glad that we are represented there. I have no doubt that what is there done and the presence of our envoys there will make for the advancement of our commerce in Morocco and will also make for what is infinitely more important, the peace of the world.

I desire now to say a further word in regard to Santo Domingo, which has been the principal subject of discussion in the debate which has sprung up here in regard to various resolutions. That treaty, Mr. President, involves a very large question of policy, and has been used to open a very extensive discussion upon the Monroe doctrine. I was quoted the other day as having said that it was a "new departure," that it was a "new policy." The reference was to a speech which I made last summer—an entirely extemporaneous speech—in which I used neither the phrase "new departure" nor "new policy." I spoke of the treaty as "the beginning of a great policy," and in using the word "beginning" I spoke loosely and inaccurately. I should have said that it was the continuance of a great policy; and I am prepared, and desire briefly, to show why I think it is also a sound and necessary policy. In the first place, I do not think that we can escape from our responsibilities, and I think our responsibilities in those islands are not created for us merely by the Monroe doctrine, but by the very fact of our neighborhood to those islands.

As the Monroe doctrine has been brought into the case, I want to say a word in regard to it. It was very ably and very eloquently discussed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], and upon what he then said I wish myself to say something. The Monroe doctrine is very familiar and almost as much misunderstood I sometimes think. We constantly refer to the famous passage in which President Monroe said:

With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere; but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

But there was another principle laid down in another part of the message, where Mr. Monroe said:

That the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

The exclusion of Europe from meddling with the political conditions of the American States was advanced by Canning before it was advanced in this country, and, as is well known, he invited us to join with him in that protest; but it is not quite so well known that after Mr. Monroe's message Mr. Canning, in more than one dispatch, absolutely repudiated the doctrine on account of the clause relating to colonization. When he repudiated it, he refused to go on with us as against the claims of Russia on the northwest coast.

Up to that time England and the United States had protested jointly and proposed to act jointly against the enormous claims put forward by Russia in the ukase of 1820. But Canning broke from us at that time on account of that clause relating to colonization. The clause relating to colonization is the really vital one, for it covers the acquisition of territory; and it is that which I desire to discuss briefly, with some reference to what the Senator from Maryland said in regard to it.

I am quite ready to admit that the temporary possession of a custom-house does not in the least necessarily involve the Monroe doctrine. So far as enforcing contractual obligations by force of arms may go, that is something about which there is a great variety of opinions, and the practice has been as various as the opinions. But in regard to the Monroe doctrine, the Senator from Maryland cited three cases which he suggested settled our interpretation of it. I do not think his citations were altogether fortunate for his purpose, and yet I think he covered the only cases where the Monroe doctrine has been brought into controversy, except, perhaps, the first Venezuelan case.

The Senator from Maryland referred first to the action of France in regard to Mexico, and quoted from a letter of Mr. Seward as showing that we did not regard that at the outset, at least, as an infringement of the Monroe doctrine. He drew a large deduction from mere silence, and the inference is contradicted by subsequent events. Mr. President, it is to be remembered that when England, France, and Spain conjointly determined to send a fleet over here for the purpose of taking coercive measures in regard to Mexico they stated in the convention which they made:

ART. II. The high contracting parties engage not to seek for themselves, in the employment of the coercive measures contemplated by the present convention, any acquisition of territory nor any special advantage, and not to exercise in the internal affairs of Mexico any influence of a nature to prejudice the right of the Mexican nation to choose and to constitute freely the form of its government.

In other words, they explicitly in their convention included all the prohibitions of the Monroe doctrine. England and Spain found that France intended to go much further, and they withdrew from the agreement. Then it became evident that it was the purpose of France to overthrow the Mexican Government and establish on its ruins an imperial government with a member of the House of Austria as the head.

There was never any doubt then, I think, in the minds of anyone here that it was an infringement of the Monroe doctrine. Certainly if we had not been engaged in our civil war, we should have acted with immense promptitude; but, as it was, the House of Representatives passed a resolution, without a dissenting voice, in 1864, declaring that:

The Congress of the United States are unwilling by silence to have the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico, and that they therefore think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge any monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America under the auspices of any European power.

The very day after the surrender of Lee at Appomattox a dispatch went from Washington, through our London legation, to our French legation notifying the Government of France that the United States expected the immediate withdrawal of her forces; and we moved an army down to the Mexican border to support our demand.

There was no doubt whatever as to what the world thought of it. Sir Edward Creasy, a distinguished English historian, says in his book, the *First Platform of International Law*:

The United States (occupied by their own civil war which was then raging) did not actually send troops to oppose the French in Mexico, but they steadily refused to recognize Maximilian or any other government except a republican government in Mexico; and the language of their statesmen exhibited the fullest development of the Monroe doctrine.

I have always believed, and I still think, Mr. President, that our action after the civil war was a thorough and powerful vindication of the Monroe doctrine, which had been seriously invaded and disregarded by the French.

Now, as to the Corinto incident, which is referred to by the Senator from Maryland. That was brought about, not by a contractual obligation of any kind or by the failure to pay bonds, but by an affront offered to the British consul. An indemnity for that indignity was demanded by the British Gov-

ernment. They sent a fleet to Corinto; they took temporary possession, and they compelled Nicaragua and the surrounding States to pay this indemnity of £75,000. I thought at the time that the attitude of our Government was weak and spiritless. I thought, despite the fact that there was no attempt to overturn the Government of Nicaragua and no attempt to take permanent possession there, that nevertheless our Government ought to have interfered and that the incident was one of evil example.

I desire further merely to show that very far from establishing a precedent as to our interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, the Corinto incident was thought at the time by American statesmen to have been treated by our Government in a very dangerous manner and in a way we should not have permitted.

I quote the words of one of the ablest international lawyers who ever sat in this Chamber—a man of profound learning, who had given the study of years to this question. I refer to the late Senator Davis, of Minnesota. In his little book *On International Law* he says:

The events at Corinto, in Nicaragua, are recent and well known. For a trifling offense to her dignity, which was either wholly denied or greatly palliated by the statement of Nicaragua, which was committed during a time of revolutionary excitement, Great Britain fined that weak and poverty-stricken Republic \$75,000, and demanded immediate payment in gold. It was in vain that Nicaragua pleaded for arbitration. It was in vain that she asked for time to pay the money, arbitration having been refused. In default of immediate payment, the British ships of war appear in Corinto. British troops take possession of the town. The British flag floats over Nicaraguan soil, and this armed occupation continues, until, it is said, Costa Rica, San Salvador, Guatemala, the little brothers of that family of republics, contribute what pocket money they have to get the burly, blustering intruder out of the house. Of course, the pretext was that England has the right to make war upon Nicaragua, and that her seizure of a portion of its territory, to hold it and govern it until the fine is paid, is not an infraction of the Monroe doctrine. But, all things considered, the nature of the grievance, the brutality of the reprisal, the refusal to arbitrate or to give time to pay, the actual seizure of territory, the position of Great Britain on the Atlantic coast as to the Nicaragua Canal, her position at Corinto, on the Pacific, as to the same work, the great investments of American capital in that enterprise, the successful continuation of which greatly depends upon political stability in Nicaragua; considering also what Great Britain is doing in Venezuela at the mouth of the Orinoco, looking north to the canal, her possessions in Jamaica and the Windward Islands completely commanding it, it is my opinion that the seizure of Corinto was "dangerous to our peace and safety," and should have been prevented.

I quote that passage merely to show that one of the leading statesmen of the United States at that time not only questioned the attitude of the Administration, but absolutely denied its soundness.

Later, in his second Administration, however, Mr. Cleveland, by his action in the Venezuela question, entirely redeemed the weakness which he had shown in regard to Corinto. The Venezuelan case was an attempt to take additional territory. I do not think anyone will now dispute that the English course then was an infringement of the Monroe doctrine. I very cordially supported the attitude of Mr. Cleveland at that time, and I firmly believe now in the wisdom of his action. It did more to vindicate the Monroe doctrine than anything that had been done up to that period, with the single exception of the expulsion of the French from Mexico. It had a profound effect on Europe, and greatly improved his own relations with Great Britain.

The last case cited by the Senator from Maryland was the recent trouble with Venezuela, when we, without interference, allowed Germany and Italy and Great Britain to go to Venezuela, bombard her towns, and compel her to enter into an arbitration.

Mr. President, it was perfectly understood before those powers moved a ship that no territory was to be taken, and later, if I am not mistaken, assurances were given that no troops were to be landed and no custom-houses taken. It is too early as yet for all the correspondence in relation to that incident to be placed before the world, but I think it will be found that in that incident, as in the case of the invasion of Mexico, the policy of our Government was firmly against permitting even temporary occupations. These cases, far from showing that we have confined our enforcement of the Monroe doctrine to attempts to subvert American governments or seize territory, exactly prove the reverse.

Temporary occupations, so wisely resisted and frowned upon by our Government, are very dangerous things, for there is no limitation on the word "temporary." Egypt began with a temporary occupation by the British and the French, and to-day it is wholly in the control of England. And France has now disavowed by the treaty that relates to Morocco all further connection with Egypt.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator whether Great Britain did not, at the very time she entered upon the occupation, disavow any intention to permanently stay there?

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not only was it to be temporary, but she disavowed that it would be permanent.

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be a very great misfortune to this country to have foreign powers taking possession, temporarily or otherwise, for any purpose, of the custom-houses or other portions of the territory of any of the American republics. I think when that is done it creates a perilous situation, which we should all deplore. It is far wiser to avoid situations of that kind than to wait for them and try to cure them after they have arisen.

I freely admit that the Monroe doctrine in nowise interferes, and ought not to interfere in any way, with the right of any nation to seek redress for any infringement of the rights of its citizens, anything in the nature of a national affront, or anything which derogates from its honor. Of course, the Monroe doctrine touches no question of that kind. In the same way, I am perfectly willing to admit that the Monroe doctrine interferes in no way with the collection of debts. But, Mr. President, that is not the point.

The Monroe doctrine is not a question of international law. As the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] said, it is a declaration of national policy. It is coextensive with the American Navy—not one bit bigger than that. If you have no navy, all the fine talk about the power of the United States and 80,000,000 people will not amount to anything as against the greed of foreign nations. The Monroe doctrine is a vital and effective doctrine just so long as the United States stands behind it with an effective and powerful navy; and the question that we are dealing with in Santo Domingo to-day is not a question of how far the Monroe doctrine goes or where it stops, but is a question simply and solely of the facts and conditions now existing in that unfortunate island.

Look at those three islands as they lie there by the coast of the United States. One of them, Porto Rico, has passed into our hands. Another, Cuba, is under our suzerainty or protectorate. She is limited by us as to her foreign relations; she is limited by us as to her power to borrow money. We made her make those limitations a part of her constitution. The result is that Cuba to-day is the most successful of all the South American Republics which border on the Caribbean Sea, with the exception of Mexico. She has been prosperous; she has been peaceful; there has been no suggestion of foreign interference, and it is simply because we took with her the position we now occupy.

Our policy in regard to Porto Rico and our action in regard to Cuba are not matters of chance. They have come about by necessity. Not only are these islands near our coast, but we are going to build the Panama Canal. We have begun that great work. Its protection and its defense are of enormous importance to the people of the United States, as well as to the commerce of the world, and every portion of the Caribbean Sea is essential to the safety of the canal. We can not possibly allow the canal and the approaches to it to be commanded by any other power, and we have taken naval stations in Cuba for no other reason than its protection.

Between the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, within 90 miles of Porto Rico, where our flag floats, lies the island of Santo Domingo. It is in a condition of chaos. It is buried in debt. It has had a revolution every year at every annual election practically for the last forty years. It is no credit to us or to civilization that such a condition should exist in one of the most fertile and beautiful islands on the face of the earth.

Now, we have been brought face to face with this situation, and I am not summoning up any ghosts or any bogies or anything of that kind. The financial condition of Santo Domingo had reached such a point that foreign nations, representing their bondholders, were determined to get some of the money back. At the time when these negotiations began, at the very time when Colonel Colton went down there by the appointment of Morales and took over the custom-houses, there was an Italian man-of-war lying in the harbor ready to take possession, and intending to take possession, of those custom-houses in case some one like Colonel Colton, representing order and decency, was not put in control of those custom-houses by the Dominican Government.

I think, Mr. President, that in order to avoid the complications growing out of the taking of custom-houses by a foreign government it is infinitely better to take possession of them and administer them ourselves. I do not like this alternative, but I like the present condition still less, and I much prefer doing what it is now proposed that we should do than waiting until some foreign government steps in there. Then we should find ourselves in complications with the foreign power, and some of the very people who are now denouncing the President for interfering in Santo Domingo would be rending the air with shrill

cries and demanding to know why he did not enforce the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. President, the policy embodied in this treaty is the peaceable, the sensible, the intelligent way to deal with this question. I admit it is a disagreeable thing to do. I admit it is not a thing that we naturally would like to do. That is not the question. The point is whether it is not a better process of dealing with a question which we can not avoid than to leave it alone feebly and helplessly until other nations undertake to settle it for themselves. I for one have never had the slightest doubt in regard to the wisdom of this policy.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I wish to ask the Senator a question, with his permission, not for the purpose of argument, but that I may correctly understand the proposition; and if the Senator will accept the interrogatory in that spirit, I should like to submit it.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. The Senator states with force the influences which these neighboring islands, and I suppose he would also include countries upon the Caribbean Sea, or rather the bordering islands and lands on the Caribbean Sea, have necessarily upon our interest in the Panama Canal. The question I desire to ask the Senator is whether the logic of his proposition extends to other islands and bordering countries on the Caribbean Sea, and whether in that case the Senator goes further and means that in every case where a Central American or South American country bordering on the Caribbean Sea or one of the islands should become insolvent and on account thereof be threatened with violence for the collection of debts by some European power, a like obligation would necessarily, whether we desired it or not, rest upon the United States; and if not an obligation, whether the interest of the United States would require similar action in such a case?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the island of Santo Domingo and the adjoining Republic of Haiti, of course, are exceptional in their condition, as they are in their geographical situation. I trust no such condition as that of Santo Domingo will arise in any of the states bordering upon the Caribbean Sea. I certainly hope that nothing of that sort will happen. But if a question should arise which would involve the taking possession, permanently or temporarily—and by "temporarily" I do not mean overnight, but taking possession for administration for a time—of any of these strategic and important points along the Caribbean Sea, I do not think we as the builders and owners of the canal ought to permit it, and I think we ought to take proper steps to stop it if such a thing should occur.

I do not think either that we could afford to see the transfer of islands now held by small and friendly European powers, nonmilitary powers, to great military powers. I do not think we could permit the establishment of great places of arms by any military nation in the Caribbean Sea. I do not think we could afford, in our own interest and in the interest of the canal, to permit those ports and harbors bordering on that sea to be taken possession of.

Mr. BACON. I am very much interested in the statement of the Senator, and he will pardon me for making my question a little more explicit, in order that I may understand him correctly. Does he go to the extent which I will now suggest? I would ask the Senator whether I am to understand from his reply that he means that in case of the insolvency of any of the countries bordering upon the Caribbean Sea and the proposed action by any European power to take possession of custom-houses for the purpose of collecting debts the Senator would recognize that the logic of the proposition suggested by him would either require or make it to the interest of the United States Government to interpose, as it is now proposed to interpose in the case of Santo Domingo, by the United States itself undertaking to administer upon the revenues of that Government, their collection and disbursement, for the purpose of thus satisfying those European nations and for the settlement of the country's debts?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that is a very practical question—I do not mean the way of putting it, but the question itself—at this moment. I think we must deal with each of these cases as they arise. I see no governments around the Caribbean Sea, except the unfortunate Government on this island, which can not take charge of its debts. We may very likely be compelled to exercise some pressure in order to compel them to pay their debts, but I do not see any prospect of such a situation as the Senator suggests.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator pardon me? I think the situation exists now in the case of Venezuela, and we all know that

the finances of Colombia are in a condition where that situation may speedily develop.

Mr. LODGE. When a foreign nation undertakes to take the ports, then will be the time for us to interfere. I do not think the only way of preventing a foreign nation from taking ports for the security of debts or for the payment of indemnity is what we desire to do in Santo Domingo. I think it can be prevented by proper representations and in the way of diplomatic negotiations, as it could be, I believe, and will be eventually in Venezuela; as it was done at the time when Germany and Italy and Great Britain came over and forced Venezuela into The Hague arbitration and into sufficient arrangements for the payment of her debts. But Santo Domingo is too feeble and too helpless to stand alone, and somebody must take possession of her custom-houses in order to relieve her people from the mass of fraudulent debts which are set up against them and to put them in a position where they shall have their debts in process of liquidation and shall be prevented from incurring more.

Under those circumstances I believe they would go on with a reasonable degree of peace and progress, and if we do not do the work somebody else will.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts, but I wish to suggest in this connection whether it is not true that if some government instead of ours does it, the just and admitted claims of American citizens would be extinguished by the preference of the claims of active governments under the award of The Hague tribunal in the Venezuela case? Would not the just and admitted claims of American citizens which would be placed in jeopardy be extinguished?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. We should be relegated to a secondary place in the payment of debts, and, moreover, we should have to join with other nations in that arrangement, if it were made. Instead of doing it ourselves on our own terms, we should join with other countries and have them do it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand the Senator from Massachusetts objects to the occupation of the custom-houses in Santo Domingo by foreign military powers—

Mr. LODGE. By any foreign power.

Mr. NEWLANDS. By any foreign military power, because he fears that that temporary occupation may result in a permanent occupation.

Mr. LODGE. That is not the reason, at least it is not the only reason.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is that one reason?

Mr. LODGE. That is a reason, but I do not think it the only one in this case.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask him if that fear exists, whether there is not also fear that if we enter into the temporary occupation of these custom-houses for the purpose of collecting the debts due foreign nations, it will end in our drifting into permanent occupation, not simply of the custom-houses, but of the territory?

Mr. LODGE. One of my reasons for advocating this policy is that, in my judgment, it will have precisely the opposite effect. It has saved us from the annexation of Cuba, by the establishment of the partial control which we have over her debt and her foreign relations. One of the dangers I want to guard against is the reduction of Santo Domingo to such a condition that she will be forced into our hands. I do not want to take possession of those islands. I do not want to annex them to the United States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LODGE. Let me finish. I say I think the arrangement we made with Cuba, which was embodied in her constitution, by which we should have a voice in her foreign relations; by which we should have a voice in the manner in which her debt was incurred, is what prevented the annexation of the island. I think if we establish order in Santo Domingo by administering her custom-houses and settling her debts, we shall bring that island into a condition where annexation will be out of the question; but if we leave it in this welter of financial distress and political disorder, sooner or later we shall have to take her in self-defense, because we can not let anybody else take

possession of the island; and I do not want to annex any more islands.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to cite several instances where mere *possessio pedis*, such as we shall have under his proposed plan in Santo Domingo, has ripened into occupation and alleged title?

Mr. LODGE. I know that. I have already stated so myself. I have been over some of those cases in illustrating another part of the argument. I know what the Senator means.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then I will not trespass upon the Senator's time.

Mr. LODGE. I think temporary occupation by a foreign power might easily ripen into something of that sort. I do not believe our taking possession will, because we tested it in the case of Cuba, and I think we have a well-settled policy which I think we are capable of following out.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit me to cite him at least two instances in our own history in which innocent acts, temporary possession, accidental acts, have ripened into possession, and—

Mr. LODGE. Taking possession of custom-houses?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; to occupation of territory.

Mr. LODGE. Have ripened into annexation? I should like to hear them.

Mr. NEWLANDS. For instance, under our treaty with Colombia we had a mere *possessio pedis* on the Isthmus of Panama, involving a mere right of way—

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows that is not a parallel case. It was settled by treaty.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I propose to show it is a parallel case.

Mr. LODGE. I wish the Senator would do so in his own time. It will take too much of mine.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will not trespass upon the Senator's time.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to a question, but this will take too much time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator asked me to cite several instances, but, of course, I do not wish to proceed without his consent.

Mr. LODGE. The point I wish to make is that I believe that this treaty is the surest way of avoiding annexation. I believe it is the surest way of preventing temporary foreign interference or occupation; and, Mr. President, except for the great mistake of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, we have sedulously guarded ourselves from permitting any foreign nation even to join us in anything relating to American affairs. One of the great and, to my mind, vital objections to the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty was that we invited the nations of Europe to join with us in neutralizing the canal. We do not want any assistance in managing American affairs.

Mr. President, if we take this ground, and we always have taken it, then the responsibility goes with it, and the responsibility is to see that these people, where they are helplessly unable to do it themselves, should be aided by us to pay their debts and maintain a reasonable degree of order. It was with that view that the treaty was made. The Senate adjourned without action upon the treaty. It neither ratified it nor did it reject it.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], in his usual picturesque way, described the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and myself as going to see the President in regard to it after the adjournment of the Senate. He might have included the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] as being present at the conversation to which, I suppose, he alludes, and he further described us as there surrendering our convictions and joining in with this Presidential policy which, under guise of a temporary arrangement, put the treaty in force.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is giving me credit for language which is not mine. It is the New York Sun's that I quoted, and I could not pretend to compete with the Sun in picturesque language.

Mr. LODGE. I was referring to the phrase "surrender at discretion."

Mr. TILLMAN. That, too, is in the Sun's article.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; then, the picturesque language is the New York Sun's. I am quite willing to admit that it is better language than the Senator's, if the Senator says so. I made no surrender, that I know of, of any kind. I was, personally, heartily in favor of this policy from the beginning as I am today. I think it is essential. I think it is absolutely sound and

wise. I think it is a preventive of much greater and much worse evil.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator says he is in favor of this policy now and has been from the beginning. As I understand him, this policy involves the prevention of any European nation acquiring a foothold in the Caribbean. The Senator, of course, is already aware that Great Britain owns Jamaica—

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. And has fortified it.

Mr. LODGE. It owned it at the time the Monroe doctrine was enunciated.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know. They already have great naval stations there, and either of their navies is larger than ours.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not follow current events. Great Britain has given up Santa Lucia as a place of arms and has specifically withdrawn.

Mr. TILLMAN. Bermuda is right north. She is close enough, and she has ships enough to give us trouble.

Mr. LODGE. Where does the Senator think the Bermudas are?

Mr. TILLMAN. They are a little off Florida—a little west.

Mr. LODGE. Has not the Senator mixed them up with the Bahamas?

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not studied geography lately, but they are close enough, and in case of trouble—

Mr. LODGE. The Bermudas are far off in the Atlantic. They are not in the Caribbean at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. That may be. I am not trying to bring out the exact geographical location of these places, but the fact is that Great Britain already owns and controls the island of Jamaica, and her fleet is able to trouble us, I think, though I doubt whether there is any other fleet that could seriously disturb us on this side of the ocean. Her fleet controls the Caribbean Sea and is likely to control it; and is not this a bugaboo which the Senator is trying to bring out here to frighten the imagination of the American people when he says it is our business to seize upon and control the destinies of this little black republic and become responsible for its good order and thrift and responsibility as a debt payer?

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the Senator from South Carolina asking me a question, but I do hope that he will not put into my mouth words I never uttered or anything resembling them.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did ask a question.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] fortunately has a map here. I merely call attention to the fact that the Bermudas are off here [indicating] in the Atlantic Ocean, in the latitude of Charleston.

Mr. TILLMAN. I said they were off Florida, only a hundred or two miles away, north.

Mr. LODGE. I should think they are, roughly, about a thousand miles from Santo Domingo. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] says about fifteen hundred miles from Santo Domingo. They are, as I said, near the center of the Atlantic Ocean and north of the West Indies, and have nothing to do with them.

Mr. TILLMAN. Jamaica is one of the West Indies.

Mr. LODGE. I will not discuss what any nation might do in case of war. At least now there is no nation with a great place of arms there, and I do not wish to see a great nation establish itself there; and if there is one, I do not care for another.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator from South Carolina evidently did not intend to include Bermuda, for he mentioned several islands in the neighborhood under discussion. The Senator from Massachusetts, well aware of the absence of Bermuda from the neighborhood, mentioned the fact that England had broken up its great naval establishment at St. Lucia. But the nearest land to the mouth of the Panama Canal is Jamaica. It lies due north of it, and in Jamaica, at Kingston, is the largest entrepôt of naval stores and arms and the greatest dock and the greatest shipyard in the Western Hemisphere. That is certainly a fact that ought not to be excluded while we are showing what there is there.

Mr. LODGE. The great fleet, which I understood the Senator to say was at the island of St. Lucia, has certainly been withdrawn; at least it was so announced by the prime minister of England, just as they withdrew from Halifax.

Mr. MONEY. If the Senator will allow me, they also proposed to withdraw the troops from the Blue Mountains of Jamaica, and it so excited the white people that they threatened to go away.

Mr. LODGE. I am not discussing the possessions of Great Britain there. They are there. They have always been there. Great Britain is not seeking to interfere with us. We are not seeking to interfere with her possessions, but the fact that there is one foreign nation there does not alter the force of the argument that it is not desirable to have another.

To return to the point at which I was interrupted. The case being in that condition, the treaty pending in the Senate, the President of the United States is said by Senators on the other side to have put the treaty into practical operation by his own act. I need not go over the ground, as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin, that the President of the Dominican Republic appointed a man designated by the President of the United States, and that under a decree of the Dominican Republic that man and his assistants have collected the revenues of Santo Domingo.

There is not one single arrangement beyond the division of the amount of revenue which has a counterpart in the treaty. The President by that arrangement, which the Dominican Government submitted to him and which he accepted, has maintained the status in the island and prevented it from going to wreck while the treaty was pending. Nothing is more common than to make arrangements for maintaining a status during the pendency of a treaty.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator, from his great familiarity with these matters, cite us to another case in which one party maintained the relationship of both parties; in other words, where one party not only undertook for himself to preserve the status quo, but also took upon himself the obligation to preserve the status quo for the other fellow?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, nobody undertook to preserve the status quo. That is a common provision in treaties. The Senator can look over the treaties and conventions in our collection of treaties and in other collections and he will find it is a very common provision.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understand that, but—

Mr. LODGE. There is no such provision in this treaty, and it would not have expedited matters if there had been. The President of the Dominican Republic made an arrangement, with the approval of our Executive, for the maintenance of the status quo in Santo Domingo.

Mr. TILLMAN. As I understand it, from the documents that have been furnished, the President himself made the decree, and then the Dominican people, or the Dominican President, accepted it, and the proclamation of Morales is subsequent to the order of the President to the War Department to detail Colonel Colton. One is dated in April and the other is dated in March, and the President's order is dated in March.

Mr. LODGE. Of course the request was submitted through the usual diplomatic channels to the President, asking him if he would make such a designation. He was asked to do it, and when they were informed that he would, they made the necessary decree and proclaimed it; and that is all that has been done. My own judgment is that the President would have been derelict in his duty if he had not done that precise thing.

I think, Mr. President, it is extremely important that that treaty should be ratified. I can not enter upon a discussion of the details of the treaty here, and I have no desire to do so. It is not properly before us. It is quite true that the treaty is not—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish right here to ask the Senator, as he is commenting upon the treaty—

Mr. LODGE. I am not going to comment on the treaty.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, he is referring to it, and I wish to ask him whether he does not think it would be advisable to discuss that treaty in the open Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I do not.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Here let me say that whilst I object to the method in which the President has intervened in this matter, I realize that there is a situation which requires serious consideration by the Government of the United States, and perhaps action. But I believe that as we are now considering a new policy with reference to the Central American, South American, and Caribbean republics, which are hopelessly involved in debt, we should take the entire country into our confidence and discuss that entire question before the entire people. I believe the end of such a discussion, aided by the public judgment as ex-

pressed in discussion elsewhere, in newspapers and in periodicals, would be to reach a just conclusion.

I appeal to the Senator from Massachusetts as one of the influential members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to favor a resolution making this treaty a matter of open discussion in the Senate. Already I understand it has been discussed by the President practically in his public utterances, and I see no reason why we should not discuss it before the American people. I ask the Senator whether he would not favor such a resolution?

Mr. LODGE. No, Mr. President, I should not favor it, and I do not care to discuss it now, for it does not seem to be at all apposite to what I am trying to discuss, which is the general policy which has been adopted. This task in Santo Domingo is not an agreeable one, as I have said; but if we now reject this treaty, if we now abandon this policy, if the President withdraws the ships and leaves the island alone, on what ground can we rightfully interfere with some other nation which goes down there to collect her debts?

We are told that it is not an infringement of the Monroe doctrine; that they may go down there and take the custom-houses and that doing so would not infringe the Monroe doctrine. When we withdraw and foreign vessels go down there and foreign marines are landed and custom-houses are taken possession of by foreign troops, I think you will find that the American people will consider that the Monroe doctrine is involved.

Now, that is the precise situation I wish to avoid. I do not believe it can be avoided wisely and well in any way but by the one proposed in the treaty. I think the President pursued the precisely correct course in the line which he has taken. He has kept the matter so that if the treaty should be ratified nothing would be lost, and that we shall not be complicated by changes in the fiscal administration of the island in the meantime.

These attacks, Mr. President, are aimed at the President of the United States, with the idea apparently of creating an impression that he is a usurper, seeking to break through the constitutional limitations which have been drawn about his great office. He has the right to interpret the Constitution, as we have, and he is as loyal to it, and has always been as loyal to it, as any of his critics.

This same charge was made during the campaign when he was a candidate for election to the Presidency. It was made the main issue that he was a dangerous man, disposed to break down and disregard the Constitution of the United States. The question was fought out before the people of the United States, and those who made the charge got their answer at the polls. They failed to convince the people of the United States that there was one particle of truth in their charge; and this dangerous man, whom they held up as likely to involve the country in war, has made the greatest achievement of his Administration the establishment of peace between two great warring nations.

Mr. President, every step the President has taken has been in the interests of peace, our own peace, and that of the world. I believe this treaty to be another important movement, not merely for the peace and prosperity of the little disorderly Republic of Santo Domingo, but for the maintenance of peace and the removal of causes of discord in American waters and in the American hemisphere.

This old attack upon the President has now been renewed. It failed utterly when the President was a candidate for election before the great tribunal of the American people. It will fail again and react upon its author. What is the use of trying to arouse feeling now when the President has received the great indorsement of the American voters, when he has passed out finally and irrevocably from the region of candidates for the office of President, and put his refusal in his own words as explicitly and as honestly as man could do it? Yet they charge with usurpation a man who refused not merely to be a candidate, but even to accept the great office if it were again offered to him, because he said that although technically he had not received two terms, practically he had, and he wished to live up to the customs and the traditions which had been established by Washington.

A man who is as sensitive as that, Mr. President, to the traditions of his country, I think can be trusted not to violate the Constitution openly or secretly in an agreement with another nation. He has aimed, and aimed alone, in this policy at the promotion of the peace and well-being of the great islands which lie near our shores. The policy involved is something much more important than any little details which may be in the treaty. It is a question whether we are going to maintain in the West Indies a condition of peace and progress and or-

dered liberty, not on account of the Monroe doctrine, but to the end that danger to the Monroe doctrine and all that such danger imports need never arise.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, with very much that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has stated as to the power of this nation I fully agree. I am particularly opposed, though, to some remarks that he has made within the last few moments. We have before the Senate of the United States a treaty which is to be considered in secret session, although it has been made public. Everybody knows what it is. I have expressed my opinion on it everywhere, as I have a right to do. I am now charged by the Senator from Massachusetts with attacking the President because I do not agree with that treaty.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, Mr. President, I was not referring to the Senator from Colorado or his opposition to the treaty. The Senator knows to what I was referring.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator was not referring to me individually, because I have not spoken on this question, but the Senator knows very well what my attitude has been on the treaty. He knows very well that I am not in favor of it. I am opposed to it.

The question really before us when we come to consider the treaty is not the power of the President to make a treaty, but whether the treaty will be beneficial and useful to us or whether it may not be dangerous to us. That is the question, Mr. President; but I can not discuss it here, I suppose; at least the Senator says I can not, and I know that if I should try it the door would be shut on me instantly.

Mr. PATTERSON. The treaty has been made public.

Mr. TELLER. The treaty has been made public, but it is said I can not discuss it if all the same, and I am not disposed to discuss it. I do not believe in the theory of government that closes the doors except in extreme cases. I have contended here for twenty-five years for an open Senate upon treaties that do not involve any great amount of foreign concern—I mean European concern—but I know it can not be had. I am going to comply with the rule and not discuss it, not even as much as the Senator from Massachusetts has done. I want to stand upon my right here to pass upon a treaty and to discuss it, when the proper time comes, in terms and measures proper for a United States Senator to use.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] yesterday spent a long time to show the power of the President of the United States over foreign affairs. The Constitution fixes the power of the President of the United States over foreign affairs as certainly as it fixes the power of the members of this body or of the body itself. I do not deny that the President of the United States may initiate a treaty. He may propose a treaty to us. But I do deny that the President can make a treaty or a protocol or agreement or *modus vivendi* with any power coming from the United States unless this body here, by two-thirds of the Senators present, shall agree that he may make such a treaty. When he sends his proposed treaty here it is as dead as Julius Caesar until we by our consent shall give it life.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a naval reserve, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Colorado will proceed.

Mr. TELLER. There is complaint made—it has been made here, it has been made in the press—that the President has attempted at least to put in operation a proposed treaty. The Senator from Wisconsin said yesterday he had not put it in operation. He certainly has not put it in operation on the part of the Government of the United States, because he has not the authority so to do. When he said, as he did say at Jamestown, where the Chautauqua was being held, that the Government had put it in operation, he was mistaken as to his power and mistaken as to the law; and the Senator from Wisconsin is much nearer right when he says he did not put it in operation than is the President when he says he did put it in operation.

But, Mr. President, for all practical purposes this proposed treaty is now doing service. If it was ratified by the President after we had consented to it, the status quo would be exactly as it is now; there would be no difference. Not a single thing down there would be done under the treaty that is not being

done now, that I know of. That has nothing to do with the merit of the treaty. It may have something to do with the administration of public affairs.

Mr. President, no matter who may be the President nor what claims he may have upon the public for his great ability and honesty, I am not willing to admit that any man can, under the Constitution of this country, make an agreement with a foreign power and put it in operation. The Constitution marks out plainly his relation to foreign affairs. He may appoint ambassadors, ministers, and consuls. That is, he may do that with the advice of this body. He can not do it without. He may make treaties with our advice. He can not do it without.

The other day it seemed to me that the discussion took the form of a complaint because we wanted some information from the State Department, information that it turns out now any Member could have had by walking up to the State Department and asking leave to look at the papers. What I am entitled to do as a Senator this body as a body is entitled to do. That is a complete answer to all the claim in the discussion that was had with closed doors, to which I suppose I can not refer, that we were invading another branch of the Government, the executive department, by such a resolution.

There are more than a hundred resolutions that could be read here to-day where the Senate has called upon the executive department to give them information, that has come to us sometimes in the open Senate, frequently with the seal of secrecy on it. There are some cases where the President has stated: "I do not consider it compatible with the public interest to give that information now." "Subsequently," in one case, he said, "I hope to be able to give it."

Mr. President, in all the inquiries made in more than a hundred years there is not a single line to show that any Executive ever took offense at a resolution here. The President recognized what Madison said was an emergency duty on his part and on ours when it came to treaty making. We are as much a part of the treaty-making power as he, and a little more. Mr. President, for while he has a veto on the treaty after we have said "You may ratify it," as the Senator from Wisconsin said yesterday and once before, I believe, after all, the custom has been that when this body amended a treaty, or when this body consented to the ratification of a treaty, that treaty has been ratified; and I recall no instance in my reading and none in my public service where a treaty, having been amended by the Senate as it might, the President has refused to ratify it because of that amendment—

Mr. BACON. It was done in the recent general arbitration treaty.

Mr. TELLER. Wait until I get through. It has been done in no case, I say, until the case that occurred within a very short time. I said I knew of no other.

Mr. BACON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not know that I care to take up that question, because I did not rise to make a general speech. I did not rise to criticize the President. I rose to present a few of what I think are the principles which ought to govern this body and to repudiate some things I have heard here to-day. I mean for myself to maintain the right the Constitution gives to this body, not because I want the prerogative. It is not mine. It is the prerogative of the body. You could no more avoid exercising these duties—

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TELLER. I will simply say the Senate must exercise the duty of making treaties, and it must exercise it with judgment and discretion, and not simply take the treaty the President sends us, good or bad, as he may dictate. If the Senator wants to ask a question I will yield.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course, Mr. President, I am in entire accord, as every Senator must be, with the proposition which the Senator makes. I wanted to ask the Senator whether in his experience or as a result of his study (and I know of no one who has been a more industrious student of our history) he has known of any request, public or private, open or secret, by this body upon a President of the United States that he shall communicate the instructions given by him to diplomatic agents in the absence of a pending treaty before the body?

Mr. TELLER. If I had a little time I could do it. I have had my attention called by my study within the last ten days to cases where requests have been made by this body for the instructions given to ministers who were negotiating treaties.

Mr. SPOONER. I was asking for information.

Mr. TELLER. I have right here, if I could turn to it in a moment, in the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, one of

those cases where the President returned in secret what the instructions had been.

Mr. President, there was allusion made here to-day to the fact that the President of the United States has the right to come here when we make treaties and sit in the Senate. I believe there is only one instance of it, and that is where George Washington came here, giving the Senate notice that on a certain day he would appear. He came here and consulted the Senate about a treaty not made, not drafted, not what some of the Senators call a protocol, nor a project; but in that case he wanted to know what the Senate thought about it, and he came here to discuss it beforehand, before he prepared the treaty. On several occasions Washington sent a message to the Senate saying: "I would like to make a treaty of this character. Will it be satisfactory to the Senate?" He said, "I should like to know whether the Senate would be willing that I should make a treaty to pay \$40,000 to the Algerine pirates, or would the Senate be willing to put it higher than that, if it became necessary." I have not found what the answer to that was, except that the treaty was made and we paid the money. There can be half a dozen cases of that kind cited.

Mr. Lincoln sent to the Senate a treaty made by Mr. Corwin in Mexico. It was that we should join in the defense of Mexico against the combined powers of Europe. We were to award or guarantee certain expenditures of money. That is all we were asked to do. The Senate did not take up the treaty and pass on it. It passed a resolution saying it was not, in their judgment, wise that it should be done, and sent it to Mr. Lincoln. Later Mr. Lincoln, referring to this same action of the Senate, sent back a treaty on a different line, from Mr. Corwin, who was still our minister there, and who had negotiated something with Mexico of a different character.

There has not been, until within a few years, that absolute claim for independence on the part of the State Department, I will say, and the sensitiveness that appears sometimes to be growing, if we may take the statement of the friends of the Administration here as representing how they feel. None such existed then. There was a feeling between the Executive and the Senate that they were doing a duty put on them by the Constitution. The President, by the Constitution, is the maker of treaties. Our fathers followed what was the world's practice. Everywhere, so far as I know, in those days the sovereign made the treaty. Even in powers that had legislatures the legislative power had no interest or control over a treaty. I think that now France has a system something like ours, and perhaps some other country may, but I do not know of any other country that does.

Mr. MONEY. Denmark.

Mr. TELLER. "Denmark," the Senator says. Perhaps so. But, Mr. President, those are things that have grown up in later years. They did not exist originally. The old Roman senate made the only treaties that were made, because the executive power at that time was supposed to be lodged in the senate. Our fathers did not think it was wise to leave it to the Executive, and in the discussion in the convention it will be seen that there was not only a feeling that it was not wise to leave it with the Executive and the Senate, but there was a strong party there who thought the treaty must be passed on also by the House. During President Washington's Administration the House made such a claim by calling on the President for information touching a treaty then in controversy, which he declined to send for the reason that the House was not charged with any duty in that particular. I believe that practically settled the matter. The House has no right.

But, Mr. President, the Senate was confined to making treaties that were recognized to be legitimate and proper for a sovereign to make in those days, except the limitation the Constitution put upon us. I do not think this body could make a treaty by which we could dismember the Union. I do not think we could give up any of the territory that belongs to the United States by a treaty. I think if we did the House of Representatives would undoubtedly come into the arena. I do not know but we could as a Congress do that with the consent of the President. I do not mean that we could dismember a State, but we could perhaps get rid of Alaska by a Congressional act if we saw fit to do so. I do not believe, however, that the Senate of the United States and the President, without the concurrence of the House of Representatives, could get rid of Alaska under our Constitution.

Mr. President, I do not intend to make any long discussion on this question. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE] alluded to Cuba and our interference there as a defense of our interference in Santo Domingo. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that a condition might become so intolerable in

Santo Domingo as to require the interference of the United States, but I deny the right of the Executive of the United States to make such interference. When the condition grew so bad in Cuba, why did not the then President of the United States interfere? The whole people of the United States were clamoring for interference in the affairs of Cuba. A hundred Members of the House of Representatives, of his own political faith, met in caucus and declared that it was the duty of the Government to interfere.

Why did the President not interfere? He recognized that that was the duty of Congress; that Congress alone could interfere, and Congress did interfere. I do not mean to say that the body and the other acting under the Constitution might not interfere; I will not say that they should not interfere; but that is not the case presented. It is like putting up a man of straw to say we may do this, that, or the other.

Nobody denies the President's right to withhold a treaty after we have consented to its ratification; nobody could doubt that; it has been done, not because the Senate amended the treaty, but because conditions arose that made the Executive think that it ought not to be put in operation. I do not hesitate to say that the President of the United States has the right to withhold a treaty that we have amended here which he thought would be objectionable to foreign powers if he sent it to them. That is his right.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

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

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. I of course concur with the Senator as to the Senate's participation under the Constitution as a part of the treaty-making power; but does the Senator claim, under the Constitution, that the Senate has any part or lot whatever with the President of the United States in the negotiation of treaties, or in the negotiations with foreign governments that may or may not lead to the signing of treaties?

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I have cited a case where the first President of the United States thought it was very proper to consult the Senate before he attempted to send the draft of a treaty to the Senate. I do not know that it is necessary to do that, but if we knew the President of the United States was engaged in the negotiation of a treaty which the Senate would not ratify, or might not ratify, I think it would be courteous to inform the President that we would not consent to ratify it. I think it would be courteous for us to say, just as was done in the case I mentioned in reference to Mexico, by a resolution of the Senate, "We do not think it is wise to make that treaty." It is no invasion of the power of the President or of his right when we make that declaration to him, and it ought to be accepted in a friendly way, this branch having just as much power as he in the matter of treaties.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator would not claim that such a resolution would be anything more than advisory, would he? It would not be at all binding upon the President, would it?

Mr. TELLER. The President can no more make a treaty than the Senator from Wisconsin can make one.

Mr. SPOONER. I know that.

Mr. TELLER. And when he sends here what is miscalled "a treaty," it is not a treaty at all.

Mr. SPOONER. Ah, but, Mr. President, the Senator misunderstands me. I understood the Senator to speak of the passage by the Senate of a resolution regarding a treaty which it was understood the President was negotiating.

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator surely does not intend to be understood as saying that the passage of a resolution of that sort, pending any negotiation of a treaty by the President, would be anything more than advisory to the President. It would not be binding upon him, would it?

Mr. TELLER. Of course he could go on and have his clerks draft the treaty.

Mr. SPOONER. And he could go on and negotiate the treaty, sign it, and send it to the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. He would have the power to sign it, if he wanted to, but it would be an idle thing for the President to do if he knew the Senate of the United States would not consent to its ratification. I do not believe it possible that we shall ever get a President who would do so foolish and absurd a thing as that, although, of course, nobody can tell what in the course of time may happen in that direction. I have seen some gentlemen who were aspiring to that office who, possibly, if they could ever be elected, might do something of that kind, but the chances of their election are so remote that I do not think the Senator or I need cause ourselves any uneasiness for fear such

a discourteous thing would be done to the Senate as making the draft of a treaty which the Senate had said it would not ratify.

Mr. SPOONER. There is that much more reason, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, why the Senate should not object into a negotiation conducted by the President in a constitutional way a prejudgment as to what the body would do if the President did not discontinue the negotiation.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it may be that that is correct.

Mr. SPOONER. In other words, if the Senator will permit me another interruption—

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I have always assumed that the Senate would not commit itself hastily for or against a treaty, that it would abide the debate amongst members of this body and in the other branch which prevails in such discussion before they would in any wise become bound one way or the other, that the Senate would never pursue any course in relation to a treaty which would deprive the people of the benefit of the unfettered judgment, upon full debate, of the members of the body in that interest.

Mr. TELLER. The Senate might have that unfettered debate before the treaty was made.

Mr. SPOONER. Before it found out what it was?

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I do not want to take time by mingling in this little colloquy between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] as to the authority of the Executive, but I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the constitutional provision on that point. It is that—

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

That would seem to carry out the inferences of the first President, who did consult us in the case cited by the Senator from Colorado, but the Constitution does not use the same language when it comes to the matter of appointments. It says that the President—

shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States.

It might as well be inferred that the President shall negotiate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, make treaties as that he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, make appointments. I will say to my friend from Wisconsin that I am not denying the right of the President to make treaties, but I say that ground might be very well taken, in view of the precedents cited by the Senator from Colorado and the language used in the same paragraph about the right to make nominations and appointments by the consent of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I do not care to dwell upon that. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin in his statement that we are neither a baby nation nor a hermit nation; but I must say that I can hardly see why that declaration should be made in this body. I was not aware that there was anyone here who believed that we were either a hermit nation or a baby nation. If that was addressed to those of us who do not believe in this Santo Domingo treaty, there was no reason why it should have been addressed to us, for none of us entertains any such crude idea as that.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. In the first place, I did not say what the Senator attributes to me. I stated that it was never intended by the framers of this Government that we should be either a puny or a baby or a hermit nation. At that time I was discussing entirely the question of the strictures upon the President for sending delegates to the Moroccan conference. I had no reference whatever to the Santo Domingo treaty. What I said yesterday on the subject of the Santo Domingo treaty I would say if I were opposed to the treaty on principle as quickly as if I were for it.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the making of such a statement puts the Senators who are in opposition to the treaty before the country as if they were condemning it on some such idea as that.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] spent some time to show that we could make treaties with other nations by which we would agree to do certain things, such as the Morocco treaty we made some years ago, when we signed a treaty with six or eight other powers; I do not remember how many.

Why, Mr. President, I do not suppose there is anybody here who has ever doubted our right to do that. We have a right to make such a treaty, and we have a right to do it if we do it as the Constitution provides we may do it, for we have a right to do what any other nation in the world has a right to do. We could make a treaty of alliance with Great Britain if we saw fit so to do, though I should regret to see it done. That, however, is a question of judgment for the Senate and the President of the United States. But, Mr. President, it will not do to put this Santo Domingo case upon that theory. You can not carry through a treaty that the President may have power to make simply by proving that he has the power to make it, nor can you carry through a treaty that shall come to us from the coast of Africa simply because the President has power to make it. This body must pass on it; this body must agree to it as much as the President himself. I insist, as the burden is upon us as much as it is upon him, as the responsibility is as great upon this Senate as it is upon the Executive, that our right to all the information he has is as good as his right would be to any information that he desired from this body.

Mr. President, in the course of this debate a great many things have been drawn in which I do not propose to touch upon; but the principal point in the debate was whether there was a condition down in Santo Domingo brought about by the President of the United States that was practically the same as it would be if the treaty had been ratified by our advice and consent. I have said heretofore that I did not believe any change in the existing condition would be made if that treaty were put in operation.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] contributed what I think was a very important piece of evidence to this controversy, to the effect that the President of the United States assumes now that he has practically put in force this treaty. The President in the last message he sent to us states this very question:

This brings me to what should be one of the fundamental objects of the Monroe doctrine.

You notice he does not say that it is one of the fundamental doctrines, but what should be one of the fundamental doctrines.

We must ourselves in good faith try to help upward toward peace and order those of our sister republics which need such help.

Certainly not, Mr. President, unless the sister republics ask it. It is no part of our duty to go out as missionaries, lifting up other people. Even if we had the power, it may be doubted whether we ought to do anything of that kind.

Just as there has been a gradual growth of the ethical element in the relations of one individual to another, so we are, even though slowly, more and more coming to recognize the duty of bearing one another's burdens, not only as among individuals, but also as among nations.

I deny that there is any authority in the President of the United States to commit us to any policy under which we should bear the burdens of any other nation. If Congress sees fit to do it, Congress, perhaps, within the power granted to it, may possibly do so, although I should think that would be very doubtful.

Then the President turns to Santo Domingo and says:

Santo Domingo, in her turn, has now made an appeal to us to help her, and not only every principle of wisdom but every generous instinct within us bids us to respond to the appeal. It is not of the slightest consequence whether we grant the aid needed by Santo Domingo as an incident to the wise development of the Monroe doctrine, or because we regard the case of Santo Domingo as standing wholly by itself, and to be treated as such, and not on general principles or with any reference to the Monroe doctrine.

I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to declare that there was no new doctrine here; that there was no new development. This is a declaration on the part of the President, at least, that he thinks there has been a new development of the Monroe doctrine, or rather a wise development. I suppose that is what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] the other day called the "Roosevelt doctrine," as contradistinguished from the Monroe doctrine.

The President goes on at some length—and I will not read all he says in this connection—to argue the question; but I want to call attention to something that he said on the following page:

Accordingly the Executive Department of our Government negotiated a treaty under which we are to try to help the Dominican people to straighten out their finances. This treaty is pending before the Senate. In the meantime a temporary arrangement has been made which will last until the Senate has had time to take action upon the treaty.

If that is not a declaration that the arrangement has been made by the Government, I do not understand the meaning of plain English language. On another page he says, referring to the action under the treaty:

We shall ourselves thoroughly examine all these claims, whether American or foreign, and see that none that are improper are paid.

There is, of course, opposition to the treaty from dishonest creditors, foreign and American, and from the professional revolutionists of the island itself. We have already reason to believe that some of the creditors who do not dare expose their claims to honest scrutiny are endeavoring to stir up sedition in the island and opposition to the treaty.

That, at least, is not very flattering to the Senate of the United States, which, through one session of Congress, declined to take up that treaty.

On yesterday the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] read an extract from a speech of the President delivered at Chattanooga, N. Y., on August 11, 1905. I will not read it again, but I ask to have it put in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and then I shall drop that part of the subject.

The extract referred to is as follows:

Accordingly the executive department of our Government negotiated a treaty under which we are to try to help the Dominican people to straighten out their finances. This treaty is pending before the Senate, whose consent to it is necessary. In the meantime we have made a temporary arrangement which will last until the Senate has had time to take action upon the treaty. Under this arrangement we see to the honest administration of the custom-houses, collecting the revenues, turning over 45 per cent to the Government for running expenses and putting the other 55 per cent into a safe deposit for equitable division among the various creditors, whether European or American, accordingly as, after investigation, their claims seem just.

The custom-houses offer well-nigh the only sources of revenue in Santo Domingo, and the different revolutions usually have as their real aim the obtaining possession of these custom-houses. The mere fact that we are protecting the custom-houses and collecting the revenue with efficiency and honesty has completely discouraged all revolutionary movement, while it has already produced such an increase in the revenues that the Government is actually getting more from the 45 per cent that we turn over to it than it got formerly when it took the entire revenue.

Mr. TELLER. There has been considerable discussion in the Senate—

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to inquire whether the Senator questions the President's power to do this, or is it a question of policy? I have not been able to gather clearly from his remarks whether the Senator questions the President's power to do it.

Mr. TELLER. To do what?

Mr. HEYBURN. To make the arrangement which he admits having made, and to which the Senator has just referred, with reference to the collection of the revenues and customs of Santo Domingo.

Mr. TELLER. If I desired to inquire what power the President has to do a thing, I should look in the Constitution and see what the Constitution authorizes him to do. I deny utterly that the President has the right to make any arrangement or treaty—and I so stated in beginning my remarks, when the Senator was probably not here—I deny that he has the right to make any arrangement of that kind and call it a treaty or a *modus vivendi* or a protocol or anything else; and he has no right to put in operation any system of government in the island without first having the consent of the Senate, no matter whether it is written or verbal.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to know if the Senator uses the word "right" as synonymous with "power." The Senator has used the word "right." He says the President "had no right to do it." Does that mean he had no power to do it?

Mr. TELLER. I mean he had no right under the Constitution to do it; he had no authority to do it. I do not mean to say that he can not do it by mere force, in violation of law; I do not mean to say that he can not send down there men and put them in charge of the custom-houses; but I do say that his doing it is without the slightest authority of law; and every act of the President of the United States without authority of law is absolutely void, as the Senator from Idaho knows as well as anybody else in this Chamber; it is nugatory.

There has been a good deal of debate about some legislation that ought to be had. As I am speaking to the shipping bill now, I believe, though I am not sure as to the particular bill that is pending—

Mr. GALLINGER. The pure-food bill, I will suggest to the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. TELLER. The pure-food bill. I know what I am trying to speak about, but I do not know the particular bill which is pending. Freedom of debate in the Senate is such that we are entitled to speak on any subject, and I thank God that we are, because it is the only body under the Government in which there can be open discussion. It is the only place where the spoken word can go to the people; and a great writer on international law and liberty has declared that the right of free and full discussion of public affairs is the dearest thing that a free people could have and the last thing that they should surrender.

Although here in the Senate we may sometimes transcend the usual ideas of debate and go beyond what in other places

is permissible, yet after a hundred years or more no injury has come to the Republic by the action of this body.

I am about to call the attention of the Senate to some things touching this body which, I think, are of especial interest just now. I believe I can say without offense, and everybody will admit its truth, that the Senate is somewhat in a shadow, or, in ordinary parlance, under a cloud. In the last few months there have been newspaper articles, magazine articles, and various declarations in public—some of them where they ought not to have been made—to the effect that this body is an obstruction, and that the Senate stands as an objection and a hindrance to the reforms that are desired in certain circles.

The other day one of the newspapers of this city had a long article—and I want to digress far enough to say that I am not going to charge that on the Executive, for I know how irresponsible some newspapers are, and I know how responsible some others are. I know that frequently they may get wrong information, which they think is correct. The article to which I allude does not pretend to come from the Executive, consequently, whatever I say about the condition of the Senate must not be taken as a reply to anything that the Executive has said or even thought. I am not going to read all of the article; I will read only the first few lines. In order to establish the authenticity of the statement the article says:

Through a source so close to the President that its authenticity can not be doubted, it is learned that the Administration is convinced that interests in Congress hostile to railroad rate legislation are creating a fog of opposition to the Roosevelt foreign policies under which to disguise their organized plans to defeat the reforms to which President Roosevelt stands committed before the world.

From the Administration viewpoint these antagonistic interests are seeking to show that the President's foreign policies, particularly with reference to Latin-America, prove him to be ambitious to drag the United States into world politics with a reckless disregard of George Washington's admonition against "foreign entanglements," to the end that the name of Theodore Roosevelt may live in the history of his country as one of the few Presidents who "did things."

In support of this contention friends of the President point to the threatening rows thus early in the record of the Fifty-ninth Congress over his course in these various affairs—

Then Santo Domingo is named, a subject which I have been discussing as much as I dare in the open Senate. Then the article continues:

Panama.
Venezuela.
Morocco.
China.

Presumably, it is the theory of the opposition to the President's programme for railroad reform—granting, of course, that the Administration's diagnosis of the hidden causes of the opposition is correct—that if it can be shown that he has erred in his foreign policies he will, to a greater or less extent, be discredited before the country, and that with this accomplished the opposition will be emboldened to fight his other proposals vigorously and openly without hazarding the risk of arousing the implacable wrath of their constituencies.

I know what the President is doing in Santo Domingo and I know what his proposition is; I do not agree with it; but I do not know what is meant by the reference to Panama. I do not know what the President wants to do in relation to the Panama Canal. I have made some remarks on the floor of the Senate on that subject, and I defy any man to torture anything I have said into an attack upon the President or his policy. In the argument which I attempted to make I contended simply that what we wanted to do was to build the best canal in the world, if we built any; that there was but one canal that would meet the demands of commerce, and that was a sea-level canal. Whether the President is in favor of a sea-level canal or a lock canal I do not know. I myself did not in the slightest degree—and perhaps I made an extended a speech as was made on this subject—criticise the President. I did not take up the question that was discussed here somewhat as to the wisdom of certain appointments and salaries. My position on that subject I should like to define in just a moment. Congress gave to the President of the United States the power to build the canal within a certain limit. I did not vote for the bill. I did not think it was right. I think now it was vicious legislation. I stated on the floor of the Senate when that bill had passed and had become a law that I should faithfully endeavor as a Senator to carry out its provisions and make the canal a success; and I would feel myself recreant to my trust here if I should directly or indirectly put a hindrance to the efforts of the Executive to build the canal.

I deny here that the President ought to be subjected to criticism for the mistakes which people say he has made. When Congress conferred that authority upon him, it must have known that in all human affairs men are liable to make mistakes. We ought to have known that no man could construct this great work unless he was learned and experienced in that kind of business; and we put this duty upon the President of the United States with his multitudinous duties otherwise, and we

must have presumed that he would do the work with agents and with such agents as he might select, and we ought to have understood that he would make mistakes. We left it to him, and if he thought it was necessary, in order to get a good man to build it, to pay him \$50,000, that is what we instructed him to do—to act upon his own judgment and not ours. We abandoned our control over the subject for the present at least. While we can repeal that act, there has been no indication for more than three years that Congress intends to abandon that policy and adopt any other. I think we ought to repeal the act. I think we ought to provide some better and safer method, but until we do that let us leave the President of the United States to carry out this work upon the very theory on which we turned it over to him—because he was better qualified to do it than we.

The statement on my part or on the part of anybody else that the work is not being well done and that some other method ought to be adopted, is no attempt to interfere with the doing of the work and is no implication that the President has not discharged his duty as well as we expected he would.

Some day I shall have something further to say on the Panama Canal, but I do not desire to say it now.

The next is Venezuela. Just exactly what we have to do about Venezuela now I do not know, and I certainly do not know what the Executive proposes to do. I am not in his confidence. I do not believe anyone in this body knows what is to be done with Venezuela. Whether there will be war with France or whether there will be peace in Venezuela nobody now knows. That is a question which has not yet been presented to Congress, and if the President presents it I have no doubt we shall deal with it according to the best judgment we have and with such information as we may be able to get.

Morocco we have discussed.

I do not know that there has been any criticism in this body of his policy toward China. I do not know that there has been anything done here which could possibly under any condition of affairs be said to be hostile to the purpose of the President in reference to China.

But the important item of legislation before this body and the House is the question of regulating railroads and their rates. A year ago last December the President of the United States sent us a message in which he declared a principle upon which he thought it wise for us to pass a law. He said he thought it would be wise to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power, whenever a railroad had made a rate that was unfair or unreasonable, to change the rate and put the new rate in operation until the railroad should go into some court and there have it set aside as an improper decision on the part of the Commission.

At the last session of Congress the House sent us a bill. It was called the "Esch-Townsend bill." It came here, I think, about three or four weeks before Congress adjourned by law. We had before us one of the important things of that session, and that was an impeachment case. It was a judicial hearing by this body. It was a hearing that could not be hurried. It was a hearing upon which every Senator was to act as a judge, and nothing that came before this body could justify us in neglecting our duty in that particular.

Then there were left about two weeks before Congress was compelled to adjourn. There is nowhere a man who is disposed to be fair, and who knows anything of public affairs, who knows anything of the difficulty of dealing with this question, who can say that we could have dealt with it in the two weeks. We in this body ought not to be charged as a body with any dereliction of duty because we did not take up and pass that bill. We had a right to pass upon these questions ourselves. Nay, more, it was our duty to do it. We were not to take up so great a subject as that, involving millions of dollars, involving great legal principles, upon which the legal profession of the nation are at sea, and pass a bill in haste.

What was this body made for? It was supposed when this body was organized that it would stand against the public cry, for immediate legislation; that it would stand against the "radicalism," if I may so term it, of another body, moved, perhaps, because of their close relation to the voters of the country. We were to come, not only with clean hands, but with clean judgment. We were to look into these things.

It has been six weeks—almost eight weeks now—since Congress assembled, and yet there is no rate bill here. Can anybody say that there has been any dereliction here because the rate bill is not before this body? There is not a body of lawyers anywhere in this country who can sit down together—ninety of them, the best in the land—and agree what is the law in the first place; and if they know what the law is can agree what will be the method of enforcing the law so as to give protection

not only to the shipper, but to the railroads. We can not legislate, and we will not legislate, in the interest of either of them. When we come to legislate we will take into consideration the interest of all the people and the combined capital connected with these great enterprises.

Does delay here indicate that the Senate is obstructing the President in that particular? I have here on my table—I sent over and got them—thirty-odd bills pending now in the House of Representatives touching this question, and I have seven bills which have been introduced in the Senate touching the same question. That indicates the diversity of opinion in this body and the other, and while we might perhaps get up a bill and send it over to the House, the House would have to be convinced that the bill is a good measure.

Mr. President, I am moved to say these things because the Senate is being attacked, the Senate is being derided, the Senate is being abused, because we have not with quick feet rushed to the solution of this question, which needs the wisdom of the world to settle. If we should settle it improperly, the old adage would come in that no question is settled until it has been settled right, and it would appear before us again. It is wisdom to delay, it is wisdom to take time, and it is wisdom on the part of the Executive and his friends to let the legislative body deal with this subject. He has expressed his opinion—and that is all the law authorizes him to do—and there he should stand. A proper respect for the Senate, a decent regard for the legislative body, should incline the Executive and those who stand near him to let the Senate work out this great problem as it sees fit, and not in haste.

Mr. President, I do not know that it is worth while to have said this—much more might be said—but I do think the time has come when the Senate should vindicate its right to deliberate legislation, when the Senate should vindicate its right to legislate without Executive interference. Mr. President, when the time comes I shall be ready to vote upon this question. I shall not say now how I am going to vote. I shall vote as I think the interest of the whole country demands. If I should agree with the President and vote with him, it will not be because of anything he has said or anything he has done. I take it that is the position of this membership, that we will pass upon this question because it is our duty to pass upon it and not the Executive's. We will act with the other branch of Congress, and we will not let them send us a bill here at the close of the session in hot haste and demand of us that we pass it. We will take time to deliberate on it, and when we get through all that the chances are a hundred to one we shall have made a mistake. But we shall have some excuse for the mistake we make, if we make it, after careful deliberation, after careful consideration, after we have considered every argument for and against the proposition. Then we shall be able to say to the country, if they complain, that we did the best we could.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I desire to submit some remarks upon the matters which have been debated during the day, and I now give notice that I will take the floor to-morrow after the routine morning business for the purpose of addressing the Senate.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT ELIZABETH, N. J.

Mr. KEAN. My colleague [Mr. DRYDEN] has been called from the Senate Chamber, and he asked me to make a report. On his behalf, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 846) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Elizabeth, N. J., I report it favorably without amendment, and submit a report thereon.

It is a short bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present passage. It might just as well be passed now.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the bill had better go over.

Mr. KEAN. All right. I have no objection.

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

ELIJAH R. WILKINS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2481) granting an increase of pension to Elijah J. Wilkins.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elijah R. Wilkins, late chaplain Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The unfinished business, which was temporarily laid aside by request of the Senator from New Hampshire, is now before the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. If no one is now prepared to speak, and I think no Senator on either side of the Chamber is, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION AND MILITARY RECORD BILLS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension bills on the Calendar and also unobjected bills to correct military records.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, of course I shall not object to that order, but I should like to have the further understanding that no other business shall be transacted during the remainder of the day.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is all I desire to bring up, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension bills and unobjected bills correcting military records, no other business to be transacted to-day. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the first bill under the order on the Calendar will be stated.

ADOLPHUS N. PACETTY.

The bill (S. 1702) granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty was announced as the first bill on the Calendar under the order, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adolphus N. Pacetty, late captain Pacetty's boat company, Florida Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

FLORENCE GREELEY DE VEAUX.

The bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Florence Greeley De Veaux was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "widow," to strike out the name "De Veaux" and insert "De Veaux;" in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert "seventeen;" and in the same line, after the word "month," to insert "and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of the said James G. De Veaux until she reaches the age of 16 years;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Florence Greeley De Veaux, widow of James G. De Veaux, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of the said James G. De Veaux until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JOHN HECK.

The bill (S. 2112) granting an increase of pension to John Heck was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Heck, late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AGNES ZENTZ.

The bill (S. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Zentz was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Agnes Zentz, widow of Charles A. Zentz, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

HIRAM SWAIN.

The bill (S. 622) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swain was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hiram Swain, late of Company I, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN SAVAGE.

The bill (S. 238) granting an increase of pension to John Savage was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Savage, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

PHEBE J. BENNETT.

The bill (S. 625) granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Bennett was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Phebe J. Bennett, widow of Edwin W. Bennett, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

FRANCIS PICCARD.

The bill (S. 1042) granting an increase of pension to Francis Piccard was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Francis Piccard, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOANN MORRIS.

The bill (S. 1456) granting a pension to Joann Morris was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joann Morris, widow of Jordan D. Morris, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN W. WARNER.

The bill (S. 328) granting an increase of pension to John W. Warner was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ISABELLA WORKMAN.

The bill (S. 322) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Workman was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "Iowa," to strike out "Volunteer Infantry" and insert "Volunteers, war with Mexico;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isabella Workman, widow of Oliver G. Workman, late of Company B, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ROBERT CATLIN.

The bill (S. 1841) granting pension to Robert Catlin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Robert Catlin, helpless and dependent child of Robert Catlin, late second lieutenant, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, and captain, Forty-third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

EMMA M. REA.

The bill (S. 950) granting a pension to Emma M. Rea was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Emma M. Rea, widow of John P. Rea, late captain Company I, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CHARLES M. WITTIG.

The bill (S. 493) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Wittig was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "One hundred and eighty-second" and insert "Eighty-second;" so as to make the bill read:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM FURLONG.

The bill (S. 142) granting an increase of pension to William Furlong was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Furlong, late of First Independent Battery Minnesota Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MICHAEL LINEHAN.

The bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to Michael Linehan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael Linehan, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

OSCAR R. ARNOLD.

The bill (S. 943) granting an increase of pension to Oscar R. Arnold was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Oscar R. Arnold, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GORDON H. SHEPARD.

The bill (S. 206) granting an increase of pension to Gordon H. Shepard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Gordon H. Shepard, late of Company M, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE F. ROSS.

The bill (S. 209) granting an increase of pension to George F. Ross was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George F. Ross, late second lieutenant Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SILAS P. HALL.

The bill (S. 210) granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Hall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Silas P. Hall, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARTHA G. CUSHING.

The bill (S. 1163) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Cushing was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "lieutenant," to strike out "and adjutant;" in the same line, after the word "Company," to strike out the letter "K" and insert "H," and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "seventeen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Martha G. Cushing, widow of Martin G. Cushing, late first lieutenant Company H, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ALETHA E. REYNOLDS.

The bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Aletha E. Reynolds was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "dependent," to strike out "indigent and," and in line 7, before the word "late," to strike out "deceased;" so as to make the bill read:

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

to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Aletha E. Reynolds, dependent mother of Cyrus W. Reynolds, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

GEORGE PIKE.

The bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to George Pike was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the words "late of," to strike out "Company E, Second United States Dragoons, and late;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George Pike, late of Company A, First Regiment Dakota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

DAVID F. MAGEE.

The bill (S. 472) granting an increase of pension to David F. Magee was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "first lieutenant;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JOHN FLYNN.

The bill (S. 575) granting an increase of pension to John Flynn, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Flynn, late of U. S. S. *Hastings*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FREDERICK J. SHELLEY.

The bill (S. 576) granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Shelley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frederick J. Shelley, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

PHILENA DAVIS.

The bill (S. 1466) granting an increase of pension to Philena Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Philena Davis, widow of Martin V. B. Davis, late of Company E, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

GEORGIA A. ROLLINS.

The bill (S. 715) granting a pension to Georgia A. Rollins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Georgia A. Rollins, widow of Willis A. Rollins, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

FREDERICK HOUSER.

The bill (S. 851) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Houser was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frederick Houser, late of Company A, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AARON T. CURRIER.

The bill (S. 74) granting an increase of pension to Aaron T. Currier was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Aaron T. Currier, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALVIN ABBOTT.

The bill (S. 1828) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Abbott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alvin Abbott, late of Tenth Independent Battery, Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LAURA A. BLODGETT.

The bill (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Blodgett was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Laura A. Blodgett, widow of Pearl D. Blodgett, late captain Company E, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company G, Second Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

SUSAN H. CUTLER.

The bill (S. 16) granting a pension to Susan H. Cutler was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Susan H. Cutler, widow of Nathan Cutler, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

HENRY F. HUNT.

The bill (S. 183) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Hunt was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "and," to insert "and Company K, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry F. Hunt, late of Company I, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ELIZABETH C. DUNTON.

The bill (S. 837) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Dunton was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth C. Dunton, widow of Warren R. Dunton, late first lieutenant Company B, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ALICE E. GILLEY.

The bill (S. 707) granting a pension to Alice E. Gilley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "and," to insert "and Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alice E. Gilley, widow of Charles B. Gilley, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CHARLES W. PAIGE, ALIAS JACKSON MORSE.

The bill (S. 1258) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Paige was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles W. Paige, alias Jackson Morse, late of Battery I, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Paige, alias Jackson Morse."

IRENE A. COCHRANE.

The bill (S. 178) granting an increase of pension to Irene A. Cochrane was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 9, before the word "and," to insert "and captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers;" and in line 10, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Irene A. Cochrane, widow of William H. D. Cochrane, late first lieutenant Company E, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

FRANKLIN C. PIERCE.

The bill (S. 785) granting an increase of pension to Franklin C. Pierce was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, before the word "and," to insert "and Company B, First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps;" and in

line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Franklin C. Pierce, late of Company C, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

DAVID P. BOLSTER.

The bill (S. 9) granting an increase of pension to David P. Bolster was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "surgeon," to insert "Twenty-first and;" in line 7, before the word "Maine," to insert "regiments;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of David P. Bolster, late assistant surgeon Twenty-first and Sixteenth Regiments Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

DENNIS A. DAVIS.

The bill (S. 534) granting an increase of pension to Dennis A. Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Dennis A. Davis, late second lieutenant, Company F, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM H. SATTERTHWAIT.

The bill (S. 531) granting an increase of pension to William H. Satterthwait was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Satterthwait, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

NATHANIEL L. BADGER.

The bill (S. 923) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Badger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Nathaniel L. Badger, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JANE M'MAHON.

The bill (S. 991) granting a pension to Jane McMahon was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve;" and in line 9, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of that she is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jane McMahon, widow of Patrick McMahon, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

GEORGE A. FRANCIS.

The bill (S. 96) granting an increase of pension to George A. Francis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN C. EBERLY.

The bill (S. 193) granting an increase of pension to John C. Eberly was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ANDREW M'CLORY.

The bill (S. 1035) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McClory was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew McClory, late first lieutenant Company H, District of Columbia and Maryland Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MICHAEL STUMP.

The bill (S. 122) granting an increase of pension to Michael Stump was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael Stump, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN M. SCOTT.

The bill (S. 2825) granting an increase of pension to John M. Scott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John M. Scott, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY T. ANSHUTZ.

The bill (S. 2071) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Anshutz was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry T. Anshutz, late second lieutenant Company B, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ESTHER G. WHARTON.

The bill (S. 1200) granting a pension to Esther G. Wharton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to

place on the pension roll the name of Esther G. Wharton, widow of George W. Wharton, late of Companies L and I, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

DENNIS BUCKLEY M'CREADY, ALIAS THOMAS BUCKLEY.

The bill (S. 515) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Buckley McCready, alias Dennis McCready, alias Thomas Buckley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Dennis Buckley McCready, alias Thomas Buckley, late of U. S. S. Bermuda and Savannah, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Dennis Buckley McCready, alias Thomas Buckley."

ANNIE L. TREDICK.

The bill (S. 509) granting a pension to Annie L. Tredick was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and hospital steward, United States Army;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Annie L. Tredick, widow of John Tredick, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and hospital steward, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILSON HYATT.

The bill (S. 564) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Hyatt was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Wilson Hyatt, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LUMBARD B. ALDRICH.

The bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to Lombard B. Aldrich was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the name "Lumbard," to strike out the initial "D." and insert the initial "B.;" so as to make the bill read:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Lombard B. Aldrich."

GEORGE W. GEAREY.

The bill (S. 385) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gearey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Gearey, late of Company H, Forty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOSEPH DAVIS.

The bill (S. 1474) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Davis, late of Company F, Georgia Battalion Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM H. HICKS.

The bill (S. 1368) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hicks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Hicks, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ZACHARIAH BRADFIELD.

The bill (S. 1525) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Bradfield was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Zachariah Bradfield, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE W. PURVIS.

The bill (S. 407) granting an increase of pension to George W. Purvis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Purvis, late of Company D, First Regiment Georgia Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELIZA J. HARDING.

The bill (S. 596) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Harding was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eliza J. Harding, widow of Charles G. Harding, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LIDE S. LEONARD.

The bill (S. 603) granting an increase of pension to Lide S. Leonard was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lide S. Leonard, widow of William L. Leonard, late second Lieutenant Company C, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and late of Company G, Eighth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM J. GROW.

The bill (S. 1098) granting an increase of pension to William J. Grow was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William J. Grow, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LEONARD HARMONY.

The bill (S. 647) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Harmony was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Leonard Harmony, late of Company F, Ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN M. BERKEY.

The bill (S. 1524) granting an increase of pension to John M. Berkey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of Company G, Forty-sixth" and insert "lieutenant-colonel Ninety-ninth;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John M. Berkey, late lieutenant-colonel Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The 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.

JOHN C. KENNEDY.

The bill (S. 1517) granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John C. Kennedy, late captain Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LAURA CLARK.

The bill (S. 1559) granting an increase of pension to Laura Clark was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Laura Clark, widow of William T. Clark, late brigadier-general and brevet major-general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

ANDREW PATRICK.

The bill (S. 666) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Patrick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Andrew Patrick, late of Company I, One hundred and tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LAURENCE MERICLE.

The bill (S. 669) granting an increase of pension to Laurence Mericle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Laurence Mericle, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ANTHONY BARRETT.

The bill (S. 670) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Barrett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anthony Barrett, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HARRISON BROTT.

The bill (S. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Brott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harrison Brott, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

JASPER H. KEYS.

The bill (S. 727) granting an increase of pension to Jasper H. Keys was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jasper H. Keys, late captain Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOSEPH M'SWAIN.

The bill (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McSwain was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the name "McSwain," to strike out "orderly sergeant" and insert "late of Company F;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joseph McSwain, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ALEXANDER F. M'CONNELL.

The bill (S. 2256) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alexander F. McConnell, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CHARLES W. KNIGHT.

The bill (H. R. 5027) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Knight was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles W. Knight, late of Company E, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

RICHARD C. SILENCE.

The bill (S. 2486) for the relief of Richard C. Silence was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that Richard C. Silence shall be held and considered to have been a first lieutenant of Company I, First Regiment, West Tennessee, from November 29, 1862, to March 7, 1863, and to have been honorably discharged from the service of the United States as of date of March 7, 1863, and directs that a certificate of such service and discharge shall be issued.

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

SAMUEL FOSTER.

The bill (H. R. 2735) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Foster was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel Foster, late of Company I, One hundred and fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LAURA J. FORBES.

The bill (H. R. 2089) granting an increase of pension to Laura J. Forbes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Laura J. Forbes, widow of Henry C. Forbes, late lieutenant-colonel Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JACOB SHADE.

The bill (H. R. 1789) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shade was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jacob Shade, late of Company K, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GALON S. CLEVINGER.

The bill (H. R. 1056) granting a pension to Galon S. Clevenger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Galon S. Clevenger, late chaplain Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, war with Spain.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move to amend the bill by inserting at the end the following words: "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

STERNS D. PLATT.

The bill (H. R. 1288) granting an increase of pension to Sterns D. Platt was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sterns D. Platt, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS PICKET.

The bill (H. R. 1179) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Picket was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Picket, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY C. WILDY.

The bill (H. R. 4153) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Wildy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry C. Wildy, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HARVEY GASKILL.

The bill (H. R. 3449) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Gaskill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Harvey Gaskill, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY G. STERNBERG.

The bill (H. R. 4165) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Sternberg was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry G. Sternberg, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DAVID PALMER.

The bill (H. R. 3405) granting an increase of pension to David Palmer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David Palmer, late second lieutenant Company F, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM MOORHEAD.

The bill (H. R. 3340) granting an increase of pension to William Moorhead was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Moorhead, late of Company B, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LYDIA A. JEWELL.

The bill (H. R. 1199) granting a pension to Lydia A. Jewell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lydia A. Jewell, dependent stepmother of Jefferson M. Jewell, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

JAMES F. HARE.

The bill (H. R. 2718) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hare was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James F. Hare, late of Companies I and D, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

RANSOM O. THAYER.

The bill (S. 1842) granting an increase of pension to Ransom O. Thayer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ransom O. Thayer, late of Second Battery Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, or-

dered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLA T. HAPEMAN.

The bill (S. 1987) granting a pension to Ella T. Hapeman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ella T. Hapeman, widow of Douglas Hapeman, late lieutenant-colonel One hundred and fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month.

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

WELLINGTON MARLATT.

The bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Wellington Marlatt was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Wellington Marlatt, late of Companies E and A, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Engineers, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MAITLAND J. FREEMAN.

The bill (S. 140) granting an increase of pension to Maitland J. Freeman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Maitland J. Freeman, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES W. CALVERT.

The bill (S. 143) granting an increase of pension to James W. Calvert was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James W. Calvert, late of Company I, Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AKEY C. JOHNSON.

The bill (S. 3243) granting an increase of pension to Akey C. Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Akey C. Johnson, late of Company D, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AUGUST WESTFIELD.

The bill (H. R. 5023) granting an increase of pension to August Westfield was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of August Westfield, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

AMANDA M. RICHEY.

The bill (S. 2023) granting a pension to Amanda M. Richey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Amanda M. Richey, widow of John Richey, late of Company I, One hundred and twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

CAROLINE M. DOAN.

The bill (S. 986) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Doan was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Caroline M. Doan, widow of Amos Doan, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN S. WILCOX.

The bill (S. 1212) granting an increase of pension to John S. Wilcox was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "Fifty-second," to insert "and colonel;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John S. Wilcox, late lieutenant-colonel and colonel Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JACOB H. EPLER.

The bill (S. 949) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Epler was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jacob H. Epler, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

JAMES J. EGAN.

The bill (S. 2779) granting an increase of pension to James J. Egan was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, before the word "and," to strike out "and adjutant of regiment;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars" to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James J. Egan, late first lieutenant Company B, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JOHN T. LIDDLE.

The bill (S. 212) granting an increase of pension to John T. Liddle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll, the name of John T. Liddle, late of Company C, Hatch's Independent Battalion Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, or-

dered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILSON J. POOL.

The bill (S. 211) granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Pool was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Wilson J. Pool, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES J. WINANS.

The bill (H. R. 4196) granting an increase of pension to James J. Winans was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James J. Winans, late of Company E, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE W. McCORMICK.

The bill (H. R. 3506) granting an increase of pension to George W. McCormick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. McCormick, late of Company L, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LEVI BEARSS.

The bill (H. R. 2594) granting an increase of pension to Levi Bearss was considered as in Committee on the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Levi Bearss, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN LEZENBY.

The bill (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to John Lezenby was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Lezenby, late second lieutenant Company K, Twelfth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HILIA ANN CONNOR.

The bill (H. R. 2435) granting a pension to Hilia Ann Connor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hilia Ann Connor, widow of Laban Connor, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

CHRISTOPHER CLINTON.

The bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Clinton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Christopher Clinton, late of Company G, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HUGH LOKERSON.

The bill (H. R. 1752) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Lokerson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hugh Lokerson, late of Company G, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM BIRMINGHAM.

The bill (H. R. 1505) granting an increase of pension to William Birmingham was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Birmingham, late of Company H, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

XL—94

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

CORNELIUS A. HALLENBECK.

The bill (H. R. 1511) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius A. Hallenbeck was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Cornelius A. Hallenbeck, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LUCINDA STAMPER.

The bill (S. 393) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Stamper was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lucinda Stamper, dependent mother of William E. Stamper, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM E. BLEWETT.

The bill (S. 329) granting an increase of pension to William E. Blewett was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William E. Blewett, late first lieutenant Company F, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to William E. Blewett."

FANNIE I. EDGERTON.

The bill (S. 2415) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Ida Edgerton was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Fannie I. Edgerton, widow of Wright P. Edgerton, late professor, with rank of lieutenant-colonel, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Wright P. Edgerton until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Fannie I. Edgerton."

MILTON MARSH.

The bill (S. 1852) granting an increase of pension to Milton Marsh was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Milton Marsh, late captain Company G, Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JAMES THOMPSON.

The bill (S. 2255) granting an increase of pension to James Thompson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out

"thirty-six" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James Thompson, late of Company G, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM H. CRITES.

The bill (H. R. 3006) granting an increase of pension to William H. Crites was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Crites, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS C. MEADOWS.

The bill (H. R. 3010) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Meadows was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas C. Meadows, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM J. CASTLOW.

The bill (H. R. 1073) granting an increase of pension to William J. Castlow was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William J. Castlow, late of the U. S. S. *Princeton*, *Powhatan*, and *Ohio*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY H. HOBART.

The bill (H. R. 1378) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hobart was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry H. Hobart, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN T. STONE.

The bill (H. R. 1766) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stone was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John T. Stone, late second assistant engineer U. S. S. *Choctaw*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES C. PLYBON.

The bill (H. R. 1772) granting an increase of pension to James C. Plybon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James C. Plybon, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

BENJAMIN F. BEAN.

The bill (H. R. 1074) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bean was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Benjamin F. Bean, late captain Company I, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Emergency Militia, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN ARMSTRONG.

The bill (H. R. 486) granting an increase of pension to John Armstrong was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Arm-

strong, late of Company A, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DAVID H. QUIGG.

The bill (H. R. 1381) granting an increase of pension to David H. Quigg was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David H. Quigg, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

PERRY EGGE.

The bill (H. R. 1868) granting an increase of pension to Perry Egge was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Perry Egge, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN BIERER.

The bill (H. R. 8550) granting an increase of pension to John Bierer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Bierer, late first lieutenant Company K, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MICHAEL MATHENEY.

The bill (S. 2564) granting an increase of pension to Michael Matheny was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael Matheny, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM I. HILKEY.

The bill (S. 2229) granting an increase of pension to William I. Hilkey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William I. Hilkey, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM J. STREET.

The bill (S. 126) granting an increase of pension to William J. Street was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William J. Street, late of Company C, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN M. BUCKLEY.

The bill (S. 120) granting an increase of pension to John M. Buckley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John M. Buckley, late of Company E, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

THOMAS ROBEY.

The bill (S. 2583) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Robey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with

an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Artillery," to strike out "Volunteer;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas Robey, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JACOB A. GEIGER.

The bill (S. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Geiger was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM KRESS.

The bill (S. 508) granting an increase of pension to William Kress was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Kress, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

KEMENSKIO A. N. L. COLLINS.

The bill (S. 330) granting an increase of pension to Kemenskio A. N. L. Collins was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "second-class fireman;" in line 8, before the word "and," to strike out "as second-class fireman" and insert "United States Navy," and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Kemenskio A. N. L. Collins, alias Lewis Collins, late second-class fireman, United States steamer Tacony, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Kemenskio A. N. L. Collins, alias Lewis Collins."

JOHN W. FOREAKER.

The bill (S. 1432) granting an increase of pension to John W. Foreaker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "Eighty-eighth" and insert "First;" and in the same line, before the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Pennsylvania" and insert "Delaware;" so as to make the bill read:

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

JAMES P. FORD.

The bill (S. 2730) granting an increase of pension to James P. Ford was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James P. Ford, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

HARVEY S. HARRIMAN.

The bill (S. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Harvey S. Harriman was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harvey S. Harriman, dependent father of William C. Harriman, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM R. HUBBELL.

The bill (S. 644) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hubbell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William R. Hubbell, late of Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN D. O'BRIEN.

The bill (S. 637) granting an increase of pension to John D. O'Brien was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John D. O'Brien, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and captain Company F, First Battalion Wyoming Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MYRON E. BILLINGS.

The bill (S. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Myron E. Billings was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Myron E. Billings, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters; Company L, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and captain, One hundred and twentieth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. What is the "private report" with this bill?
The VICE-PRESIDENT. What is the inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. KEAN. In looking over the Calendar I find entered the words "private report." I do not understand what that means.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have the report read?

Mr. KEAN. No; but I should like a brief explanation of what the "private report" is. I do not doubt the chairman of the Committee on Pensions can tell us.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say that generally a private report is understood to be a report on a private pension bill.

Mr. KEAN. I only saw that it was labeled "private."

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.

JAMES FRAZIER.

The bill (S. 1038) granting an increase of pension to James Frazier was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

THOMAS BRAMEL, ALIAS THOMAS BRAMBLE.

The bill (S. 244) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bramel was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas Bramel, alias Thomas Bramble, late of Company E, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bramel, alias Thomas Bramble."

LOUISE J. D. LELAND.

The bill (S. 2552) granting an increase of pension to Louise J. D. Leland was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "chaplain," to strike out "of;" in line 8, before the word "and," to insert "war with Spain;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Louise J. D. Leland, widow of Lewis Jay Leland, late chaplain First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

WASHINGTON HOGANS.

The bill (S. 1735) granting an increase of pension to Washington Hogans was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Washington Hogans, late of Captain Ledwith's company, Florida Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JAMES A. M. BROWN.

The bill (S. 2144) granting an increase of pension to James A. Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "Volunteers," to insert "Seminole Indian war," and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "sixteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James A. M. Brown, late of Capt. N. P. Willard's company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ROBERT C. SMYTH.

The bill (H. R. 3245) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Smyth was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert C. Smyth, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SILAS B. HOVIOUS.

The bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Silas B. Hovious was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Silas B. Hovious, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN S. HOOVER.

The bill (H. R. 3606) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hoover was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John S. Hoover, late major and aid-de-camp, United States Volunteers, and to pay him a pension of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ADELLE TOBEY.

The bill (H. R. 5686) granting an increase of pension to Adelle Tobey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adelle Tobey, widow of Henry Tobey, late of Company D, Seventy-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

ELIJAH THOMPSON HURST.

The bill (H. R. 4701) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Thompson Hurst, alias Elijah Thompson, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elijah Thompson Hurst, alias Elijah Thompson, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE NULTON.

The bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to George Nulton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George Nulton, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

AUGUSTUS FOSS.

The bill (H. R. 3716) granting a pension to Augustus Foss was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Augustus Foss, late of Company A, Marion County Battalion Missouri Home Guards, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

PAYTON S. LYNN.

The bill (H. R. 8713) granting an increase of pension to Payton S. Lynn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Payton S. Lynn, late of Company F, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES M. LONG.

The bill (H. R. 6518) granting an increase of pension to James M. Long was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James M. Long, late of Company I, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay to him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN V. SANDERS.

The bill (H. R. 3573) granting an increase of pension to John V. Sanders was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John V. Sanders, late of Company H, Twenty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE S. M'GREGOR.

The bill (H. R. 1686) granting an increase of pension to George S. McGregor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George S. McGregor, late of Company H, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES KELLEY.

The bill (H. R. 1339) granting an increase of pension to James Kelley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Kelley, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON.

The bill (H. R. 1853) granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William J. Johnson, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HELEN A. FREDERICK.

The bill (S. 164) granting a pension to Helen A. Frederick was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Forty-ninth," to strike out "of the;" and in line 8, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and Fifth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Helen A. Frederick, widow of Calvin H. Frederick, late lieutenant-colonel Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry and Fifth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ROBERT BOON.

The bill (H. R. 4216) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Boon, late of Company D, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteers,

war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ANNA F. KEITH.

The bill (S. 3244) granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Keith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anna F. Keith, widow of William Keith, late first lieutenant Company F, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

MARY J. HOGE.

The bill (S. 2879) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hoge was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary J. Hoge, widow of Marion D. Hoge, late of Captain Jones's company, Second Regiment Illinois Foot Volunteers, war with Mexico, and major One hundred and tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM M'NAIR.

The bill (H. R. 3368) granting an increase of pension to William McNair was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William McNair, late of Company K, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MORRIS BENNETT.

The bill (H. R. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Morris Bennett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Morris Bennett, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE W. RAIGLE.

The bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to George W. Raigle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Raigle, late of Company I, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HIRAM F. ARMSTRONG.

The bill (H. R. 604) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Armstrong was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hiram F. Armstrong, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM M'CRAW.

The bill (H. R. 4348) granting an increase of pension to William McCraw was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William McCraw, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOSEPH W. PRICE.

The bill (H. R. 7408) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Price was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph W. Price, late of Company D, Second Regiment, and Company A,

First Regiment, Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LOUIS DIECKGRAEFE.

The bill (H. R. 7309) granting a pension to Louis Dieckgraefe was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Louis Dieckgraefe, late of Company A, Gasconade Battalion Missouri Home Guards, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

JAMES L. SMALL.

The bill (S. 1529) granting an increase of pension to James L. Small was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James L. Small, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALMON FOSTER.

The bill (S. 1367) granting an increase of pension to Almon Foster was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Almon Foster, late captain Company G, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN H. CROWELL.

The bill (S. 606) granting an increase of pension to John Houston Crowell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John H. Crowell, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

CAMILLUS B. LEFTWICH.

The bill (H. R. 1361) granting an increase of pension to Camillus B. Leftwich was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Camillus B. Leftwich, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment, and Company I, Seventh Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM L. BEEKS.

The bill (H. R. 4876) granting an increase of pension to William L. Beeks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William L. Beeks, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

THOMAS T. HODGES.

The bill (S. 1509) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Hodges was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the names of Thomas T. Hodges, late of Company H, Seventy-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SARAH A. BARGAR.

The bill (S. 2555) granting a pension to Sarah A. Bargar was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah A. Bargar, widow of Jephtha Bargar, late of Company E, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

WILLIAM C. HITCHCOCK.

The bill (S. 2293) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hitchcock was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William C. Hitchcock, late of Company D, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EDWARD IRWIN.

The bill (S. 1271) granting an increase of pension to Edward Irwin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "New York," to strike out "Volunteer Infantry" and insert "Volunteers, war with Mexico;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Edwin Irwin, late of Company A, Stevenson's regiment New York Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN C. BARR.

The bill (S. 1270) granting an increase of pension to John C. Barr was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John C. Barr, late acting ensign, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MICHAEL MOHAN.

The bill (H. R. 4176) granting an increase of pension to Michael Mohan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael Mohan, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SAMUEL E. CHAMBERLAIN.

The bill (H. R. 3428) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Chamberlain was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel E. Chamberlain, late major and lieutenant-colonel First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM H. CRANSTON.

The bill (H. R. 3481) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cranston was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Cranston, late of Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ALPHEUS A. ROCKWELL.

The bill (H. R. 3451) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus A. Rockwell was considered as in Committee of the

Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alpheus A. Rockwell, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM B. KIMBALL.

The bill (H. R. 3427) granting an increase of pension to William B. Kimball was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William B. Kimball, late captain Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I ask leave, out of order, to introduce a bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would state that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the consideration of the Calendar of unobjected pension bills and unobjected bills correcting military records was to be proceeded with until completed; and it was understood that no other business should be transacted.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does that apply to the introduction of bills?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands it applies to all business except that which was specifically included in the unanimous-consent agreement.

SIDNEY S. BRIGHAM.

The bill (H. R. 3402) granting an increase of pension to Sidney S. Brigham was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sidney S. Brigham, late first lieutenant Company H, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

BRUNO TIESLER.

The bill (H. R. 3283) granting an increase of pension to Bruno Tiesler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Bruno Tiesler, late of Company C, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FERDINAND WEISE.

The bill (H. R. 3487) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Weise was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ferdinand Weise, late of Company K, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

EPHRAIM PLUMPTON.

The bill (H. R. 2770) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Plumpton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ephraim Plumpton, late of Company C, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FRANK W. WEEKS.

The bill (H. R. 1653) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Weeks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frank W. Weeks, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MELISSA S. LEE.

The bill (H. R. 1675) granting an increase of pension to Melissa S. Lee was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Melissa S. Lee, widow of Gideon E. Lee, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided, however*, That in the event of the death of Lucy L. Lee, helpless and dependent child of said Gideon E. Lee, the addi-

tional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Melissa S. Lee the name of said Lucy L. Lee shall be placed on the pension roll subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month, from and after the date of death of said Melissa S. Lee.

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

EMMA ROWE.

The bill (H. R. 1908) granting an increase of pension to Emma Rowe was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Emma Rowe, widow of Charles W. Rowe, late of the Second Battery, Connecticut Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Guy W. Rowe, helpless and dependent child of said Charles W. Rowe, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Emma Rowe the name of the said Guy W. Rowe shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month, from and after the date of death of said Emma Rowe.

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

GEORGE E. BRICKETT.

The bill (H. R. 1062) granting an increase of pension to George E. Brickett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George E. Brickett, late surgeon Twenty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM A. HILDRETH.

The bill (H. R. 1330) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hildreth was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William A. Hildreth, late of Company D, First Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay to him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES T. BERRY.

The bill (H. R. 532) granting an increase of pension to James T. Berry was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James T. Berry, late of the U. S. S. *Mohican*, *Dawn*, and *Emma*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LEWIS H. CATE.

The bill (S. 185) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Cate was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lewis H. Cate, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CHARLES H. MAYHEW.

The bill (S. 179) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Mayhew was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles H. Mayhew, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JULIA A. STANYAN.

The bill (S. 80) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Stanyan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Julia A. Stanyan, widow of John M. Stanyan, late captain Company B, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

GEORGE C. CHASE.

The bill (S. 1827) granting an increase of pension to George C. Chase was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George C. Chase, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

DAVID E. EVERETT.

The bill (S. 81) granting an increase of pension to David E. Everett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David E. Everett, late first lieutenant Company D, Twelfth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY G. SALISBURY.

The bill (S. 572) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Salisbury was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry G. Salisbury, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SARAH A. PAGE.

The bill (S. 845) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Page was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah A. Page, widow of Leverett H. Page, late of Company C, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

STEPHEN ERNST.

The bill (S. 787) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ernst was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Stephen Ernst, late of Company E, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SUSIE PLACE.

The bill (S. 714) granting an increase of pension to Susie Place was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Susie Place, widow of Charles E. Place, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

JULIET A. BAINBRIDGE-HOFF.

The bill (S. 3001) granting an increase of pension to Juliet A. Bainbridge-Hoff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Juliet A. Bainbridge-Hoff, widow of William Bainbridge-Hoff, late captain, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

MARTHA E. SALTAR.

The bill (S. 706) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Saltar was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Martha E. Saltar, widow of John C. Saltar, late of Company E, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

RUTH B. GURNEY.

The bill (S. 11) granting an increase of pension to Ruth B. Gurney was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixteen" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ruth B. Gurney, widow of Horace M. Gurney, late of Company K, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ARTHUR F. DEVEREUX.

The bill (S. 850) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Forrester Devereux was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Arthur F. Devereux, late lieutenant-colonel and colonel Nineteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry and brevet brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Arthur F. Devereux."

HORACE E. BARKER.

The bill (S. 279) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Barker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Horace E. Barker, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill just passed completes the pension Calendar. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a naval reserve, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 25, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1906.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

George E. Anderson, of Illinois, now consul at Amoy, to be consul-general of the United States at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, vice Eugene Seeger, superseded.

CONSULS.

Albert H. Michelson, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Turin, Italy, vice Pietro Cuneo, resigned.

Edward B. Walker, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Burslem, England, vice William P. Smyth, removed.

Ross R. Brattain, of Washington, to be consul of the United States at Hangchow, China, vice George L. Dobson, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Walter I. Lillie, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Michigan, in the State of Michigan, to succeed George A. Farr, whose term of office will expire by limitation February 9, 1906.

James J. Haynes, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Corpus Christi, in the State of Texas. (Reappointment.)

Robert W. Dowe, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Saluria, in the State of Texas. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Lucius Q. Hobbs, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Leadville, Colo., vice Fred Butler, resigned.

PLACED ON RETIRED LIST OF ARMY.

Col. Frank Thorp, Artillery Corps, to be placed on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier-general from the date upon which he shall be retired from active service.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Roy C. Smith to be a commander in the Navy from the 22d day of January, 1906, vice Commander Joseph B. Murdock, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

John H. Avery to be postmaster at Hot Springs, in the county of Garland and State of Arkansas, in place of John W. Howell, resigned.

J. H. McPherson to be postmaster at Paragould, in the county of Greene and State of Arkansas, in place of James R. Snodgrass. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1906.

CALIFORNIA.

Walter H. Metcalf to be postmaster at Sawtelle, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Thomas H. Selvage to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Humboldt and State of California, in place of Nathaniel Bullock. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1906.

CONNECTICUT.

Edwin W. S. Pickett to be postmaster at Fairfield, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in place of Edwin W. S. Pickett. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1906.

IDAHO.

Hugh Cramer to be postmaster at Hailey, in the county of Blaine and State of Idaho, in place of Hugh Cramer. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1906.

INDIANA.

Sherman L. Keach to be postmaster at Bedford, in the county of Lawrence and State of Indiana, in place of Vinson V. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

Martin V. Starr to be postmaster at Goshen, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana, in place of Chauncey D. Sherwin, removed.

George D. Taylor to be postmaster at Worthington, in the county of Greene and State of Indiana, in place of Adolphus C. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

George B. Roderick to be postmaster at Holdenville, in District Thirteen, Indian Territory, in place of George B. Roderick. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

IOWA.

W. R. Prewitt to be postmaster at Onawa, in the county of Monona and State of Iowa, in place of James J. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1906.

MAINE.

Marcellus L. Hussey to be postmaster at Guilford, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine, in place of Marcellus L. Hussey. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1906.

MARYLAND.

Harry A. Carroll to be postmaster at Havre de Grace, in the county of Harford and State of Maryland, in place of Joseph Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1906.

Asa Hepner to be postmaster at Sykesville, in the county of Carroll and State of Maryland, in place of Asa Hepner. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1906.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles L. Hammond to be postmaster at Quincy, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in place of

Charles L. Hammond. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1906.

Edgar J. Whelpley to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in place of William H. Merrill. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1906.

MINNESOTA.

Frederick A. McVicar to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, in the county of Itasca and State of Minnesota, in place of Frederick A. McVicar. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

MISSOURI.

Emory H. Brant to be postmaster at Maysville, in the county of De Kalb and State of Missouri, in place of Frank B. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1906.

Thomas Francis to be postmaster at Bevier, in the county of Macon and State of Missouri, in place of Thomas Francis. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1906.

NEBRASKA.

Cyrus E. Hunter to be postmaster at Wakefield, in the county of Dixon and State Nebraska, in place of Cyrus E. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1906.

Roy A. Richmond to be postmaster at Wausa, in the county of Knox and State of Nebraska, in place of Roy A. Richmond. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1906.

NEW JERSEY.

Robinson J. M. Chase to be postmaster at Nutley, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in place of Robinson J. M. Chase. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

NEW YORK.

Stephen D. Boyce to be postmaster at Port Jervis, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in place of Stephen D. Boyce. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

Edward J. Lewis to be postmaster at Saugerties, in the county of Ulster and State of New York, in place of John C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

Charles V. Nye to be postmaster at Harrisville, in the county of Lewis and State of New York. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Cyrus P. Frazier to be postmaster at Greensboro, in the county of Guilford and State of North Carolina, in place of Tyre Glenn. Incumbent's commission expires February 18, 1906.

Louis N. Grant to be postmaster at Goldsboro, in the county of Wayne and State of North Carolina, in place of John F. Dobson. Incumbent's commission expires January 27, 1906.

OHIO.

Plympton S. Lybarger to be postmaster at Shelby, in the county of Richland and State of Ohio, in place of Plympton S. Lybarger. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1906.

OKLAHOMA.

E. E. Darrrough to be postmaster at Pondcreek, in the county of Grant and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Mervain L. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

PENNSYLVANIA.

E. Wesley Keeler to be postmaster at Doylestown, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania, in place of James W. Bartlett, deceased.

TENNESSEE.

Joseph W. Howard to be postmaster at Greeneville, in the county of Greene and State of Tennessee, in place of Joseph W. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires May 7, 1906.

Eli A. Warren to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Sullivan and State of Tennessee, in place of Eli A. Warren. Incumbent's commission expires March 20, 1906.

TEXAS.

D. R. Emerson to be postmaster at Marlin, in the county of Falls and State of Texas, in place of George J. Elam. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1906.

John J. Stevens to be postmaster at San Antonio, in the county of Bexar and State of Texas, in place of George G. Clifford, deceased.

VERMONT.

Orrin H. Jones to be postmaster at Wilmington, in the county of Windham and State of Vermont, in place of Orrin H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1906.

VIRGINIA.

T. B. Einstein to be postmaster at East Radford, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia, in place of Jacob W. Dudley. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1906.

WEST VIRGINIA.

George E. Bare to be postmaster at Alderson, in the county of Monroe and State of West Virginia, in place of George E. Bare. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1906.

William A. Mason to be postmaster at Philippi, in the county of Barbour and State of West Virginia, in place of William A. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1906.

Sira W. Willey to be postmaster at Hinton, in the county of Summers and State of West Virginia, in place of Sira W. Willey. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1906.

WISCONSIN.

E. Darwin Sperry to be postmaster at Phillips, in the county of Price and State of Wisconsin, in place of Benjamin R. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

William B. Tschanner to be postmaster at La Crosse, in the county of La Crosse and State of Wisconsin, in place of William B. Tschanner. Incumbent's commission expires January 30, 1906.

WYOMING.

Joseph Iredale to be postmaster at Rock Springs, in the county of Sweetwater and State of Wyoming, in place of Dwight M. Thayer. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1906.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1906.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

David E. Thompson, of Nebraska, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Brazil, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Mexico.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

John Albus, jr., of Missouri, to be surveyor of customs for the port of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri.

Charles W. Clarke, of Missouri, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Kansas City, in the State of Missouri.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Walter E. Dodson, to be postmaster at Springdale, in the county of Washington and State of Arkansas.

Bryant W. Ford, to be postmaster at Mammoth Springs, in the county of Fulton and State of Arkansas.

William P. Jones, to be postmaster at Batesville, in the county of Independence and State of Arkansas.

James C. Russell, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Ouachita and State of Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA.

Mrs. Frank P. Church, to be postmaster at San Leandro, in the county of Alameda and State of California.

COLORADO.

Richard G. Dalton, to be postmaster at La Junta, in the county of Otero and State of Colorado.

William H. Davie, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Fremont and State of Colorado.

Homer H. Grafton to be postmaster at Manitou, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado.

CONNECTICUT.

Frederick L. Gaylord to be postmaster at Ansonia, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

IOWA.

Henry E. Bolinger to be postmaster at Afton, in the county of Union and State of Iowa.

John H. Kolthoff to be postmaster at New Hampton, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Iowa.

Charles A. Merrill to be postmaster at Nora Springs, in the county of Floyd and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

David D. Beck to be postmaster at Scott, in the county of Scott and State of Kansas.

E. M. Clark to be postmaster at Centralia, in the county of Nemaha and State of Kansas.

John N. Evans to be postmaster at Liberal, in the county of Seward and State of Kansas.

John W. Nyce to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Sumner and State of Kansas.

Alpheus K. Rodgers to be postmaster at Topeka, in the county of Shawnee and State of Kansas.

Melville H. Soper to be postmaster at Horton, in the county of Brown and State of Kansas.

Henry M. Stewart to be postmaster at Hutchinson, in the county of Reno and State of Kansas.

KENTUCKY.

George L. Barnes to be postmaster at Frankfort, in the county of Franklin and State of Kentucky.

William B. King to be postmaster at Pineville, in the county of Bell and State of Kentucky.

MAINE.

Abial H. Jones to be postmaster at Wilton, in the county of Franklin and State of Maine.

Arthur T. Moor to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Franklin and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George F. Bourne to be postmaster at Lenox, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

Frank E. Whiting to be postmaster at Plainville, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Charles H. Castle to be postmaster at Armada, in the county of Macomb and State of Michigan.

George W. Dafoe to be postmaster at Brown City, in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan.

Eric Ericson to be postmaster at Republic, in the county of Marquette and State of Michigan.

John W. Hance to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, in the county of Isabella and State of Michigan.

Samuel C. Kirkbride to be postmaster at Clare, in the county of Clare and State of Michigan.

John T. Owens to be postmaster at Benton Harbor, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

Blair F. Scott to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Missaukee and State of Michigan.

Eugene S. Upson to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Shiawassee and State of Michigan.

Fred A. Woodruff to be postmaster at St. Joseph, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Moses Emery to be postmaster at Caledonia, in the county of Houston and State of Minnesota.

MONTANA.

Charles A. Burg to be postmaster at Livingston, in the county of Park and State of Montana.

NEBRASKA.

Alfred L. Brande to be postmaster at Pierce, in the county of Pierce and State of Nebraska.

M. A. Brown to be postmaster at Kearney, in the county of Buffalo and State of Nebraska.

William H. McNeal to be postmaster at Wayne, in the county of Wayne and State of Nebraska.

Wellington A. Post to be postmaster at Stromsburg, in the county of Polk and State of Nebraska.

Delbert E. Sherman to be postmaster at Valentine, in the county of Cherry and State of Nebraska.

Charles A. Warner to be postmaster at Geneva, in the county of Fillmore and State of Nebraska.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Fred H. Perry to be postmaster at Charlestown, in the county of Sullivan and State of New Hampshire.

John C. Richardson to be postmaster at Gorham, in the county of Coos and State of New Hampshire.

NEW JERSEY.

David M. Anderson to be postmaster at Gloucester City, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey.

William H. Hamilton to be postmaster at Ocean Grove, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK.

R. Burchard Hulst to be postmaster at Port Washington, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Harry S. Oliver to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Ransom and State of North Dakota.

Tobias R. Tobiason to be postmaster at Hatton, in the county of Traill and State of North Dakota.

OKLAHOMA.

Harry B. Gilstrap to be postmaster at Chandler, in the county of Lincoln and Territory of Oklahoma.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John C. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Everett, in the county of Bedford and State of Pennsylvania.

William J. Leahy to be postmaster at Falls Creek, in the county of Clearfield and State of Pennsylvania.

RHODE ISLAND.

Clinton D. Sellow to be postmaster at Providence, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

TEXAS.

William E. Dwyer to be postmaster at Brenham, in the county of Washington and State of Texas.

Talvus D. Wilson to be postmaster at Livingston, in the county of Polk and State of Texas.

UTAH.

James P. Driscoll to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Juab and State of Utah.

WISCONSIN.

Samuel S. Fifield to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Ashland and State of Wisconsin.

Frank A. Johnson to be postmaster at Spring Valley, in the county of Pierce and State of Wisconsin.

Peter E. Olsen to be postmaster at Rice Lake, in the county of Barron and State of Wisconsin.

Charles P. Peterson to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of St. Croix and State of Wisconsin.

Charles L. Valentine to be postmaster at Janesville, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin.

Ambrose H. Woodworth to be postmaster at Tomahawk, in the county of Lincoln and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 24, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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 without amendment joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) to authorize use of transport *Sumner* to convey members of Santiago Battlefield Commission and others to Cuba and return.

STATEHOOD BILL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] submits a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred House resolution No. 181, have had the same under consideration and respectfully report the following resolution in lieu thereof:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this order, and daily hereafter, immediately upon the approval of the Journal, so long as the bill hereinafter referred to shall be pending in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12707) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; that after the said bill shall have been read general debate shall continue until Thursday next at 3 p. m.; and at that hour, or, if general debate shall be concluded before that hour, immediately upon the conclusion of said general debate, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall rise and report the bill to the House; whereupon immediately, without debate, intervening motion, or appeal, a vote shall be taken on the bill to a final passage: *Provided further*, That general leave to print remarks on the bill is hereby granted for six legislative days after Thursday, the 25th day of January next."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi for a moment. I would suggest that instead of the forty minutes' debate that we would have under the rule on the previous question that we agree upon a time to be equally divided between us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Say forty-five minutes on a side.

Mr. DALZELL. That is satisfactory to me. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that an hour and a half debate be allowed upon the discussion of the rule, one half to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that an hour and a half be allowed for debate upon the proposed rule, and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Mississippi. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DALZELL. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I will say this hour and a half is to be in lieu of the forty minutes under the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this stage of the discussion to take any time further than to explain the proposition before the House. The Committee on Territories

has reported to this House a bill providing for the admission to statehood of the Indian Territory and Oklahoma as one State and Arizona and New Mexico as another State. If this rule be adopted, that bill will come before the House at once for immediate discussion. The House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and general debate will continue until to-morrow at 3 o'clock. At 3 o'clock to-morrow, or at the end of general debate, if it should end sooner, a vote will be taken upon the adoption of the bill.

Having said this much, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until later on.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves the remainder of his time. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I take it that the House understands the question, and yet it is important that the country should understand it as well. This rule which we are now considering is a rule to make the House vote upon a bill admitting four Territories as two States, denying to the House the right to separate the two propositions, denying to the House the right to give a separate vote in these separate Territories to the people thereof upon the question of whether or not they desire to enter the Union in the manner prescribed in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Committee on Rules several efforts were made, as the efforts will be made here, if possible, to amend the rule itself. Gentlemen must not deceive themselves. The point of this fight is upon voting up or voting down the previous question. If the previous question is voted upon the House, then no opportunity will be left to amend either the rule or the bill. You must take the bill as it is, in its omnibus shape, or you must reject it as it is. You will have no opportunity whatsoever to admit, as an independent proposition, Oklahoma and the Indian Territory into the Union as a State; and yet there is not a man upon this floor opposed to admitting those two Territories as a State into the Union. This queer situation confronts us, that the majority is holding over the House as a whip the impossibility of admitting Oklahoma and Indian Territory, a thing that everybody desires, unless the House will do something that the House does not wish to do, to wit, at the same time, as a part of the same mouthful, admit Arizona and New Mexico, against the will of the people of Arizona, into the Union as one State; coupled together for all time as a State into the Union, with populations differing in language, differing in religion, differing in traditions, differing in customs, necessarily antagonistic to one another; admitting into the Union a State within the womb of which there will be at all times a race antagonism of the most considerable sort.

But the thing to which I am addressing myself now is the fact that this rule if passed prevents this House, representative of the people of the United States, in a matter of the very highest privilege and most permanent importance, of expressing its true will. If you adopt the previous question, that will be the end of your connection with this bill, except a vote in favor of the bill or a vote opposed to the bill. Now, if the previous question is voted down, I shall move to strike out of the rule all the language after the word "States," in line 13 of the first page of the rule. That would then bring the statehood bill into the House under the ordinary rules of the House, subject to the control and management of the House, so that the House could vote up the proposition to bring Oklahoma and Indian Territory into the Union as a State, and could vote down the proposition to bring Arizona and New Mexico into the Union as a State, or could take the opposite course, or could vote both up or could vote both down.

All that is aimed at is to give the House the control of itself; and you gentlemen over there must remember that you as a party control the House. All that we are asking is that each individual Member of you, in the interest of what is good for the general welfare of the country, may have an opportunity to vote upon each of these items separately; may have an opportunity to amend this bill and make it better for everybody. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Now, you understand the proposition. There can not be any mistake about it; every one of you knows if you vote the previous question upon this House that you cut off the opportunity of admitting Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, no matter how advisable or wise and absolutely just and requisite it may be, unless at the same time the population of Arizona is forced into an unwilling marriage with the population of New Mexico, and the population of New Mexico into an unwilling marriage with the population of Arizona.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed six minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we have yet to hear the arguments that will be made on this side in support of this resolution. So we can only guess what these arguments shall be. I hope that the motion for the previous question on this resolution will be voted down, and that the motion which will then be made, to strike out all after the word "States," in line 13 of the rule, will be carried. The House will then proceed to the consideration of this bill under the rules of the House, and every Member here will have an opportunity to record his honest judgment on this measure and all features of it.

I know it will be said, Mr. Speaker, that this is a party measure, and therefore those on this side should vote for the rule. Mr. Speaker, nothing can ever be made a Republican party measure save and alone by the action of the Republican party. The only official action that has ever been taken by our party on the question of statehood for Arizona and New Mexico has been contrary to the provisions of this bill. No measure can ever be made a Republican measure that does violence to the wishes and desires of the people of two great Territories of the Union, and we know that practically every man, woman, and child in Arizona is opposed to the jointure of the two Territories; and only by reason of the fact that the people of New Mexico have been assured that they must accept this jointure or remain out of the Union have they tardily, reluctantly acquiesced in a procedure which makes them unwilling parties to the outrage of a sister Territory.

We can not escape the responsibility we owe our constituents by voluntarily tying our own hands and placing ourselves in a position where we can not vote in accordance with the dictates of our conscience and the promptings of our judgment on this measure. Practically all are agreed in regard to the bringing of the Territory of Oklahoma into the Union. There is wide difference of opinion in this body, as is known to every Member, with reference to the action which should be taken with regard to Arizona and New Mexico. There are some who believe that both should be admitted separately; there are others who believe that neither Territory should be admitted at this time, and there is unquestionably a majority here who, if their hands and votes are not tied by this rule, will insist that these two Territories, promised through the act that established the government of Arizona separate statehood, promised by the voice of the Republican party in convention assembled, separate statehood, shall not be joined against their will in an unwieldy, inharmonious State.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the previous question will be voted down, and that an opportunity will be given to the Members of this House to express their judgment on this measure, to the end that the people of those two Territories in the Southwest may have justice done them; that this violence to the pledges of our party shall not be accomplished, and that our party may continue to be what it always has been—a party true to its every pledge and promise; a party that does justice and equity. [Loud applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. I could not hear anything the gentleman said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, how much time did the gentleman consume?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman consumed six minutes. Occupants of the galleries will please not converse; gentlemen on the floor of the House will please be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will now consume some of his time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to disguise the position of the Republican party on this floor in the support of the rule pending and ultimately the bill as reported from the Committee on Territories. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] appeals to the House to waive politics, and, whatever we do, to avoid tying anybody's hands. I should like to know what light the gentleman has seen so suddenly. I have before me the RECORD of the long session of the last Congress, showing the pendency of a rule exactly similar to this one in all important respects; a demand for the previous question and the vote of the gentleman from Wyoming in favor of the previous question; secondly, in favor of the rule, and, thirdly, in favor of the bill itself.

Mr. DALZELL. And, if my colleague will allow me to interrupt him at this point, fourthly, in favor of a rule which took the bill out of the Committee on Territories and sent it

to conference disagreeing in the Senate amendments—votes on four different occasions.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Gagging the House of Representatives and tying up the hands of the House of Representatives! Why, Mr. Speaker, the event figured in by St. Paul on his way down to Damascus was not a circumstance compared with the glorious blaze of light that has suddenly attacked the gentleman from Wyoming; and without any apology, without any explanation, he comes here and undertakes to drive his views through this House by an appeal against a rule of this arbitrary character.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will permit me, the world has benefited a great deal by the light which appeared to Paul.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, the world has not been benefited by the light that the gentleman from Wyoming has shed on this question. [Laughter.] He parted company with his great predecessor at that particular point in the place where the ways parted. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a party measure, and if we shall have a debate upon this bill ultimately I will show from the records that from the day when Vermont was admitted into the fellowship and partnership of the thirteen original States down to the present time no State ever came into this Union that was not the offspring and outgrowth of party investigation and party consideration. The State that I live in, the State that I love, the State that I, in part, represent on this floor, never submitted a vote on her constitution. Her people never asked to come into this Union; and for a partisan, political purpose, which I will lay plainly before this House if I have the opportunity, Ohio was created a State, dragged into the Union, and her electoral vote was cast for Thomas Jefferson and aided his election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, how stands the Republican majority on this floor and how stands the Republican party of this country upon this question? The President of the United States, a fairly good Republican, in my estimation, recommends the passage of this bill; and how is he met? Why, the cry comes, "He is undertaking to force his views upon the House of Representatives; he is dictating," they say, "to the House of Representatives." Let us see. The House of Representatives, taking the initiative in the Fifty-eighth Congress, without a single suggestion from the President, by the action of a majority of its caucus and by the action of substantially the whole body on this floor, not only indorsed this rule but passed it and sent it over to the Senate, and what the President has done was just exactly what a good Republican might do, just the sort of an act a Republican always does; he came and followed the leadership of the Republican party and recommended that they again do what they had already done. So this House is the leader and the President is the efficient and valued follower.

That this is a party question can be easily recognized within the next hour and a half. Here is a question that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] says ought to be passed upon by the deliberate judgment of every man. Well, I am one of the sort of Republicans who believe that the Republican party as a whole knows more than I know as an individual. That is one of the concessions that I make against my own greatness. [Laughter.] And the Republican party is actuated on this occasion to careful consideration of a fact. Every Democrat on this floor, without exception, will vote against this rule and against this bill; and you might as well try to get me to disregard the suggestion of "thin ice" on a skating pond or the red light of danger on the railroad track as to vote in favor of a proposition for which the solid Democracy of this House votes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, if it is not too long.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The gentleman from Wyoming will suspend. The Chair has difficulty in hearing what is taking place upon the floor, and it arises principally from conversation amongst the Members. The galleries seem to be observing the injunction of the Chair not to converse. It is up to the membership to say whether the membership desire to hear what is being said. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do; for a question.

Mr. MONDELL. I simply wish to ask the gentleman if he did not vote with practically the solid Democratic side last week on a very important question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did not. Practically the solid Democratic side voted with me. [Great laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Following the gentleman's illustrious example, we have their promise that they will follow us to-day. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. And with "us" are the people of Eng-

land who were represented by the "three tailors of Tooley street." Now, the difference between the condition the gentleman suggests and his condition is this: In the case of the Philippine tariff bill the Republican majority of this House had a bill reported by one of its great committees and made a public measure, not only by the action of the House itself, but by the recommendation of the President of the United States in his message, and giving an opportunity to the Democratic party to come in here and vote if they wanted to. Now, we offer the same opportunity to the Democratic party, and not one of them will vote with us, and unfortunately a few of our Republican friends will be found out on the mountain top, where the lost sheep which has been the subject of a beautiful hymn was found. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The bill which was passed the other day, the Philippine tariff bill, which the gentleman says was a Republican measure, was passed through this House by Democratic votes, was it not, and would have failed but for the Democratic vote? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; it would have failed by 7 votes. It would not have passed without Democratic votes, as I suggested at the time. I only regretted that any Democrat voted for it simply from a partisan standpoint, but from a personal good feeling toward the Democratic party I was glad to see some of them stray over into the reservation. I gladly make this correction to my remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the fact still remain, shown by the record of the roll call, that without the Democratic votes the bill would have failed?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am told that that is so. I don't care whether it is or not. I stand here to say frankly to the House that this is a party measure, and I am frank to say another thing. You let this rule be defeated to-day, gentlemen—it is a small matter, a very small matter apparently—and the control of this House passes absolutely into the hands of the Democracy on the other side of this Chamber. Can you afford to do that because somebody's gold mine or somebody's coal bank or somebody's railroad is interested in suppressing the taxgatherer in these Territories out there?

Mr. FINLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio if in the Fifty-seventh Congress he did not vote to admit the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico as States separately?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think I did. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I think I did, but at that time my party had not made this decree. Now it has, and I am a Republican, and I do not propose to shift the leadership of this House to the handful of Democrats on the other side. [Applause on the Republican side.] And since that time the Republican party has distinctly acted in favor of this measure, and since that time I placed myself upon record—and the gentleman heard me a few days ago. I am not consistent with my record of that time, and if there is anything I am proud of, it is that I am never consistent two years at a time amid changing events such as we have. [Applause and laughter.] It is enough for me to know, and it ought to be enough for any Republican to know, that the responsibility of the passage of this bill, if it shall pass, does not rest upon me or him. He will not be selected as an individual to be assaulted and assailed, but the responsibility will rest upon the great party of this country, headed by the great President of the United States, that, after a full consideration, has decided that this is the proper thing to do. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this rule may be adopted. Ample debate is provided for in the rule, ample opportunity for every man to set himself straight before the country, and the alternative is the defeat of the Republican party and chaos on the floor of this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I protest against the cunning effort upon the part of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] to turn this into a partisan question. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is an effort to make a mere question of partisanship out of the question of the permanent welfare of the population of two great Territories proposed to be made States. The gentleman says that there is an attempt "to shift the control of the House to the Democratic side." The statement is absolutely incorrect. The only thing we are trying to do is to shift the control and framing and molding of this bill to the House of Representatives [applause on the Democratic side]; to shift it out of the hands of the Committee on Rules into the hands of the House of Representatives, almost a two-thirds majority of which is Republican. Ah, Mr. Speaker, do not let

the gentleman say that he is afraid of Democratic control. What he is afraid of is that the House may control itself. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a moment in which to reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio that I have been inconsistent in my attitude relating to the admission of these two Territories into the Union. It is scarcely necessary for me to discuss that matter now that the gentleman, after having accused me of inconsistency, makes a virtue of inconsistency himself. [Applause.] There is no opportunity at this time to lay before the House the reasons that actuated gentlemen in their action last winter on a measure similar to this. I did not approve it then any more than I approve it now; and I thank heaven that the opportunity has been given, as I hoped then it would be given, to place myself right on this question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman interrupted me with a question, and I would ask him now if he will allow me to interrupt him with a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does not the gentleman think he ought to be very thankful that he has discovered one virtue and has embraced it? [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I did not catch the gentleman's inquiry, Mr. Speaker, and not having heard the gentleman's question I am unable to answer it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, my question was, if the gentleman does not think he ought to be very thankful that he has been able during two years to find one virtue and to embrace that virtue? [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I have discovered many virtues in the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], Mr. Speaker, and I regret his lack of virtue at this time in not being on the right side of this question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those "misguided" individuals who have been so unfortunate as to meet the disapproval of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in opposing this rule. I suppose that I am one of the "lost sheep" that he refers to. I am one of the men who voted in the last Congress in favor of a similar rule and in favor of joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico. I have changed my position. I say to the gentleman from Ohio, who glories in his own inconsistency, although his friends are sometimes ashamed of it [laughter and applause], that I have changed my position simply because I have gone to the Territory of Arizona, have visited twenty of its cities, met thousands of its people, seen the school children and the women and the merchants and the bankers and the ministers, all of them wearing labels, "We are opposed to joint statehood." I voted for it in the last Congress because I believed that the people of that Territory wanted it. I shall vote against this rule in this Congress because I know from personal observation that the people of that Territory do not want it. What do you propose to do? You bring in a rule here binding together with rivets of steel two propositions, and entirely distinct, in this House, one joining Oklahoma and the Indian Territory in a single State—everybody for it in the Territories and in the Congress of the United States—and then you tie to that another proposition joining New Mexico and Arizona in a single State, in defiance of the sentiment of the people of Arizona, in defiance of the sentiment of the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, and in defiance of the real sentiment of three-fourths of the Republicans on this side of the Chamber. [Applause.] You talk to us about politics. The gentleman says that we want to waive the question of politics. Not for one solitary moment do we want to waive the question of politics. We oppose this rule because it is an un-Republican measure. What do you do? Put two propositions together—one good, the other bad—like the old riders that you used to put on the appropriation bills until public sentiment stopped it. You put these two together, compelling the men who want to vote for the good measure to vote for the bad and try to pound it through this House under the party lash. Is that Republicanism? The Republican party is strong. Never was there such a majority as was cast for Theodore Roosevelt; not for many years such a majority has been here as in this Chamber to-day, but the Republican party has not been strong enough, it is not now strong enough, and it never will be strong enough to violate the principles of republican government. [Applause.] Why, do you know what caused the birth of the Republican party? It was born because an effort was made to force

upon the Territories, in defiance of the sentiment of their people, the obnoxious institution of slavery. From that day to this the Republican party has stood for representative government, and you come in here with this rule in a Republican House and in the name of Republicanism propose to do, what? Take the people of Arizona, a hundred and fifty thousand, with their tens of millions of dollars of property, protesting through the press, from the pulpits, from the Catholic Church, from the Presbyterian Church, from every church, from every school-house, from every business house, against this outrage. You will not permit the Members of this House to separate these propositions and put them squarely upon their own feet. Do you know what is being done? Every one of you know that the men who love the Speaker of this House as a brother, that the men who love and honor the President of the United States because he is honest and true, are being brought in here to vote for this rule against their convictions because of their love for the two men whom I have named. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will now yield some of his time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Mississippi to give me an opportunity to ask unanimous consent that I may have one minute.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman, or as much time as the gentleman may desire.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina, during the progress of my remarks, asked me if I did not vote for a bill of a similar character in the Fifty-seventh Congress. There are some things I can not always carry at my tongue's end, and I admitted that I might have done so. I always take it for granted, when a gentleman puts a question of that kind to me and appears to be looking down at a book in front of him, that he has the record and means to charge that I did so vote. [Laughter.] Now, I do not want to be interrupted, but I want to say to the gentleman I not only did not vote for the bill, but I voted against the bill and made a speech against the bill. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to somebody on his side?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi protests against the attempt, as he says, to make this a partisan measure. Mr. Speaker, the Republican party generally decides what they think is a partisan measure. We had this proposition before a Republican conference in the last Congress, and by a large majority of votes we decided upon the same course that we are pursuing to-day, and when we brought the rule into the House we had substantially the whole Republican majority voting in favor of that rule and in favor of the same action we are proposing to-day. Since then there has been an election. Gentlemen upon this side of the House, gentlemen who voted for that rule and that measure two years ago and who are to-day pursuing a different course, went before their constituents, and if there was any opposition among the constituents of any gentleman on this side of the Chamber to the course we pursued it was then the time to show it in the election which we had; but, Mr. Speaker, we come back here to-day with a Republican majority in this House larger than we ever had before, and that after taking just this action. Then we had a conference in this Congress, and a large majority vote decided again in favor of this action. If anything ever is a partisan question here, it would seem to me that after the action of two conferences on this side of the House we had come pretty near to making this a partisan question.

Why, Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago we had the spectacle of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] complaining of the action of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in taking them off of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. And what was his excuse? Why, that the bill which he advocated was a party measure, and adopted by the party conference, and he was disciplining these gentlemen because they had seen fit to go a little beyond what the conference had said and vote an amendment foreign to the bill, that was not covered precisely by the terms of the resolution in the party conference. He is the last man in the world to advise this side of the House as to what is a partisan measure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Gentlemen plead for justice for the people of Arizona. I believe in the greatest good to the greatest number. There are 100,000 people in Arizona, but there are 80,000,000 people in the

balance of the United States. I plead for the rights of the 80,000,000 people; I plead for the rights of the 8,000,000 people in the State of New York, represented in the Senate of the United States by two Senators, and I am unwilling that the people of Arizona, with her 100,000 people, shall have an equal representation in the United States Senate. There is the great and glorious State of Washington, with a million of population. Shall we wait until they get a million and a half and have some future Congress give us two States of New Mexico and Arizona?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In case we voted down the previous question, could not this House, if it so desired, keep Arizona out of the Union?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly it could, and I trust it will so long as there is a majority on this side of the House. But the other day the gentleman was triumphantly prophesying that the majority would change to the other side in the next Congress. It may come some day. The providence of God may again inflict the Democratic party upon the United States. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] But when the time comes, one of the worst inflictions that can come to the United States is the admission of New Mexico and Arizona to suffrage and statehood, with four Democratic Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE]. [Applause.]

Mr. BEDE. Mr. Speaker, I say first in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that if the Democratic party gets into power again it will not be because of the providence of God, but because of the mistakes of the leaders of the Republican party in this House. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] I arise to oppose this resolution, because it proposes political miscegenation by the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona. I oppose it because it is not a reasonable thing, and the people of the United States and the Republicans of this House stand for the reasonable thing. Let us vote separately upon these two questions—questions that are not germane to each other. If you had a bill in here for the admission of Oklahoma, the leaders would not let a Member on the other side introduce an amendment to let in Arizona or New Mexico. Then why not divide them now, and let us vote intelligently on measures that should be separated. [Applause.] The gentleman speaks of the Senators from New York. Most people are trying to forget them. [Great and long-continued laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Minnesota does know, or ought to know, that his remark is against the rule of the House and is against all parliamentary usage. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Republican Senators referred to and criticised Mr. HEARST over in the Senate yesterday; why can not the House permit the gentleman to refer to the Senators from New York here?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE] yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES]?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No; he did not.

Mr. BEDE. I only intended my reference in the kindest manner. [Laughter.] But the treatment of the East toward that part of the United States west of the Mississippi is a mistaken one. They speak of us as the "woolly West." They have gotten so that they are like the girl from Kentucky that I heard of the other day, whose father was an old unreconstructed Confederate, who said she was 21 years old before she knew that "damned Yankee" was not one word. [Great laughter and applause.]

When they want to whip us into line and get something done here, they call up the great name of Theodore Roosevelt, but when they want to defeat something that he wishes to bring about, they call him (not Members of this House, but the great interests of the East) the "bronco statesman." [Laughter.] They heap contumely on him merely because he once lived in Dakota. I say to you that the territory west of the Mississippi is two and one-half times greater than the territory east of the Mississippi. When you admit Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico, there will be twenty-two States, with forty-four Senators, west of the Mississippi. East of the Mississippi we shall have twenty-six States, with fifty-two Senators. The territory east of the Mississippi must forever have a density of population three times as great as that west of that river in order not to exceed it in representation. Oh, they say that they fear Senators from the West. I do not. But they say, "You haven't folks enough out there." When did a Senator ever represent folks? [Great laughter and applause.] If that is the policy, why did you not begin twenty years ago? Why did you divide the Dakotas and give them four Senators? Why did you not

make Montana and Idaho come in as one State? Why did you bring in these other States if your policy is now to unite Territories, as you are proposing to do with Arizona and New Mexico—Territories that were once together, but were divided because we could give better government to them separately than together.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEDE. I would like to have one or two minutes more.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. BEDE. That will do. [Laughter.]

Why, we used to hear it said that New England was not fit to live in [laughter]; yet we have made that a great country. Even Governor Bradford, in his notes on the early settlement of that country, intimates that the Pilgrim Fathers themselves would not have landed in New England if they had not been seasick. [Great laughter.]

We have made a great country of New England, and we love every State of it; I would not strike down one of her Representatives in this House or the other; but we love the West too. We have heard it said that Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas were the Great American Desert; but that idea has been wiped out and they are now garden spots. As a boy I heard it asserted that you could never run a railroad through Minnesota with the thermometer 30° below zero, because the water would freeze in the boiler and the locomotive would go dead. [Laughter.] We have now a great State there and other great States have been made in the West, and I believe in a fair representation for this great country west of the Mississippi River.

But this bill proposes to unite these two Territories which are greater in area than Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois all combined. Take all this territory from Plymouth Rock to the Mississippi River and you still have a territory smaller than that which you now propose to make into one State by combining the two Territories of Arizona and New Mexico. [Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will consume some of his time.

The SPEAKER. There are seventeen minutes on each side remaining.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have not occupied more than sixteen or eighteen minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will see in a moment. [After a pause.] The gentleman from Mississippi, the Chair finds, has seven minutes remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has twenty-seven minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to consume some of his time.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House believes more sincerely than I do that Arizona and New Mexico ought not to be admitted into the Union either jointly or severally. Neither of them possesses the natural conditions that give assurance of its ability to maintain a permanent population of sufficient size to entitle it to be a State forever.

But, Mr. Speaker, our Government is a government by party and party responsibility, not a government by individuals or individual responsibility. Our Government as such has no policies. Its policies are the policies of the party in control of the Government. These policies are formulated and declared by national conventions or by the representatives of the party in control in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and we must either stand or fall with the policies of our party. In this particular instance the representatives of the party now in control of the Government have declared in favor of the policy it is sought to be enforced by this rule, and although I differ individually with that policy and with the judgment of those who have framed it, nevertheless, as a member of the party in control of the Government, I bow to the judgment of the majority of my party associates, and will therefore support this resolution. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that there will be only one other speech on this side of the House, and therefore I ask him to occupy all of the remainder of his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any policy of this House has tended so much to impair its influence and power in legislation as the adoption of rules of this character. If we, as a part of the National Legislature, have lost effectiveness, it has been through the policy of gagging ourselves by rules of this kind. I have voted for them, and I will possibly vote for them again in the future, but I consider

the question now before this House, the admission of States into the brotherhood of the Union, as the most transcendent question that can come before this body, and while I am willing to give up my convictions upon matters of detail, upon schedules, matters of purely party policy, or something of that character, I can not give up my convictions upon a proposition of this kind. I love and admire the Speaker of this House more than any other man in this Union. I love and admire the President of the United States as much as any President we have ever had. I would desire more than I can say to carry out their wishes, but I can not sink my conscience even to do that. Nor would either of them ask it. They would think less of me if I did so.

What is the question here? It is not the question of admitting these States now, but it is the question of saying to the people of Arizona and to the people of the United States that their rights and their claims shall not even be presented or considered on the floor of this House. If you adopt this rule, you might just as well vote on this bill without any further debate. This rule allows no amendment. Under it we can not even offer an amendment. Some gentleman suggested a moment ago that if this rule is adopted we can debate until 3 o'clock to-morrow, and every gentleman can set himself right before the country. I do not ask any time to set myself right before the country or my constituents on this proposition. [Applause.] I voted for this proposition two years ago. I admit it, but I did it under protest. I did it at the earnest solicitation, yea, pleading, of the leaders of this House. When I visited Arizona last spring and saw the people there and the splendid civilization that they have built up, I said, "I will not vote again to force these people into an unholy union, even to bring them into the Union of States against their wishes."

Gentlemen, shall we say that we are afraid of ourselves? That is what we say if we vote for this rule. If you can adopt this rule you can not reject any amendment that you are opposed to. You know that there are many on this side of the House who would like to vote for Oklahoma alone, but who don't like to vote against this rule. You are afraid of yourselves. This is a sorry spectacle for the country to gaze upon. They say the President of the United States is in favor of this proposition. The President of the United States has declared in favor of the admission of these States, but he has not declared for this rule. He never would declare for this rule. If he were on the floor of this House every element in his nature would protest against it. If I know him as I think I do, I venture to assert that he would oppose this rule with all the power that he possesses. If he would not, he is not the man that I take him to be, he is not the man that the country believes him to be. If he would not do it, then the words that he has uttered with reference to a "square deal" are as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." [Applause.]

No; the President of the United States believes in independence of thought and independence of action. If there is any one thing that has endeared him to the people of this country, it is his sturdy adherence to what he believes to be fair and right. He believes in doing what is right. He believes in considering the claims of every section and of every class, and he would be the last man to endeavor to force these people into this unholy alliance, at least until they have a chance to be heard. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it seems somewhat tragic to me that the day of my birth should have been selected as the one day in the year for the sacrifice of the people in whose devoted service I have spent most of my life. When I saw the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. TAWNEY] take the floor in favor of this rule, I was reminded of another and much more tragic scene:

And Joab said to Amasa, Art thou in health, my brother? And Joab took Amasa by the beard with the right hand to kiss him.

But Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab's hand: so he smote him therewith in the fifth rib, and shed out his bowels to the ground.

[Applause.]

In the guise of friendship he gives us the most savage, the cruellest cut of all. Mr. Speaker, this is not a party question. If it is, it is time for any party, mine or yours, to hand down its scepter to other people. When the rights of a people can be made the shuttlecock of party rule, and when the great good heart of that Republican majority to-day, unhampered by your great power, unhampered by the President of the United States, would beat this bill four to one, yet men like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and other gentlemen arise and swing the party lash over the weak, but give no reason whatever for this outrageous proceeding except allegiance to party com-

mand. There was no caucus of the Republican party on this question. The pretense of a caucus was a fraud on new Members. Whenever the Republican party or mine can make the rights of men subservient to the mere party lash, then that party deserves to be beaten and will be beaten. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say that he intended to have only one more argument on his side.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I could not honestly cast my vote in favor of reporting this rule. As a Member of the House I can not honestly support it. So far as the people who sent me here are concerned, they have interest in it only as the people of the Union in general have interest in it. It would make no difference in my political fortunes were I to vote for this rule or vote against it, were I to support the bill or oppose it.

I am one of those who believe that so far as politics are concerned, the great American people, when their attention is really awakened and when a great question is before them, like the skilled navigator, will take the great circle as the shortest route between two points. American politics, when the people are interested in politics, and they are when great questions are up, are not to find solutions on narrow lines or in bitter prejudices.

In my vision there is that picture which is portrayed by that inimitable artist, Mr. Berryman, in the Washington Post of this morning. Beautiful American Arizona at the window with a hatchet in her hand; the Mexican endeavoring to ascend the ladder and forcibly make her his own. I see Arizona, in her magnificent American citizenship, earnest in protest against this measure and the method of it, and without a solitary vote in this body or in the other. However others may view it, whatever others may do, the people of Arizona, the people of our own blood, the American citizenship of this land, whether in a Territory or in a State, so long as I may raise my voice, so long as I may cast my vote on any proposition, shall at least find one, whatever the fates may decree, who is American and not Mexican. These people differ in traditions, they differ in education, they differ in race, they differ in ambition, they differ in religious faith, they differ largely in everything, and yet you are to weld them together as one in this indissoluble Union of States.

You separated Arizona from New Mexico years and years ago because the people of these two Territories could be governed better in two Territories than in one. Let Arizona speak, let New Mexico speak, and if the people in either protest against it, in the name of God, in the spirit of American patriotism and justice, in the honor of American citizenship, for the sake of American manhood, for the sake of American womanhood, do not perpetrate this outrage. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if I have kept correct count, I have now eight minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is right; the gentleman has eight minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there has been more or less shifting on this question since it was first brought up in the Fifty-seventh Congress. At that time Mr. OVERSTREET, the gentleman from Indiana, introduced an amendment to the bill that was then pending providing for the formation of three States—that these two Territories of Arizona and New Mexico should be united as one State, and that was voted down by 108 yeas to 28 nays.

If the Members of this House could visit Arizona, they would soon realize that the jointure of that Territory with New Mexico would be wholly unjust to the citizens of the former Territory.

Mr. Speaker, during the past summer a number of Members of this House did go to Arizona and among them was my friend from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY]. He now urges us to stand by the Republican party. I remember when the gentleman was himself an insurgent in this House upon the Cuban reciprocity bill. I honored him for his stand at that time, and I honor him now for having taken that stand; but this is what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] said while he was in Arizona, when he was among those people, when he saw conditions in Arizona, and when he had an opportunity to personally observe the state of things in that Territory. I read from the San Francisco Examiner of October 16, 1905.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi to yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield the gentleman one-half minute.

Mr. KAHN. I read from that paper:

Representative TAWNEY, of Minnesota: "Were the Members of Congress to come here and see, I doubt if four-fifths who have voted for jointure would do so after the visit. I now know the conditions, and my next vote will meet with Arizona's approval."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield one minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from California, I will again say that what he has read in respect to my statement in Arizona, with the exception of my future vote, is true, and just what I said a moment ago on the merits of the proposition. I am not in favor of admission of either one of these Territories, but that I would ever vote one way or the other, no statement of the kind was ever made by me on the trip through Arizona.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi yields to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] four minutes and a half.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have been consistently opposed to the admission of Arizona or New Mexico either as single or joint States ever since the proposition has been before Congress, and I desire to call the attention of the House and of gentlemen who are familiar with the amendment for joint statehood, which has been referred to in this debate, to the fact that the question of joint statehood was brought up in this House, not in good faith, but for the purpose of defeating single statehood, and many gentlemen on the floor know this fact. That was the purpose of the amendment at that time; the idea in bringing it up was to defeat single statehood. Now, if I were called upon to vote on either proposition—and I am opposed to both—before I would cast my vote for what I consider a crime against representative American people, that of coercing them to join two different classes of civilization in one State, I would vote for two single States. And I desire to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the political aspect of this proposition which has been referred to by our distinguished leader on the floor of the House. The argument has been made on this side of the House that if this were not done at this time, later we would have two States—Arizona and New Mexico—and four Democratic Senators. Now, I desire to call attention to a little history. I want the Members of this House to stop and think about that question. When the Dingley bill passed this House it went to the Senate and before the Finance Committee of that body. At that time, as we all know, the Senate was controlled by Democrats and Populists, or free-silver Republicans. The Finance Committee was composed of six Republicans, six Democrats, and Senator Jones of Nevada. That bill could not be moved or taken out of that committee without the vote of Senator Jones, and every amendment that he offered or proposed was accepted by that committee. What are the interests of New Mexico and Arizona? First, wool; second, mines, mining, and minerals, and third, fruits—all protected to the very highest extent under the Dingley tariff bill; and a distinguished Member of Congress from California said on one occasion that the Dingley tariff schedules fitted the West and the Pacific coast as a knit shirt does the human body; it touches every part. Now, how can Arizona or New Mexico ever be Democratic under any present conditions? A Democratic policy would take the bread and butter out of their mouths; it would destroy the protection on their mines, their minerals, their wool, and their fruit, and yet we are presented with the argument here that these States will be Democratic if they are admitted.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not further take up the time of the House, but I do want the Members on this floor to consider that proposition. Why, you might just as well go to Vermont and ask for Democratic Senators as to go to New Mexico and Arizona for them, if they should in the future have statehood.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to state the politics of the present Delegate from Arizona.

Mr. BABCOCK. I understand the present Delegate is a Democrat.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. How does it happen, if Arizona is as strongly Republican as Vermont, that the present Delegate is a Democrat?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I would like to answer that in the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BABCOCK. If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] will go to Arizona he will find that the present

Delegate is a man who has spent his life among those people, and as he goes from town to town everybody says, "Why, here is MARK—MARK SMITH." The gentleman's own personality brought him here, coupled with his position on this statehood matter. That is what elected him to Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then why was he beaten two years ago?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes; why was he beaten two years ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the time on this side is exhausted.

The SPEAKER. It is exhausted, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has twenty-three minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, for over fifty years the Territory of New Mexico has been knocking at the doors of Congress for admission into this Union, and when I say New Mexico, I mean both Arizona and New Mexico, because they were originally one, and they ought yet to be one. Fifty-three or fifty-four bills for the admission of New Mexico have been introduced into this House. Seventeen times one or the other branch of Congress has passed laws admitting New Mexico as a State into the Union.

Now, under those circumstances, the time has finally come when the two great parties of this country, the Democratic and the Republican parties, have decreed that these Territories should be admitted into the Union on some terms or other; and each of those parties has adopted a policy with respect to the manner in which they should be admitted. The Democratic party, in its platform at the last national convention, said:

We favor the admission of the Territories of Oklahoma and Indian Territory. We also favor the immediate admission of Arizona and New Mexico as separate States.

Now, here is one thing upon which the two parties are agreed, and that is that the Territories shall be admitted, but they exercise a different judgment as to the manner in which they shall be admitted. The Democratic party says they shall be admitted as separate States with four Senators. The Republican party says they shall be admitted as the Territories originally stood, as one one State with two Senators. Why the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ADAMS] says he is pleading for representative government. He is pleading against representative government and against the theory of our Government as it was originally determined. Let me call your attention to some significant figures. There are fourteen States in this Union to-day that have twenty-eight Senators and only twenty-eight Representatives. There are six States in this Union to-day that have twelve Senators and only six Representatives. There are five States in this Union to-day that have ten Senators and ten Representatives, and if you admit Arizona and New Mexico as a single State you will have sixteen States with thirty-two Senators and thirty-two Representatives. I ask my friend if that is the representative government that was intended by the men who made the Constitution? There are east of the west line of Kansas 80,000,000 of people. There are west of the west line of Kansas 5,000,000 of people. I stand here to-day for the 80,000,000 as against the 5,000,000. [Applause.] My State has thirty-two Representatives in this body and their vote amounts to nothing in the Senate as against the votes of two Senators from Nevada that has not as much population—men, women, and children—as there are voters in my representative district.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he intends to hold upon this floor that Representatives of Western States are antagonistic in their purposes, in their desires, and in their work to eastern interests or any other?

Mr. DALZELL. I am not arguing that question. I am arguing that there is an undue number of Senators in the United States as compared with the Members of Congress at this end of the Capitol representing population, and that the whole system of Government as devised by the fathers has been overturned by the introduction of these Senators from these small States. Mr. Speaker, I am arguing that Senators ought to represent population, and not rocks and sand. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There have been a great many people from Pennsylvania who have gone westward. Does the gentleman contend there are no more going in the future?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I do not know what that has to do with this matter. Possibly the gentleman does.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, this is legislation for all time.

Mr. DALZELL. When those Territories are filled up with a sufficient population to be admitted as independent States in this Union the Congress that then exists will deal justly and fairly, I have no doubt, with the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is denied that this is a political proposition. Why, if this is not a political proposition then it is impossible to make any proposition political. In the Fifty-eighth Congress the Democratic party of this House met in caucus and passed a resolution against this proposition that we are now arguing for, and made it, so far as the Democratic party is concerned, a political proposition. Upon the other hand, in that same Congress—the Fifty-eighth Congress—the Republicans of this House, many of them Members of this present Congress, met in caucus or conference—I care not whether you call it caucus or conference, it amounts to the same thing. This is a Government by parties, and the only way for a party to govern is by an organization whereby the will of the majority may impress itself upon the minority—

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. MARSHALL. Was it not distinctly understood, before a single step was taken in this conference, that the Members were not to be bound by it?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, every solitary Republican Member, with two exceptions, who attended the conference to which I am referring in the Fifty-eighth Congress voted the Republican proposition in the House, and the gentleman who now interrupts me attended that conference and subsequently voted for this present proposition in the House.

Now, I say that the Democratic party, by a caucus, made this a party measure. I say that the Republican party, by a caucus, made it a party measure. But I do not stop there. On the 19th day of April, 1904, a rule was introduced into this House almost identical in terms with the rule that is now pending, and every solitary Republican Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress, with two exceptions, voted for that rule. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], who has recently taken his seat and who expressed himself with such bitterness against this measure, voted for that rule. Every Republican Member of this Congress that was a Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress, as I say, with two exceptions, voted for that rule. But that is not all. Every single Republican Member, with one exception, when the time came, voted for the passage of the bill. That is not all. That bill went over to the Senate. The Senate added a number of amendments, but the most prominent and conspicuous amendment was the one that carried out the views now advocated by the gentlemen on the other side of the House. A rule was brought into this House that took from the Committee on Territories the bill with the Senate amendments and sent that bill to a conference with a disagreement to all of those amendments, and every solitary Republican Member of this House voted for that rule.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does not the gentleman know that that bill went to the Committee on Territories, and they absolutely refused to bring it into this House until those who were opposed to it would agree to allow it to go to conference, and when it went to conference would not allow it to come out?

Mr. DALZELL. I know nothing of the kind.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. DALZELL. I know that the gentleman voted for the rule.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know, and I know the reason why.

Mr. DALZELL. How the gentleman's conscience may have been influenced is a question with him and not with me.

Now, in addition to that, there was a Republican conference at the present session of Congress. That conference was well attended. The gentlemen who are opposing this bill here to-day attended that conference.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that it is proper here to refer to what has occurred in conferences, or what may occur in the conferences, but inasmuch as the gentleman insists upon referring to it, if it would be proper for me to do so, I would like to inquire of him how many moments of that entire conference were given to the gentlemen opposing this bill?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not see the relevancy of the question. Any gentleman who would allow himself

to be controlled upon a question of this kind by a matter of personal pique, either with respect to the time that he served in a conference or for any other personal reason, is unworthy, in my judgment, to sit in the House of Representatives. Now, I do not propose to be interrupted any more.

Mr. MONDELL. I wish to inquire of the gentleman if he has reference to myself in what he has just said?

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman is perfectly capable of understanding what I have said, and if he does not now, he can think about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that this has been made a party measure by a Democratic caucus, by a Republican caucus, by three votes of Republicans on the floor of this House, and by a conference only recently held. It has been made a party measure by the President of the United States, who adopted in his last message the action of the Republican party in this House. And I say further that it is perfectly manifest from what has taken place here to-day that it is a party measure. Why, every gentleman on this side of the House who has arisen to speak against the rule has risen by the courtesy of the leader of the Democratic party. And every Republican on this side of the House who votes against this rule votes shoulder to shoulder with the Democratic party.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I had not yielded time to those gentlemen, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania have yielded it?

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all; not a minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the gentleman is not going to blame me for permitting the representatives of the people to have opportunity to address the House? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I am not blaming the gentleman at all. I am admiring his cunning. I am admiring his ingenuity as a party leader in surrendering his time, not to the Democrats, all of whom are lined up, but to Republicans whom he hopes to have follow his leadership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not the keeper of any man's conscience, but it does seem to me that in a Government such as ours, where the government is purely a government by party, it is the duty of every member of a party upon a party measure to stand by his party; and I leave the subject just here. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question, and on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 192, nays 165, answered "present" 3, not voting 26, as follows:

YEAS—192.

Acheson	Davis, Minn.	Holliday	Mouser
Adams, Pa.	Dawes	Howell, N. J.	Murdoch
Alexander	Dawson	Hubbard	Nevin
Allen, Me.	Deemer	Huff	Norris
Allen, N. J.	Denby	Hughes	Olcott
Ames	Dickson, Ill.	Hull	Olmsted
Bannon	Dixon, Mont.	Jenkins	Overstreet
Barchfeld	Dovener	Keifer	Palmer
Bartholdt	Draper	Kennedy, Nebr.	Parker
Bates	Dresser	Ketcham	Parsons
Bennet, N. Y.	Driscoll	Kinkaid	Patterson, Pa.
Bennett, Ky.	Dunwell	Klepper	Payne
Bingham	Dwight	Knapp	Pearre
Birdsall	Edwards	Knopf	Perkins
Bishop	Ellis	Lacey	Pollard
Blackburn	Fassett	Lafean	Powers
Boutell	Flack	Landis, Chas. B.	Reynolds
Bowersock	Fletcher	Landis, Frederick	Rhodes
Bradley	Foss	Law	Rives
Brick	Foster, Ind.	Lawrence	Roberts
Brownlow	Foster, Vt.	Le Fevre	Rodenberg
Buckman	Fowler	Lilley, Conn.	Samuel
Burke, Pa.	Fuller	Lilley, Pa.	Schneebell
Burke, S. Dak.	Gaines, W. Va.	Littauer	Scott
Burleigh	Gardner, Mass.	Littlefield	Scroggy
Burton, Ohio	Gardner, Mich.	Longworth	Shartel
Butler, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	Lorimer	Sherman
Calder	Gilbert, Ind.	Loudenslager	Sibley
Campbell, Kans.	Gillett, Mass.	Lovering	Smith, Ill.
Campbell, Ohio	Graff	McCall	Smith, Iowa.
Capron	Greene	McCarthy	Smith, Samuel W.
Cassel	Grosvenor	McCleary, Minn.	Smith, Wm. Alden
Chaney	Hale	McGavin	Smith, Pa.
Chapman	Hamilton	McKinley, Ill.	Smyser
Cocks	Haskins	McKinney	Snapp
Cole	Haugen	Madden	Southard
Conner	Hedge	Mahon	Southwick
Cooper, Pa.	Henry, Conn.	Mann	Sperry
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn	Martin	Stafford
Cousins	Higgins	Michalek	Sterling
Currier	Hill, Conn.	Miller	Stevens, Minn.
Dale	Hinshaw	Moon, Pa.	Sulloway
Dalzell	Hoar	Morrell	Tawney

Taylor, Ohio	Volstead	Watson	Wiley, N. J.
Tirrell	Vreeland	Webber	Wilson
Townsend	Wadsworth	Weeks	Wood, N. J.
Tyndall	Waldo	Weems	Woodyard
Van Winkle	Wanger	Weiborn	The Speaker

NAYS—165.

Adams, Wis.	Gaines, Tenn.	Lamb	Robertson, La.
Adamson	Garber	Lee	Robinson, Ark.
Aiken	Garner	Egare	Rucker
Babcock	Garrett	Lester	Ruppert
Bankhead	Gilbert, Ky.	Lever	Russell
Bartlett	Gill	Lewis	Ryan
Beall, Tex.	Gillespie	Lindsay	Shackelford
Beidler	Gillett, Cal.	Livingston	Sheppard
Bede	Glass	Lloyd	Sherley
Bonyng	Goebel	Loud	Sims
Bowers	Goldfogle	McCreary, Pa.	Slayden
Bowie	Goulden	McKinlay, Cal.	Slomp
Brantley	Granger	McLachlan	Small
Brooks, Tex.	Grigg	McLain	Smith, Cal.
Brooks, Colo.	Griggs	McMorran	Smith, Ky.
Brown	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Md.
Brundidge	Gudger	Macon	Smith, Tex.
Burgess	Hardwick	Marshall	Sparkman
Burleson	Hay	Maynard	Spight
Burnett	Hayes	Meyer	Stanley
Butler, Tenn.	Healin	Minor	Steenerson
Calderhead	Henry, Tex.	Mondell	Stephens, Tex.
Candler	Hermann	Moon, Tenn.	Sullivan, Mass.
Clark, Fla.	Hopkins	Moore	Swanson
Clark, Mo.	Houston	Mudd	Talbot
Clayton	Howard	Murphy	Talbot
Cushman	Howell, Utah	Needham	Taylor, Ala.
Darragh	Humphrey, Wash.	Otjen	Thomas, N. C.
Davey, La.	Humphreys, Miss.	Padgett	Thomas, Ohio
Davidson	Hunt	Page	Towne
Davis, W. Va.	James	Patterson, N. C.	Trimble
De Armond	Johnson	Pou	Underwood
Dixon, Ind.	Jones, Va.	Pujo	Wachter
Ellerbe	Jones, Wash.	Ramey	Wallace
Esch	Kahn	Randell, Tex.	Watkins
Field	Kelher	Ransdell, La.	Webb
Finley	Kennedy, Ohio	Reeder	Weisse
Fitzgerald	Kitchin, Claude	Reid	Wiley, Ala.
Flood	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rhinock	Williams
Floyd	Kline	Richardson, Ala.	Wood, Mo.
French	Knowland	Richardson, Ky.	
Fulkerson	Lamar	Rixey	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Curtis Patterson, S. C.

NOT VOTING—26.

Crumpacker	Curtis	Patterson, S. C.
Andrus	Cromer	Little
Bell, Ga.	Fordney	McDermott
Broussard	Graham	Patterson, Tenn.
Burton, Del.	Hearst	Prince
Byrd	Hill, Miss.	Southall
Castor	Hitt	Sullivan, N. Y.
Cockran	Hogg	Sulzer
		Van Duzer
		Wharton
		Williamson
		Young
		Zenor

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The name of the Speaker was called, and he voted "yea."

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

- Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. ZENOR.
- Mr. BURTON of Delaware with Mr. BELL of Georgia.
- Mr. CURTIS with Mr. LITTLE.
- Mr. CROMER with Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina.
- On statehood:
- Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. VAN DUZER.
- Mr. HITT with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.
- Mr. WHARTON with Mr. BYRD.
- Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I voted; and I find that I am paired with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE]. I desire to withdraw my vote.

The name of Mr. CURTIS was called, and he voted "present."

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, is it proper in this connection to announce that I have a telegram from the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. VAN DUZER], who reports that his absence was caused by a railroad wreck in which he was somewhat injured? I would like to state that as the reason for his absence.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the statement will go in the RECORD.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

[Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, would it now be in order to ask for a recapitulation of the vote?

The SPEAKER. The difference in the vote is 38. It is in the discretion of the Chair to order a recapitulation. Unless there is some reason to question the roll, it is not usual to order it when there is so great a disparity in the vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to have it recapitulated, if the Chair will exercise his discretion in that respect.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is not satisfied or doubts the result, the roll will be recapitulated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not doubt the result, but there has been such confusion that I doubt the accuracy of some of the votes.

The SPEAKER. Well, on that suggestion the Clerk will recapitulate the vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not doubt the general result, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Well, the gentleman doubts the accuracy. The vote was recapitulated.

The SPEAKER. The previous question, as before announced, has been ordered, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in order to save the time of the House I think we had better have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 188, nays 158, answered "present" 2, not voting 38, as follows:

YEAS—188.

Adeson	Dixon, Mont.	Kinkaid	Powers
Adams, Pa.	Dovener	Klepper	Reynolds
Alexander	Draper	Knapp	Rhodes
Allen, Me.	Dresser	Knopf	Rives
Ames	Driscoll	Lacey	Roberts
Bannon	Dunwell	Lafean	Rodenberg
Barchfeld	Dwight	Landis, Frederick	Samuel
Bartholdt	Edwards	Law	Schneebell
Bates	Ellis	Lawrence	Scroggy
Bennet, N. Y.	Fasset	Le Fevre	Shartel
Bennett, Ky.	Flack	Lilley, Conn.	Sherman
Bingham	Fletcher	Lilley, Pa.	Sibley
Birdsall	Foss	Littauer	Smith, Ill.
Bishop	Foster, Ind.	Littlefield	Smith, Iowa
Blackburn	Foster, Vt.	Longworth	Smith, Samuel W.
Bontell	Fowler	Lorimer	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bowersock	Fuller	Loudenslager	Smith, Pa.
Bradley	Galnes, W. Va.	Lovering	Smyser
Brick	Gardner, Mass.	McCall	Snapp
Brownlow	Gardner, Mich.	McCarthy	Southard
Buckman	Gilbert, Ind.	McCleary, Minn.	Southwick
Burke, Pa.	Gillett, Mass.	McGavin	Sperry
Burke, S. Dak.	Graff	McKinley, Ill.	Stafford
Burleigh	Greene	McKinney	Sterling
Burton, Ohio	Grosvenor	Madden	Stevens, Minn.
Butler, Pa.	Hale	Mabon	Sullyway
Calder	Hamilton	Mann	Tawney
Campbell, Ohio	Haskins	Martin	Taylor, Ohio
Capron	Haugen	Michalek	Tirrell
Cassel	Hedge	Miller	Townsend
Chaney	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Tyndall
Chapman	Hepburn	Morrell	Van Winkle
Cocks	Higgins	Mouser	Volstead
Cole	Hill, Conn.	Murdoch	Vreeland
Conner	Hinshaw	Nevin	Wadsworth
Cooper, Pa.	Hoar	Norris	Waldo
Cooper, Wis.	Hogg	Olcott	Wanger
Cousins	Holliday	Olmsted	Watson
Currier	Howell, N. J.	Overstreet	Webber
Dale	Hubbard	Palmer	Weeks
Dalzell	Huff	Parker	Weems
Davis, Minn.	Hughes	Parsons	Welborn
Dawes	Hull	Patterson, Pa.	Wiley, N. J.
Dawson	Jenkins	Payne	Wilson
Deemer	Kelfer	Pearre	Wood, N. J.
Denby	Kennedy, Nebr.	Perkins	Woodyard
Dickson, Ill.	Ketcham	Pollard	The Speaker

NAYS—158.

Adams, Wis.	Fulkerson	Knowland	Rixey
Adamson	Gaines, Tenn.	Lamar	Robertson, La.
Alken	Garber	Lamb	Robinson, Ark.
Babcock	Garner	Lee	Rucker
Bankhead	Garrett	Legare	Ruppert
Bartlett	Gilbert, Ky.	Lester	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Gill	Lever	Ryan
Bede	Gillespie	Lewis	Shackleford
Bonyng	Gillett, Cal.	Lindsay	Sheppard
Bowers	Glass	Livingston	Sherley
Bowie	Goebel	Lloyd	Sims
Brantley	Goldfogle	McCreary, Pa.	Small
Brooks, Tex.	Goulden	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Cal.
Brooks, Colo.	Granger	McLachlan	Smith, Ky.
Brown	Gregg	McLain	Smith, Md.
Brundidge	Griggs	McNary	Smith, Tex.
Burgess	Gudger	Macon	Sparkman
Burleson	Hardwick	Marshall	Spight
Burnett	Hay	Maynard	Stanley
Butler, Tenn.	Hayes	Meyer	Steenerson
Calderhead	Heflin	Minor	Stephens, Tex.
Candler	Henry, Tex.	Mondell	Sullivan, Mass.
Clark, Fla.	Hermann	Moon, Tenn.	Swanson
Clark, Mo.	Hopkins	Moore	Talbott
Clayton	Houston	Mudd	Taylor, Ala.
Cushman	Howard	Murphy	Thomas, N. C.
Darragh	Howell, Utah	Needham	Towne
Davey, La.	Humphrey, Wash.	Padgett	Trimble
Davidson	Humphreys, Miss.	Page	Underwood
Davis, W. Va.	Hunt	Patterson, N. C.	Wachter
De Armond	James	Pou	Wallace
Dixon, Ind.	Johnson	Pujo	Watkins
Ellerbe	Jones, Va.	Rainey	Webb
Esch	Jones, Wash.	Randell, Tex.	Weisse
Field	Kahn	Ransdell, La.	Wiley, Ala.
Finley	Keliber	Reeder	Williams
Fitzgerald	Kennedy, Ohio	Reid	Wood, Mo.
Flood	Kitchin, Claude	Rhinock	
Floyd	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Richardson, Ala.	
French	Kline	Richardson, Ky.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Curtis

Otjen

NOT VOTING—38.

Allen, N. J.	Cromer	Little	Sullivan, N. X.
Andrus	Crumpacker	Loud	Sulzer
Beldler	Fordney	McDermott	Thomas, Ohio
Bell, Ga.	Gardner, N. J.	McMorran	Van Duzer
Broussard	Graham	Patterson, S. C.	Wharton
Burton, Del.	Gronna	Patterson, Tenn.	Williamson
Byrd	Hearst	Prince	Young
Campbell, Kans.	Hill, Miss.	Scott	Zenor
Castor	Hitt	Slemp	
Cockran	Landis, Chas. B.	Southall	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of the Speaker; and he voted in the affirmative.

The Clerk resumed and completed the calling of the roll.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. COCKRAN.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. SOUTHALL.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is agreed to; and under the order the House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12707) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, with Mr. CRUMPACKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I can not see the object in reading a bill which there is no possible opportunity to amend. It seems to me like consuming the time of the House unnecessarily, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the further reading be dispensed with.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I think it can not be dispensed with, under the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opinion of the Chair, that under the order of the House the reading can not be dispensed with.

The Clerk proceeded and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the rule adopted by the House makes no provision for a division and control of the time, I ask unanimous consent that the time shall be equally divided between the Democratic and Republican sides of the House, and that the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. MOON, shall control the time on that side, and that I be permitted to control the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the time for debate upon the pending bill shall be divided equally between those supporting and those opposing the measure, and that the time of those supporting the bill shall be under the control of the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. HAMILTON, and those opposing the bill under the control of the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. MOON. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Michigan to ask that the time be divided between the Democratic side and the Republican side.

The CHAIRMAN. The request, as put by the Chair, was that it be divided between those who support the bill and those who oppose the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, it becomes my duty to attempt a review of the provisions of this bill. I desire at this time to occupy only a short time, and would be glad if I might finish what I have to say, by way of opening, in thirty minutes. To that end I will ask that I be permitted to proceed for a time, and then if inquiries shall suggest themselves I will endeavor to make response to them.

The Constitution provides that "New States may be admitted by Congress into the Union," but it nowhere prescribes the number or character of the people who shall constitute a proposed State.

No community, I take it, can claim admission into the partnership of States as a matter of absolute right, but whether a community shall be admitted into the partnership of States

ought to depend on the national judgment as to whether the best interests of the Government will be subserved by such admission.

Lying between the thirty-first and thirty-seventh degrees of north latitude stretches an immense domain, bounded on the east by Arkansas and Missouri and on the west by California and Nevada, out of which it is proposed by this bill to create two States, provided the people living thereon shall so elect.

Out of that part of this immense domain, now known as Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, the one organized about fifteen years ago and the other still unorganized, it is proposed to create a State to be known as the "State of Oklahoma." These Territories—Oklahoma and the Indian Territory—are rich in corn, cotton, wheat, coal, gas, and oil, and their cities, staked out upon the level plain but a few years ago by a virile population, drawn from all parts of the Union, have sprung like magic into opulence and power, equipped with every device of energy and luxury. Indian names once synonyms of savage warfare have become the musical names of municipalities, of civilized progress, in which both Indians and white men are participating. [Applause.]

Oklahoma, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is an area of 38,830 square miles, divided into 26 counties, with a population according to the last national census of 398,000, and that population has now probably increased to about 700,000. The Indian Territory has an area of 31,000 square miles, with a population of 392,000 by the last national census, which has now grown probably to a population of about 700,000.

These two Territories when combined as a State will make a State smaller than Kansas, smaller than Nebraska, smaller than South Dakota, and about the size of North Dakota. Gentlemen, the arguments in favor of statehood for Oklahoma and the Indian Territory are urgent and compelling. I take it there is hardly a man on the floor of this House who is opposed to statehood for Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, although some few would prefer to see those two Territories separately admitted.

One important provision I desire to call attention to before passing to a discussion of Arizona and New Mexico, and that is the provision whereby it is proposed to project Federal authority into the proposed State of Oklahoma by a requirement that the constitution of the proposed State shall compel prohibition for twenty-one years of the sale of intoxicating liquors within those parts of the proposed State now known as the Indian Territory and the Osage Nation and any Indian reservations which may have existed as such on the 1st day of January of this year.

The reason why this provision is sought to be incorporated in the constitution of the proposed State grows out of what the committee regards as our moral obligations to the Indians. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that our treaty relations with the Indians have almost ceased by their own limitations, and that such treaties as still exist will expire on the 4th day of March of this year; but our committee could not escape the view that there was a certain moral obligation incumbent upon the Federal Government to protect the Indian from himself. We do not doubt the legality of the proposition—we believe in the constitutionality of it.

Farther west lie the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, with their deserts shimmering in eternal sunshine, their mountains towering toward the sky, their canyons where daylight is twilight, their river valleys of inexhaustible fertility when touched by the magic of irrigation, their mines of inexhaustible wealth, their climate with health in every inspiration, their cities teeming with activity, and here and there the remnants and reminders of one of the oldest civilizations on the American continent. [Applause.]

Topographically the Territory of New Mexico has been called a part of the roof of the continent, sloping not only eastward and westward, but southward, from the eastern side of which the waters flow into the Atlantic and from the western side of which the waters flow into the Pacific.

The Territory is divided, according to the governor's last report, into three regions; one, the eastern plains, being an extension of the high plains of Texas; another, the valley of the Rio Grande, and the third, the western plateaus. In this valley of the Rio Grande and its tributary valleys two-thirds of all the population of New Mexico live, and in these valleys are to be found three-fourths of all the irrigable lands of the Territory of New Mexico.

Arizona is divided into two regions, one the high northern plateaus, where, from plateaus 5,000 to 7,500 feet above sea level, great mountain peaks and spurs and volcanic cones rise still higher. These plateaus farther south in Arizona become great mountain ranges, which grade off into low volcanic ridges; and these volcanic ridges farther southward

descend, by a succession of mesas or table-lands, down to a great alkali desert, almost on a level with the sea. Arizona has an area of 113,000 square miles, or 73,000,000 acres. New Mexico has 122,580 square miles, or 78,000,000 acres. This makes a total area of 235,580 square miles, or 151,000,000 acres, and of all that vast area only about 1 per cent is irrigable. The governor of New Mexico in his last report, which I have here on my desk—and they claim a larger population than the last Federal census gives them—says that there are 300 acres of land down there to every person, and that only 1 acre out of the 300 is cultivated.

Arizona has a population of 123,000. I say 123,000. By the last Federal census it is a trifle less, between 122,000 and 123,000. Of this, 26,000 are Indians, and it is only fair to the people of Arizona to say that they claim a much larger population. They say that they have a population of from 140,000 to 170,000. New Mexico, by the last Federal census, has a population of 195,000. They also claim more. They also claim that the Federal census is inaccurate; and of that population of 195,000, there are about 16,000 Indians, if I remember correctly; but the Indians in New Mexico are the Pueblo Indians.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are certain powerful interests that are opposed to statehood for Arizona and New Mexico. Among these powerful interests which are opposed to the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as one State are the railroads of Arizona and New Mexico—and I do the railroads no injustice in supposing that in their opposition to statehood for Arizona and New Mexico they are animated, at least in part, by their financial relation to the situation. Supporting this supposition, permit me to call your attention to that part of the last report of the governor of Arizona, in relation to the assessment of railroads. He says, on page 19, as to the second class—that is, those railroads to which he has previously referred as being in part exempt from taxation:

In the second class is the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad, extending across the Territory from east to west, a distance of 390.99 miles. This road constitutes a part of the transcontinental line of the Santa Fe. By an act of Congress it is provided that it shall pay to the Territorial treasurer the sum of \$175 per mile in lieu and in full of all taxes leviable for Territorial or county purposes. *This flat rate is arbitrary, and must in every instance be greater or less than the rate of equality would impose.* At a 3 per cent rate of taxation (which is probably less than the actual rate) this would fix the valuation of one of, if not the most, valuable railroad lines in the Territory at \$5,833.33 per mile. And this must be assumed to be a valuation fixed, inferentially, by Congress. *It would seem, therefore, unequal to assess a railroad of no greater actual value at a higher rate, just as it destroys every notion of equality to assess arbitrarily 390.99 miles of a total of 1,837 miles at \$5,833.33, or approximately that, and wholly exempt another 558 miles of the total mileage from any taxation.* At best, if the railroads were the only property upon which taxes were to be levied, it would seem fair that those having no greater value than the one whose valuation is, inferentially, fixed at \$5,833.33 per mile should not be assessed at a higher rate than that, and that roads of less real value should, for the purposes of taxation, be assessed at less than \$5,833.33 per mile. *But the railroads are not the only property upon which taxes are to be levied, and hence, if a valuation upon them is to be fixed at a proportionately lower rate than upon other taxable property, an inequality arises that is unjust to the owners of other property than railroads.*

The difficulty is, Mr. Chairman, that this system of taxation—that is, the flat rate of \$175 per mile per annum—is not applied equally to the whole Territory, as the governor complains. Now, in addition to this, there are railroads in Arizona estimated by the governor (on page 32 of his report) to be worth \$10,312,380 exempt from taxation. To enable the House to form some idea of the condition of which the governor complains, permit me to call your attention to the fact that the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad north and east of Albuquerque, which is not part, I take it, of the exempt roads, is taxed on a valuation of \$7,000 per mile. That part between Albuquerque and Rincon is taxed on a valuation of \$6,500 per mile. That part west of Albuquerque is taxed \$175 per mile per year. This tax of \$175 per mile per year, the governor of Arizona says, would be on a valuation of a little over \$5,000 per mile in Arizona, whereas in New Mexico this tax of \$175 per mile per year, it is estimated, would be on a valuation of about \$4,000 per mile. Some gentlemen may say, Now, how would this condition be cured if these two Territories were made into a State? This one suggestion ought to help—that that very same railroad, when it crosses the border line from Arizona into California, at the town of Needles, if I remember correctly, has a valuation fixed upon it by the State of California of \$14,000 per mile, and by Census Bulletin No. 21, recently issued, it appears that these roads have a commercial value in the Territories of \$39,000 per mile. Further, the Southern Pacific, when it crosses the line from New Mexico into Texas, at El Paso, has its valuation there raised by the State of Texas to \$17,000 per mile. These facts to every fair-minded man ought to suggest some reason why these powerful interests are opposed to statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, and the

act of Congress which provides that flat rate of \$175 per mile per year says it shall continue so long as they shall continue to be Territories. Another interest—

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. I yield, certainly, for a question.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Whose fault is it that that act of Congress exists?

Mr. HAMILTON. I have not any defense to make for that act, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. That is one Republican act you do not defend?

Mr. HAMILTON. It ought to be plain to my friend that I am not defending that act.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Then I want to ask you this question: Conceding there is corruption on the question of taxation in Arizona, and it is admitted that it is also in New Mexico by the Delegate—

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. How much better condition will they be in under joint statehood than under single statehood on this question?

Mr. HAMILTON. Certainly that is a very proper inquiry. Just as soon as Arizona and New Mexico are joined in statehood, I take it, all the American citizenship of that Territory would immediately see the impropriety of taxing a railroad at the rate of \$175 per mile per annum, when in California, just over the line, that same railroad was taxed at the rate of \$14,000 per mile; when in Texas, just over the line, another railroad, taxed in the Territories at about \$7,000 per mile, was taxed at the rate of \$17,000 per mile [applause], and when the Census Bulletin shows that these roads have a commercial value of \$39,000 per mile; and further, I take it that the gentleman from Tennessee will not dispute that American citizens, having the interest of the State at heart, desiring to have fair taxation of every industry, not desiring that other industries shall be discriminated against, will see to it that some fair system of taxation is substituted.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee concedes—

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I am conceding something myself now.

Mr. HAMILTON. Good!

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee concedes that American citizens would do that and American citizens do that everywhere, and yet he wants to make the suggestion to the gentleman from Michigan that 90 per cent of the people of the present Territory of Arizona are American citizens and that the American Congress is composed of American citizens.

Why is it, then, that the Congress does not remedy it, if it is wrong? Why is it that the people of Arizona do not remedy it, if it is wrong? In other words, is not the gentleman from Michigan undertaking to present to this House a statement that is totally irrelevant to the question of joint statehood?

Mr. HAMILTON. Now, the gentleman has propounded a somewhat lengthy question.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Would Americans in the Territory do as well—

Mr. HAMILTON. I do not yield further now. Arizona as a Territory is permitting these improprieties. New Mexico as a Territory is permitting these improprieties. If, as it is hoped by my friend from Tennessee and his Democratic brethren, Arizona could come into the Union as a separate State, these same influences, which are very powerful in that Territory, would still continue to be very powerful in the proposed little State of Arizona, and the same influences, which are very powerful in the little Territory of New Mexico, would still be very powerful in the little State of New Mexico. But sometimes two poisons neutralize each other. Put these two Territories together and they will not pursue that course.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I desire to ask my friend one question now.

Mr. HAMILTON. I want to pursue this line further.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Corruption, the gentleman says, exists.

Mr. HAMILTON. I have not charged corruption, nor have I made one suggestion of it.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. What does the gentleman charge there?

Mr. HAMILTON. I read the governor's report. I ask gentlemen to draw their inference as thinking gentlemen.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. The only inferences an intelligent man can draw is that it means corruption. Let me ask the gen-

tleman, if corruption exists in Arizona, where the population is 90 per cent American; if corruption exists in New Mexico, where the majority of the population is Mexican, then if you unite those two Territories will not the corruption have a better advantage in the control of one legislature and one governor than of two legislatures and two governors?

Mr. HAMILTON. Let me answer the gentleman. Under present conditions the Territory can not purge itself as well as a State can. [Applause.] The governor of a Territory is an appointive officer. He is not responsible to the electorate. Make the governor of Arizona and the governor of New Mexico responsible to the moral sentiment of the people and a different condition might prevail there. [Applause.] The governor of New Mexico—and I can not speak about Arizona—appoints a little coterie of officeholders—about 350 of them. That little coterie of officeholders go about the Territory of New Mexico. They owe their position to that appointive power. That makes a close corporation for the carrying along of any purpose which they desire to carry on as a Territory. Change that condition, give them a legislature, let the people be represented there, and I take it that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], unless he wants to reflect upon State government, will admit that those people ought to be able to regulate and change their condition, or else State government is a failure.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Just one suggestion there—

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman stated he would allow me to proceed.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I will in one second. The logic of the gentleman's position is this: If the forces of corruption are united they become weaker.

Mr. HAMILTON. They are united now. [Applause.] I said that sometimes one poison neutralizes another.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. But the corrupt poison—

Mr. HAMILTON. I made my position clear. Now, I want to call the attention of my friend, and he does not approve this any more than I do, to the mining interests, referred to on page 23 of the report of the governor of Arizona. The governor of the Territory, in his annual report, has taken occasion to call attention to the gross undervaluation of mines for purposes of taxation. Referring to the manner in which the law is disregarded by the local taxing officers, he says:

It is conceded by estimates made by the most conservative experts that the mines of Arizona have not heretofore been assessed in the aggregate at 5 per cent of their value.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HAMILTON. I can not yield now.

At a recent meeting of the Territorial board of equalization (August 14–21, 1905) an attempt was made in the direction of remedying this palpable evil. So careless or ignorant in the discharge of their duties have been the local taxing officers that gross inequalities are found in the assessment of the mining properties. It would appear that because of this disregard of duty any step taken to rectify the inequality in the valuation of such properties may work hardships in individual cases. These cases, however, are not numerous. It is a usual result, where those charged with the administration of law are ignorant, habitually careless, or corrupt, that an attempt to return to a fair administration of it is temporarily followed by apparent hardships upon some.

Now, I would like to make a comment on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Chair understand the gentleman from Michigan to request that he be informed when he had consumed thirty minutes of his time?

Mr. HAMILTON. I think perhaps I will try to proceed ten or fifteen minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. That is entirely under the control of the gentleman.

Mr. HAMILTON. I want to discuss this just a moment, and then I will give my friend from California a chance.

Now, this state of affairs as to mining assessments is not a matter solely of testimony before the committee. There is not any possible conflict of opinion. It is not one man's opinion against another man's opinion. It is a cold statement in type of the governor of Arizona. The railroads in Arizona are valued for commercial purposes at about \$68,000,000; they are valued for taxation at about \$6,000,000; that is about 9 per cent. In New Mexico the railroads are valued at about \$86,000,000, and valued for taxation at about \$8,000,000, about 9 per cent of their value. The mines in Arizona—and there is where the principal mines are—are taxed at less than 5 per cent of their value.

Now, I could call your attention to specific instances which appeared before our committee, and in doing this I desire not to cast any reflection upon anybody. Take, for instance, the case of a gentleman who appeared before the committee—a Senator of the United States. The Senator, having waived his privilege as United States Senator, proceeded to make comment upon the governor's statement to which I have referred, and upon the statements made by the well-known newspaper correspondent, Mr. William E. Curtis, and of the equally well-known

correspondent, Mr. Walter Wellman, as to the value of certain mines. It appeared that William E. Curtis had said that the owner of the mine told him that he had been offered \$25,000,000 for his mine. The Senator said he had never been offered \$25,000,000 for his mine, and that he did not make any such statement to Mr. Curtis. In that same connection I called his attention to the fact that Mr. Curtis said that there had already been taken out of that mine \$90,000,000 worth of ore and that the annual income of that mine had been upward of \$3,000,000, and that there was about \$150,000,000 worth of ore in sight. The mines of Arizona are rich beyond the dreams of avarice.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. The gentleman need not look that way at me.

Mr. HAMILTON. I was trying to get some inspiration out of my friend. Well, now, that mine with an annual \$3,000,000 output is valued for taxation at less than a million dollars. Now, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Do you not know that the assessors in Arizona and New Mexico are now elected by the people? Then what difference would there be under joint statehood?

Mr. HAMILTON. The governor says that these matters are regulated by a board of equalization.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Only the railroad property; but all other property is assessed by assessors elected by the people.

Mr. HAMILTON. My recollection is not in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from California.

Mr. NEEDHAM. You are mistaken.

Mr. HAMILTON. I simply ask my friend from California to draw that just inference which the governor's report permits to be drawn, and I do not care to discuss this subject any further.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Is not that inference drawn by nearly every governor of every State in the Union to-day?

Mr. HAMILTON. No; not every State. Here is an assessment of less than 5 per cent of the valuation of these mines, which are rich beyond conjecture.

Another great interest is said to be opposed to joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, the lumber interest. On page 23 the governor of Arizona says that this interest is very inadequately taxed. I do not care to make any further comment upon that.

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of California. Are the taxing officers elected or appointed? Which is it, under the Territorial government?

Mr. MCGUIRE. The assessors are elected, and in addition to the assessors there is a board of equalization which can either raise or lower taxes.

Mr. SMITH of California. I wanted to know whether we had to charge this condition of things to the people of the Territory or to the President of the United States, the appointing power.

Mr. HAMILTON. Charge it where you will, but look for your remedy—

Mr. SMITH of California. Now, if they are elected by the people will you change the nature of the people and therefore the nature of their public servants by transferring the form of government from a Territory to a State?

Mr. HAMILTON. I will ask the gentleman to study that board of equalization pretty carefully in connection with the governor's report. That is all I have to say about that.

The cattlemen are said to be opposed to joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, and this casts no reflection upon the cattlemen. One gentleman down there appeared before the committee. He had cattle on a thousand hills and more, and probably did not know how many cattle he has. The interests which he represents are opposed to joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico because of the disappearing public domain. These lands, intended for school purposes, for making one of the finest school systems of any State in the Union, would be set aside for that purpose and would no longer be free grazing ground for the gentlemen who own large herds of cattle.

I have commented upon the Territorial officers. Now, I want to hurry on. Objection is made because the systems of laws in the two Territories are inconsistent. Gentlemen, there is not a shadow of an argument to any fair mind, I take it, in that. They say there is a difference in the system of laws. New Mexico has one code of laws, Arizona has another code of laws; but witnesses before the committee stated that these laws were drawn from various States—California, Texas, and New York—and that they were practically drawn from the same sources, and that the Territory of Arizona is talking about adopting the sanitary laws of New Mexico. Their codes of laws are not inconsistent, but what difference? If they were made one State,

they would get together and adopt a code of laws which would contain the best elements in both the old codes.

Ah, but they say the administration of the law in the courts would be difficult. Let us examine that. You gentlemen come from the different States of the Union. You know that the administration of State laws is by what we in Michigan call circuit courts. Some of you in other States call them district courts. From these courts an appeal lies to the supreme court of the State. Now all over these two Territories, after they are admitted to statehood, would be circuit courts responsive to the people living within those circuits. Is there any difficulty in such administration of laws any more than there would be difficulty in the administration of the laws by a circuit court in the city of Chicago, or in the city of New York, where the population is very largely mixed, and where there is a larger foreign element than there is in the Territory of New Mexico? Besides all that, when it comes to the Federal courts, we have made Arizona into a western district and New Mexico into an eastern district, added to the ninth Federal circuit.

They say that the school system would be injuriously affected. Gentlemen, follow me a moment. What is the school system? The school system of these Territories does not differ in any degree from the school system which prevails all over the United States of America. It is the same old common school system, the splendid old common school system that gave many and many a man who sits before me to-day the only chance he ever had in the world. It is the same old common school system down there. There is no difference between Arizona and New Mexico. Besides that, one Territory has as much school property as the other to put up against the other and make a splendid common school system. Further than that, we propose to give them 4 sections of land to help them. That arid land is not very valuable, but we are going to give them this land so that they will get along pretty well.

Now, they say the area and distance is a great objection to making a State of Arizona and New Mexico, because it will be such a large State. It will be about 26,000 square miles less in extent than Texas. Gentlemen, from Prescott to Santa Fe is about 420 miles in a straight line. From Phoenix to Santa Fe is about 420 miles. From Sacramento to San Diego, Cal., is about 540 miles. When you talk about distance, look at the distance from Austin, Tex., to El Paso, about 580 miles. From Austin, Tex., to the north line of Texas is about 540 miles. I have a large number of comparisons here to show that the argument of distance ceases to be of any force on this question. Of course you see it will be large. Why, gentlemen, if area makes a State, the Desert of Sahara would long ago have been a great state in North Africa. But area does not make a State. The irrigable land down there is about a million and a half acres in both Territories. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] has in his district 3,780,480 acres of land. Talk about size. Why, we have in the Fourth district of Michigan 2,309,120 acres of land.

Now, they say that there are barriers here—insuperable barriers to the joint statehood of Arizona and New Mexico. There is no natural barrier. What is it? None. The great Continental Divide is about 100 miles east of the imaginary dividing line. What is it? My friend Mr. Rodey—and I want to pay a tribute to Mr. Rodey, now that I have got along to him—no better Delegate ever came from any Territory to Congress [applause], and he worked to the best of his ability for joint statehood, and now he is back here hoping to see this thing go through. He told me that that so-called "Continental Divide," which has been raised up in the fertile imagination of some gentlemen here, is nothing but a hump, graded up on one side and down on the other, four railroads crossing it back and forth. He says the valley of the Rio Grande is 5,000 feet above the sea level, and when you talk about divides, there is a divide at Raton, on the Santa Fe route, and one at Glorietta, but there is no difficult divide between New Mexico and Arizona. There are two important divides in Arizona.

Now, they say it is difficult to get about these Territories. Of course it is difficult to get about from one place to another, and it will be difficult until they get more railroads.

They say there are people in New Mexico who are extracted from the Spanish, who speak partly Spanish. How many? Some people say two-fifths of the population, which is 195,000 by the last census, and that would be about 70,000—but say one-half of the people of New Mexico are of Spanish descent. As a matter of fact these people, as a rule, are God-fearing, church-going, upright, honest people, belonging to the Catholic Church, of good morals, and I understand, as a rule, they vote the Republican ticket. [Laughter.]

Mr. KLEPPER. And let me say to the gentleman that one-half of them speak English.

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes; and as my friend from Missouri says, one-half of them speak English.

But they say that the lesser population of Arizona fears merger with the greater population of New Mexico because of this population in New Mexico of Spanish extraction. Why, suppose half of the population of New Mexico were people of Spanish extraction. Suppose you had 100,000 Americans in New Mexico and 100,000 Americans in Arizona and there were 100,000 other people in New Mexico who were extracted from Spanish blood, somewhat remotely—three hundred years ago—that would be two to one on the count, would it not? Ah, but they say, "When you get a constitutional convention they will make their power felt there." Let us see about that. We provide for 66 delegates to a constitutional convention from New Mexico. We provide for 44 delegates to a constitutional convention from Arizona. Divide your 66 delegates from New Mexico and say that there are 33 of those reputable, respectable people who have the misfortune to speak two languages at least—which is more than a good many of us can speak—say that there are 33 of them out of the 66; well, add to your 33 Americans the 44 from Arizona, and you have 77. There you have it—77 to 33. Now, who has cause to be afraid there? What becomes of that bugaboo? Why, gentlemen, these people of Spanish extraction in New Mexico have demonstrated their loyalty and patriotism to this great Union of which they seek to be more intimately a part. From the Territory of New Mexico, a large percentage of whom were these same people, were drawn 6,500 men in the late civil war, and those men fought on the side of the Union; and in the late Spanish war, of those people 1,000 were recruited, and 500 of them were rough riders, who went, some of them, to war against the very nation from which they are extracted. In Arizona they have set up a monument to Bucky O'Neill, who died at San Juan Hill. Ah, if it had not been for the patriotism of people like that we might, indeed, possibly have been reduced to the condition somewhere described by Mr. Dooley, where travelers on the way to China would be getting up and looking over the side of the ship and saying, "There is where America used to be."

Now, because of the patriotism of people like that, we have become forty-five indestructible States in an indestructible union of States, united under one written Constitution, symbolized by one flag, known and respected the whole world over as the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.] And, Mr. Chairman, we hope to add two more stars to that flag, one to be known as the State of Oklahoma and the other to be known as the State of Arizona. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take part in this debate until morning, and I am not as fully prepared as I had hoped to be to present what few facts occur to me might contribute interest to this discussion, and yet when I reflect upon it the whole subject appears somewhat in the nature of satire to me. I do not think any gentleman who will address this committee on this subject entertains the slightest hope that a single vote will be changed by any character of argument that may be made. After the passage of the rule adopted by the House to-day, it becomes perfectly manifest that it is not a question of facts or figures; it is not a question, Mr. Chairman, of right or wrong. It has been boldly stated upon the floor of this House in the discussion of the adoption of the rule that the rights of these people are not to be considered, that the interests of this country are not to be considered, that these things must all be subordinated to party expediency of the hour, and it is that proposition alone which it is conceded actuates the majority of this House in the adoption of the rule by which we are forbidden to offer an amendment to this bill or to discuss it as it should properly be discussed. The hurried reading of the measure before the committee is the only one, permit me to say, that has been had or will be had either in this House or in the committee that had this measure under consideration. When the committee that had this bill in charge met for its consideration, I think it proper that this House should know that we were informed by the chairman and other Republican members of the subcommittee that they had met together previous to the meeting of the whole committee and had agreed upon every line and word of that measure, that every "i" had been dotted, every "t" had been crossed, and that every amendment which might be offered by the minority or anybody else relating to any subject involved in this bill would be promptly voted down. I want the country to know, Mr. Chairman, that in that committee we did what we were not permitted to do in this House. We offered to compromise our views upon this subject by separating these two propositions, and offered to amend the bill so as to submit to this House the question as to whether Oklahoma and Indian Territory should come into the Union as an independent State, striking out that part of the bill

which related to Arizona and New Mexico. Not being satisfied with that, intending to go to the very farthest limits in justice to the people of Arizona, we offered to insert the word "each" in the bill at the proper place, which would leave to the people of Arizona and New Mexico the right to say whether they would accept the character of government that it is proposed shall be forced upon them now. The gentlemen promptly voted it down. We are not permitted to ask the consideration of the House of that subject.

I listened with great pleasure and interest to the chairman of the committee who has this bill in charge. I was in hope that he would assign some reason why Arizona and New Mexico should be combined in this unwilling union. Let us look at this matter as it appears to this House for a few minutes. On the one hand, here is Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, either one of them measuring up, in my humble judgment, to the highest standard of statehood; either one of them entitled to come into this Union on an equal footing with any other State in the Union; either of them with more taxable wealth, with more population, more area than dozens of Territories had when they were admitted to the sisterhood of States, entitled to admission by every rule that has ever been prescribed by Congress in the one hundred and twenty years since a Territory was first admitted into this Union as a State.

Many of us insist, Mr. Chairman, that they should be admitted as separate States now; but conceding that the people down in that country are the best judges of their interests, or at least have more at stake upon the proper solution of the question than others, and realizing that they are suffering from the form of government that obtains, we are willing to make that concession, and there is not a man upon this side of the Chamber, so far as my information goes, but who is ready and willing to step up here and join the other side of the House and make a State in twenty-four hours from Oklahoma and Indian Territory. Show me the man, Mr. Chairman, who has lifted his voice in this House in opposition to that proposition. Will the chairman of the committee having in charge this bill, will anybody deny that Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, under the conditions provided in this bill, are not entitled to be admitted now as a State in this Union? That being true, why is it not promptly done? Why are we standing here to-day in opposition to this measure? On the other hand, here is Arizona, through her Delegate, pleading simply to be let alone, begging the Congress of the United States not to destroy her original boundaries, not to join her forever in an unwilling union with her neighbor, New Mexico.

New Mexico is here to-day telling us through her Delegate that they are not anxious to be joined with Arizona. They claim that they have the right to statehood upon their own merits. This is also claimed, and justly claimed, in my judgment, in behalf of Arizona. The gentleman who preceded me referred in complimentary terms to the former Delegate from Arizona. I concur in everything he said complimentary to that gentleman, but I can not but mention the fact that when a similar measure was pending for consideration before the Committee on Territories two years ago the gentleman was then an earnest and ardent advocate of single statehood for New Mexico, and convinced me then that New Mexico should be made a State of this Union and made a State upon her own individual merits; and when the gentleman pictured to us the great Continental Divide that made an impassable barrier between those two Territories and told us that it would be impossible ever to adjust their different conditions and to communicate to that extent and with that ease that was necessary to carry on a proper State government and gave many and various other reasons why they could never be joined and why the Territory of New Mexico should be made a separate State, I listened to him with interest, and I became thoroughly convinced of the correctness of his views. He added to that argument another before the committee of the Senate, and I think I quote him correctly when he said before that committee that if the proposition were left to the people of New Mexico as to whether they should be joined with Arizona at this time it would be promptly voted down, and he said they would never surrender their views unless coerced by the unjust action of Congress. I stand upon what he said, Mr. Chairman, and insist it is the unjust action of Congress that is coercing the people of New Mexico into surrendering their views upon this subject. [Applause.] It is a species of powerful coercion, Mr. Chairman, and let me go a step further and say not only I feel absolutely sure, having learned from association with people in that section and what I have learned before the committees that have investigated this matter, that if the proposition were put to the people to-day in Oklahoma and Indian Territory as to whether they should have statehood as one State or as two, if we would just simply say,

"Now, you can have either one you want, it is not a question of what party is in power or what party is not, we leave it to you," three-fourths of the people of those Territories will say that they should have a single State of each Territory. They have been coerced into this position—coerced by the unjust action of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman at some length went on to show that the railroads and mining interests, the lumbering interests, and the various other great interests in Arizona and New Mexico were not properly taxed. That may or it may not be true. I am inclined to believe that it is true, that it is there as it is elsewhere, that these institutions and industries, great and powerful as they are there, often escape their just portion of the burdens of civil government, and I thought when the gentleman took up that phase of the subject that he would certainly assign to this House some reason why it was necessary to force a union of New Mexico and Arizona in order to remedy that condition. I heard from him that they were not properly taxed. I heard from him for the first time also, Mr. Chairman, that the railroads of this country were opposed to joint statehood. I should like for the gentleman to tell me upon what authority he bases that statement. I heard him say that the mining interest is opposed to joint statehood; that the lumbering interest is opposed to joint statehood, and the only reason he assigned was that they escaped their share of taxation. I have no doubt they are opposed to statehood—opposed to statehood in any form—and they know there is no better way to defeat statehood legislation than by means and under the guise of this omnibus bill. In this form, in order to secure even a partial recognition of the rights of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, we must trample the rights of New Mexico and Arizona ruthlessly under our feet and turn deaf ears to the piteous appeal that comes to us from every village and hamlet and hill and plain in Arizona.

I attended the committee when they had the hearings upon this subject closely, I think, and it escaped my memory if any man said that the railroads were opposed to joint statehood or that the mining interests were opposed to joint statehood, or any of these other interests to which the gentleman has referred. The gentleman may correct me if it is not true. This is the first time that I have ever heard that proposition stated in that way. I have always understood they were opposed to any statehood legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Has the gentleman not heard that the railroads are opposed to joint statehood?

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, there is just the point. They are opposed, perhaps, to statehood. I do not blame them, if they are not taxed any more than it is said they are taxed; but who said they were opposed to joint statehood?

Mr. HAMILTON. May I suggest to the gentleman that the railroad is not an eleemosynary corporation, and that when it sends a train of cars down into the Territory, furnishing transportation, it will be an inference from which one might suppose that they were opposed to statehood?

Mr. REID. When they did what?

Mr. HAMILTON. They are not eleemosynary corporations.

Mr. REID. I have never heard of them being accused of being eleemosynary corporations. I do not understand the force or relevancy of the gentleman's remark, Mr. Chairman. My statement is that no such proof as that was made before the committee. I do not know whether they are opposed to joint statehood or single statehood. I assume, if what he says is true, they would oppose statehood under any circumstances. But it occurs to me that if they were compelled to make any concession whatever that these powerful institutions to which he refers, these railroads and the mining interests that take legislative bodies by the throat and direct them as they will, they would much prefer to have one legislature down somewhere in the mountains, from five to seven hundred miles to the farthest end of its jurisdiction, to deal with than two legislatures composed of such people as constitute the population of Arizona and New Mexico. [Applause.]

Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut. It is only in the Territory of Arizona that they have mining. It would hardly apply, as all mines are in that Territory. They do not have to deal now with two legislatures.

Mr. REID. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. There are mining interests in both Territories, and they would have two legislatures. The railroads are not all in the Territory of Arizona, and it is railroads that constitute a large per cent of the taxable wealth that, I understand, is escaping its just part of taxation.

Mr. KLEPPER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he remembers any evidence to the effect that the cattle barons of Arizona are opposed to joint statehood?

Mr. REID. I do not know. There was no such evidence before the committee when I was present.

Mr. HAMILTON. A gentleman by the name of Sturgis appeared, representing the cattlemen of Arizona.

Mr. REID. Perhaps I was not present when that occurred. I remember that the chairman made a remark once there that the cattle barons were opposed to statehood, but they have been keeping very quiet about it if they are opposed to joint statehood, Mr. Chairman, and that is all the more reason that they ought to have statehood. If these railroad corporations and mining interests and these great cattle barons are all doing what they can to prevent statehood, it is all the more reason why we ought to have statehood. We are here to agree with you that Arizona and New Mexico ought to be incorporated into the Union. The only question upon which we divide is as to whether they ought to come in here as separate States or to come in as one State. Now, I undertake to say if there has ever been any test prescribed in all the history of this country by which a Territory is entitled to admission into the Union that either of these Territories measures up fully to that standard.

What does it take to constitute a State? Is there any rule, any test, any standard by which we are to be governed, or any precedent which we are under legal or moral obligation to observe? Are we to give these people and the nation to understand that the destiny of these Territories depends not upon any question of right and wrong, not upon population, wealth, resources, and extent of area, but, spurning the jewel of consistency, as boldly stated by the gentleman from Ohio, the whole matter is to be determined by the political whim of the leaders of this House?

Let us test their sincerity. Take Oklahoma and Indian Territory. The people there are pleading for the "home rule" you proudly promised them in your party platform. They point you to their wonderful industrial development and inexhaustible resources, to their teeming hordes of population and immigrants streaming across their borders. They challenge a comparison with their sister States wearing the purple robe of sovereignty and demand to know why this great reward of the industry and courage and thrift of the American people is so long and so unjustly withheld from them. You promised them statehood. You can not deny that they are entitled to it. Let these people make no mistake as to who are their friends. You put us to the alternative of perpetrating an awful and an eternal outrage upon Arizona and New Mexico or still further deny to Oklahoma and Indian Territory the rights that are justly theirs. This is the miserable game you have always played; this is the insidious means by which you have succeeded in so far defeating all legislation whatever upon this subject. On behalf of these unfortunate people we have conceded everything but their political existence; offered to compromise everything but honor. There are many vicious things of a minor importance hidden between the lines of this bill, but we have no power to strike out. There are many things that should be added and inserted, conducive to the peaceful and proper organization of the States, but we have no power to amend.

No argument has ever been made why these Territories should be consolidated that does not apply with much greater force, if force there be in it, to the case of numbers of the Eastern States. Surely if Oklahoma and Indian Territory or Arizona and New Mexico should be made one State, then Delaware and New Jersey, New Hampshire and Vermont, Rhode Island and Connecticut should be made one. Has the country ever suffered on account of the fact that States were made of these small areas? And what are your reasons for consolidating the Territories? I confess that I have never heard a sound one advanced. In the case of Oklahoma and Indian Territory it is insisted that different resources exist in the two; that one has many things that go to make up material excellence that the other does not possess; that one is the complement of the other, and they should therefore be made one. But gentlemen forget that in the next breath they argue that Arizona and New Mexico are alike; that their material wealth is the same; that their people are engaged in similar pursuits, and should therefore be governed under the same code of laws.

In the early history of this country Territories organized themselves into States, came to the doors of Congress, presented their constitution, and demanded and received recognition as a sovereign State without any enabling act of Congress, and none is necessary to-day. Refuse to recognize them, if you will, but these communities to-day are, and of right ought to be, sovereign and independent States.

Thirteen States have been admitted to the Union with less taxable wealth than either Arizona or New Mexico. Oklahoma alone has more wealth than was possessed by any State when

it was admitted to the Union. The proposed State of Oklahoma has 200,000 more people than any State had when it was admitted, and she has more school children than many States to-day have population. Under the ordinance of 1787, which I insist is to-day an implied contract, in good faith, binding upon the Union, and these people in all these Territories have the right to make its terms in their behalf, 60,000 free inhabitants was all that was necessary. Nothing was said about area, whether small or large, or wealth and resources, whether great or small. But you say the ratio of representation has increased. I deny that this has ever been made the test. Twenty-five States were admitted, beginning with Vermont in 1791 and coming on down to Colorado in 1876, and Maine and Kansas were the only ones that had 100,000 people. From 1836 to 1837 the ratio of representation was 47,700. Arkansas was admitted with 25,000 people, and let me call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that his own State came in, and came in as a matter of right, with only 31,000 people.

From 1845 to 1848, when the ratio was 70,600, Florida was admitted with only 28,700, Iowa with 43,000, and Wisconsin with 30,000. In 1858, with a census ratio of 93,500, Minnesota came in with 7,000 and Oregon with 13,200. With a ratio of 127,000 Nebraska came in with 28,800 and Colorado with 39,000.

The secret of the whole matter is the growing influence of the West in the Senate of the United States. If these Territories were east of the mountains they would have been admitted years ago. Gentlemen cry out in alarm at the prospect of granting to these Territories the same representation upon the floor of the Senate that is enjoyed by the older States. "What," they ask, "is Arizona or Oklahoma to have the same power and influence in the Senate that is exercised by the great States of New York and Pennsylvania?" Why do they never compare these Territories with Connecticut and Rhode Island? Why do we hear nothing of the wonderful resources of Vermont, the multiplying populations of Maine and Massachusetts, or the boundless domain of Delaware? Ah, no, indeed! From the foundation of this Government New England has dictated the financial and fiscal policy of this nation, but the day of western ascendancy has begun to dawn. The ability to sustain great populations in New England is rapidly diminishing, while that of the South and West is becoming greater and greater as year is added unto year.

There is more than twice as much territory west of the Mississippi as there is east of that river. The population east has increased in the last decade at about 17 per cent, while that west has increased at from 60 to 70 per cent. Fifty years from now, if the same ratio prevails, there will be three times as many people west as there are east of the Mississippi. The same per cent, and greater, holds true in regard to material development.

The two Territories of Arizona and New Mexico have more acreage in lumber than the area of the New England States. Arizona alone has more cattle and sheep than New England. This extraordinary development is true in every department of industrial life.

But, be it understood, that while I view the grand progress and development of my own section with all of the pride of a patriot, I take no pleasure in the declining glories of New England. I love every foot of her historic soil and all that is grand and glorious in her mighty past. I am proud to trace my own ancestry back to her sturdy loins. It is not that she is less, but that in the West there has grown up a greater. God has prospered the fortunes of her sons and daughters sent forth to take the land and subdue it. The son has grown greater than the sire. Mr. Chairman, the West has won her way to the position of power and influence in the nation that she demands shall be hers. It is unjust to withhold it from her. East of the Mississippi there are 26 States, with 52 representatives in the United States Senate. If all the remaining Territories were made into States there would be 23 States with 46 Senators west of the Mississippi, representing in the comparatively near future three times as many people.

But arguments do not avail. It is vain to repeat them here. Everything must give way to the politics of the hour. Your determination is taken. Go on and pass your bill, but let it be recorded that I am one among those who will not sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. When that day shall come, as come it will if this measure is enacted into law, when the populations of the South and West, far outnumbering the East, shall cry in vain for just recognition in the legislation of the nation; when their industrial development is hampered and made to pay tribute to less populous sections; when they demand their share of appropriations for public buildings and for rivers and harbors, let them turn back and read the history of this hour and determine who among us had the real interest of the whole

country at heart. Let them say who it was that laid sacrilegious hand upon the covenant of our fathers and destroyed that equilibrium of power among the States represented in the Senate which they considered so necessary for the peace and perpetuity of this Union. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee proceed?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I know that the usual hour for adjournment has arrived, but inasmuch as this debate is so very limited under the rule, and advantage was taken of reading the bill, which occupied a great deal of time, I think we had better go along a little later. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, not in recent years has this country witnessed a more disgusting spectacle of "bossism" than has been displayed in this controversy over the admission of these Territories into the Union of States, and in no instance has this House shown more signally into what depths of degradation it has sunk. I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that if every Member here followed his own judgment and observed the behests of his own conscience there would not be fifty votes in favor of this measure. But they have not been permitted to do this.

The Speakership of the House of Representatives has always been a position of honor and of power. Under the system of rules prevailing now he is vested with autocratic power. Blind when he does not want to see, deaf when he does not want to hear, he is the great joss of this House before whom every member of the majority must daily prostrate himself or risk political excommunication. The Committee on Territories held this bill for thirty days awaiting the order of its master to report it. For thirty days the Speaker of this House concentrated his energies upon the insurgents of his own party. He wheedled and coaxed them; he flattered and frightened them; he cooed like a dove and roared like a lion, as occasion required. He pointed out green political pastures for those who would sacrifice conviction to be servile, and pictured the dark waters of political oblivion sweeping over those whose independence was above price.

The Speaker was not alone in this crusade. Under the Constitution the President is vested with the duty to "give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." This the President did at the beginning of this Congress. There the duty of the President ended. But this did not mark the limit of Presidential activity. According to press reports, he has directed the campaign in this House; he has had the little coterie that through him control this House in frequent consultation, and anointed them anew with the oil of Presidential approval. From the same high authority it is known that he has summoned the "insurrectos" into his awful presence, singly and by squads. He has appealed to every sentiment of selfishness, every instinct of pride, every phase of partisanship, and every element of fear. The demand seems to have been, "Surrender your principles or surrender your 'pie.'" To appreciate the seriousness of this choice to Republicans it is necessary to know their childlike fondness for "pie."

By these methods a sufficient number of insurgents were chloroformed into silence or cudged into obedience to make sure of the adoption of this iniquitous rule under which the voice of this House is stifled and its true will thwarted. When this was assured the bosses passed the word down to the Committee on Territories, and, in servile obedience that would be amusing were it not so shameful, this bill was reported.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill reveals so completely the shameless hypocrisy of the Republican party that this country would be startled if it were not for the fact that the country has grown accustomed to this phase of its character. For twenty years it has been demanding through its national platforms just precisely what it is now seeking to defeat, viz, separate statehood for New Mexico and Arizona. In the convention of 1888 Mr. McKinley was chairman of its committee on resolutions and reported to the convention and secured the adoption of a platform containing this language:

The Republican party pledges itself to do all in its power to facilitate the admission of the Territories of New Mexico, Wyoming, Idaho, and Arizona to the enjoyment of self-government as States, such of them as are now qualified as soon as possible, and the others as soon as they may become so.

If it be said that as to New Mexico and Arizona this was only a pledge for statehood for the future upon their becoming qualified therefor, I call attention to the fact that prior to that time Republicans had passed bills through one or the other branches of Congress granting statehood to both New Mexico and Arizona. Between 1888 and 1892 Wyoming and Idaho had been admitted

to statehood. At the Republican convention of 1892 the platform contained the following declaration:

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

In 1896 Mr. McKinley was nominated and was declared elected. The platform upon which he ran repeated the language of the platform of 1892 upon this subject.

In all these platforms the declarations quoted were understood by Republicans and Democrats alike to mean that these conventions were declaring in favor of the admission of the Territories to separate statehood.

In 1896 Mr. FORAKER, now Senator from the State of Ohio, was chairman of the committee on resolutions and chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the platform. Speaking in the Senate on January 15, 1903, on the statehood bill, he said:

It was my fortune to be not only a member of the committee on resolutions in the national Republican convention of 1896, but I was also chairman of that committee, and I was a member of the subcommittee and chairman of the subcommittee that drafted that platform. I knew then exactly what we were putting in that platform. We put it in after giving a hearing to everybody who wanted to be heard; we put it in there thinking it would strengthen the cause of Republicanism throughout the West. It was not an idle thing; it was not an ill-considered thing on the part of those who did it; it was carefully considered, and it was done after it was thoroughly discussed. * * *

I can understand how a man might think, even in 1896 or in 1900, that these Territories ought to be admitted to statehood and might now think differently, but before any man has a right to change his mind he must profess to have new light of some kind or other. I have no new light. I was in earnest then. I knew what I was doing, and every other member of that committee knew what he was doing. There was a careful hearing. That declaration was not put in there to help the opposition—it was put in there to help the Republican party; and we put it in there because we thought it was right. I feel to-day just as I did then, and I intend to vote now, when it is not a mere platform proposition, as I voted then, because I am in earnest now, as I was then.

But the platform of 1900 settled beyond all controversy the position of the Republican party upon this question. The convention at which this platform was adopted nominated Mr. McKinley for a second term and nominated Mr. Roosevelt for the Vice-Presidency. This platform made this declaration:

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

Speaking of this declaration, Senator FORAKER, in the speech referred to before, says:

I supposed it was a settled proposition when we came out of the national Republican convention of 1900 that the Republican party of this country proposed to do what we had promised to do—to bring these Territories into statehood. I suppose we had so settled it. I have been in favor of the unqualified admission of these Territories from that time until now. I helped draft that declaration and I helped to secure its adoption. Without new light I could not repudiate it now, and, Mr. President, I have had no light except only that which has strengthened me in the belief that I was right then and that I am in the right now.

Not only must the Republican party abandon every platform declaration it has made to pass this bill, but it must repudiate its legislative record of the last forty years. Bills admitting New Mexico to statehood have been considered in twenty-two Congresses and have passed either the Senate or House seventeen times and both Senate and House at least twice, dying in conference. Bills admitting Arizona to statehood have passed the Senate or House several times. In every instance Republicans and Democrats alike have voted for their admission. The able Speaker of this House, in his distinguished service here of more than thirty years, has witnessed the passage through this body of most of these bills, and the absence of protest would suggest that he consented; but now, with the mercilessness of a czar, he would crush any Republican who dares to think as he thought or to vote as he voted. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who reported on yesterday the rule and who always becomes the spokesman of his party when conscience is to be silenced and right crucified, has been a Member of this House in Congress after Congress when these bills passed, and never, so far as I have heard, did he raise his voice in protest against them. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS], into whose face I now look, has been for years a member of the subcommittee on Territories. Only four years ago he was on the subcommittee and assisted in preparing the bill admitting Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona all three to separate statehood. He is now prepared to denounce as treason that which he himself assisted in reporting and passing only a few years ago. Indeed, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Territories [Mr. HAMILTON] was a member of that committee in the Fifty-seventh Congress when the bill making States of these Territories was passed, and neither in committee nor in the House did he oppose it. I observe that the gentleman smiles. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] frequently boasts that he is not consistent. I presume the gentleman from Michigan is one of his disciples.

Mr. HAMILTON. I do not suppose the gentleman wants me

to interrupt him, but in fairness to myself I would like to say—

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I do not object to interruptions.

Mr. HAMILTON. I only want to say this to my friend from Texas. I never voted for the bill in committee. I never voted for it on the floor of the House; never voted to report it out of committee, and never had anything to do with the bill.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I think it would have been infinitely better for Arizona and New Mexico if the gentleman from Michigan had continued in his policy of doing nothing. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, you will observe that Senator FORAKER, in the paragraphs I have quoted, refers to the "new light" which gentlemen have seen, causing them to reverse themselves upon this great question. From whence did this "light" come? Not from any change for the worse in the condition of these Territories, because both Arizona and New Mexico are infinitely better prepared for statehood than they were when Republicans voted to admit them. It must be a partisan "light," because it was never a partisan question until this new "light" broke in upon the President and the Speaker. It must be a sectional "light," because it was never a sectional question until now. The Standard Oil trust and other great combinations, which have found in the East a congenial soil and which find in the West and South the only remaining obstacles to their complete mastery of the American people, may, perhaps, supply this new "light."

The Democratic record upon this matter has been consistent throughout. In its platforms it has declared in favor of separate statehood for these Territories, and in both Senate and House throughout all the long period of time this question has been pending the Democrats have done their utmost to secure the admission of these Territories.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic belief now is not only that New Mexico and Arizona should be admitted as separate States, but that Oklahoma and Indian Territory are likewise entitled to separate statehood, and we would so vote if we could do so without sacrificing their chance for statehood in some form. We believe each is large enough for a State. In area Oklahoma contains 39,030 square miles, and Indian Territory 31,000. Oklahoma alone is as large as Ohio, and the Indian Territory is much larger than West Virginia and about the size of Indiana. Each has a population more than twice that of any other State when admitted into the Union. Each now has a population greater than that of sixteen other States. No other State when admitted has ever approached either of these in resources and wealth. Their climate is delightful; their soil is most productive; their rainfall abundant. They have coal and iron and oil. They have magnificent cities springing up on every hand. They have churches and schoolhouses and colleges and universities that would do credit to any State in the Union. They have an intelligent, refined, and patriotic people, worthy of the right to work out their separate destiny in their own time and way and worthy to wear the diadem of statehood.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that in honesty and good morals the Indian Territory should be admitted to separate statehood. It is a pitiable sight to see an individual forget his honor or break his faith with his fellow-man, but it is infinitely worse to see a great government do so. The act of the individual may affect only himself, but an act of dishonor of our Government puts the stain upon every citizen. To me there is something unspeakably pathetic in the history of the Indian tribes now living in the Indian Territory. Many years ago their homes and hunting grounds were in the great forests east of the Mississippi River. They were there before the white man came there. There came a time when the white man wanted these lands. The white man and the Indian could not occupy them together in peace. The white man said the Indians must abandon them. The white man's Government—our Government—entered into the controversy. It looked westward, far beyond the border land of civilization as it then existed, and beheld a land of prairie and of forest, of rugged hills and peaceful valleys, of genial climate and fertile soil, where game was plentiful, and our Government said to these Indians: "If you will abandon your lands, which the white men covet; if you will forsake the forests that have been your home; if you will leave the ashes of your dead behind you, we will give you this new land, a land which shall be yours and your children's 'so long as fire burns and water runs.'" The Indians believed the "Great White Father at Washington" and entered into treaties with the United States, relinquishing their lands east of the Mississippi and receiving in exchange the lands embraced in what is now almost the whole of Oklahoma and Indian Territory. Not only this, but this Government made a most solemn pledge to them

that this Territory should never be embraced in or annexed to any other Territory or State. I quote from some of the treaties made at this time with some of these Indian tribes. The treaty with the Cherokees contained this provision:

The United States hereby covenants and agrees that the lands ceded to the Cherokee Nation in the foregoing article shall, in no future time, without their consent, be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any State or Territory.

The treaty with the Creeks and Seminoles provided this:

The United States do hereby solemnly agree and bind themselves that no State or Territory shall ever pass laws for the government of the Creek or Seminole tribes of Indians, and that no portion of either of the tracts of country defined in the first and second articles of this agreement shall ever be embraced or included within or annexed to any Territory or State, nor shall either or any part of either ever be erected into a Territory without the free and full consent of the legislative authority of the tribe owning the same.

Article 4 of the Chickasaw and Choctaw treaty was as follows:

The Government and people of the United States are hereby obliged to secure to the said Choctaw Nation of red people the jurisdiction and government of all the persons and property that may be within their limits west, so that no Territory or State shall ever have a right to pass laws for the government of the Choctaw Nation of red people and their descendants, and that no part of the land granted them shall ever be embraced in any Territory or State.

In 1871 the Government ceased to recognize these Indian tribes as independent nations, but it was with the express stipulation that all treaties made with them prior to that time should be sacredly observed. The following language occurs in the act of 1871:

No Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe, or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty; but no obligation of any treaty lawfully made and ratified with any such nation or tribe prior to March 3, 1871, shall hereby be invalidated or impaired.

The years rolled on. The time came when the greedy, grasping, all-conquering spirit of the white man demanded that the Indian give up some portions of that which the Government said should be his forever. In Congress the organization of the Territory of Oklahoma was attempted. It took years to overcome the scruples of Congress against breaking a solemn treaty with the Indian tribes. Old Dave Culberson, of precious memory in Texas and in this House, protested against it as an act of bad faith. In another Congress Hon. Thomas B. Reed joined in a minority report in which this language was used:

The conclusions arrived at by your committee are: First, that the bill under consideration conflicts with existing treaty stipulations; second, that while the right to decide in a last resort that a treaty is no longer binding is undoubtedly lodged in Congress, the exercise of that right is a judicial act affecting the honor and dignity of the nation, requiring for its justification reasons which commend themselves to the principles of equity and good conscience, particularly where the parties to the compact with the United States are weak and powerless and depend solely on the good faith of the Government; third, that no such reasons exist for violating the treaty stipulations which reserve the Indian Territory exclusively for the Indians, and which secures to the Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminoles the right of self-government under the restrictions of the United States Constitution.

It seems that you may as easily stay the tides of the ocean as to stay the Anglo-Saxon lust for land when it is once aroused. Oklahoma became a Territory, and from time to time other portions of the Indian Territory were added until now less than one-half of its original area remains. The influences operating to take from the Indian the control and ownership of this Territory given to him and to his forever by solemn treaty have been moving resistlessly on. His lands have been divided and parceled out under conditions that make certain the white man's ultimate ownership of it, and on March 4 of this year the tribal governments, the last link of the chain that bound them together as peoples and nations and that connects them with a past that is not without its glories, will be dissolved. Back in their cabins in the mountains, whither they have been driven by the encroachments of the white man, the few thousand full bloods of these tribes of Indians remaining will sit and weep in silent anguish over the death in a single day of their Five Nations.

And now, without their consent and even against their earnest protest, and forgetful of our solemn promise not to do so, it is proposed to merge them with another people and with another Territory and admit them to statehood as a part of Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, we know how useless it is to protest against this wrong. We know how intolerable the present condition in the Indian Territory is, and we know how earnestly the white people desire statehood and how they have despaired of ever securing this blessing except in connection with Oklahoma. We know that in their desperation they are anxious for statehood upon any conditions. Because the one and one-half millions of people in Oklahoma and Indian Territory need statehood so badly and can not secure it upon any other terms, every Demo-

crat in this House is willing to vote for the admission of these Territories as the State of Oklahoma.

But, Mr. Chairman, while we have been driven by necessity to agree to the union of Oklahoma and Indian Territory in opposition to our view of what is right and what is just to them, we are unalterably opposed to the union of New Mexico and Arizona. We are reluctantly agreeing to the union of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, because it has been made clear to us that the great majority of the people of these Territories favor this union as the only feasible plan of securing statehood and because it would be a greater crime to longer deny them the right of self-government. For the same reason, because, as we believe, the people of Arizona are unalterably opposed to union with New Mexico and the people of New Mexico are opposed to the union with Arizona, we protest against the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there were thirteen States originally. There are forty-five States now. Congress has been called upon thirty-two times to perform one of the highest functions it possesses, that of lifting out of the slough of dependence the people of a defined territory and planting them upon the high, firm ground of equality granted to the States—to perform the great function of changing those who merely belong to the United States into those who are citizens of the United States. The responsibility that accompanies the exercise of this power is also great. States are made not for to-day, to-morrow, or next year, but for all time. We may legislate amiss upon questions of finance or matters of trade and the evil effects are but transient. We may for the moment be misled by passion and strife, but reason will return. The glamour of world power and the imagined glories of conquest may tempt us from our ancient landmarks, but there is chance to face about and retrieve the wrong; but when grouping in the dark night of partisanship this Congress inflicts a wrong upon the people of New Mexico and Arizona by joining them against their will, you commit a crime that all the ages can not repair.

In the admission of the thirty-two States already admitted all the territory capable of forming States has been exhausted except that embraced in the territory included in this bill. Now, when you are dealing with the last of the Territories, why should we depart from the rules that have prevailed for more than a century?

Mr. Chairman, in times past whenever any Territory has applied for admission as a State three general propositions have been considered in determining her right of admission. One was area. Was the proposed State large enough? Another was wealth. Did the proposed State have sufficient property subject to taxation to enable her to maintain a proper State government without it being too great a burden upon her citizenship? The third consideration was population. Did the proposed State have a sufficient population? I submit that measured by these same tests that have been applied to every other State that has been admitted both New Mexico and Arizona are now and have long been entitled to admission as States.

It is surely not necessary to argue that in area each of them is entitled to associate upon terms of equality with Rhode Island and the other New England States or with the States of any other section. Arizona has in round numbers 114,000 square miles, while New Mexico has 121,000. Arizona, the smaller of the two, is larger than New York and Pennsylvania, with New Jersey, New Hampshire, and Delaware thrown in. It is more than twice the size of Illinois, nine and one-half times as large as Maryland, twelve times as large as Vermont, thirteen times as large as Massachusetts, fourteen times as large as New Jersey, twenty times as large as Connecticut, fifty-five times as large as Delaware, ninety-one times as large as Rhode Island. It is as large as Indiana, Ohio, and Virginia combined.

Mr. POWERS. How many could you make of Alaska?

Mr. BEALL of Texas. You could make a great number, of course. But you can make out of Arizona three States the size of your State of Maine.

Mr. JOHNSON. Four.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. No; three, but with enough territory over to make two or three other New England States.

So it can hardly be claimed that either of these Territories is wanting in sufficient area. Have they sufficient wealth to properly support and maintain a State government? The wealth of Arizona has been estimated to be about \$400,000,000. She has almost 2,000 miles of railroad within her borders. This railroad mileage is worth four times the value of all the property in Ohio, Indiana, or Michigan when these States were admitted. Its mines yielded in one year—last year—\$30,000,000, which is double the value of all the property of some of the States when admitted. It is the third copper-producing district in the Union and will soon be first. There are twenty-nine banks in Arizona, with resources of more than \$11,500,000. She

has the largest unbroken forest in the world, with an area in excess of 6,000 square miles and with timber reserves of more than 7,000,000 acres. It has hundreds of thousands of acres of land that a few years ago were a part of the desert that have felt the vivifying touch of irrigation and are now producing in marvelous abundance. She has an educational system of which she may well be proud. In her American population there is comparatively no illiteracy. She has a compulsory system of education, with 22,000 children filling her school rooms. She pays the highest salary to her teachers, and has in her schools a larger per cent of college-bred teachers than any State in the Union. She has her system of high schools, two normal schools, and a Territorial university.

She has her asylum for the unfortunate and her penitentiary for her vicious. She has a splendid capitol and other public buildings. Her bonds are selling above par in the market places. She collected in taxes last year \$675,504.85, and expended \$593,071.48. All this development has occurred and all these things have been accomplished while she has been fettered and oppressed by her dependent position as a Territory. If given the prestige of statehood and the advantage that will result, who can forecast what her development will be during the next decade?

Is New Mexico rich enough for separate statehood? The assessed value of her property is \$40,000,000, while its real value is nearly \$400,000,000. She has nearly 3,000 miles of railway, more than many of the present States. Her farms are worth \$75,000,000. She has 32 banks, with resources of nearly \$10,000,000. She has produced many millions of gold and silver. She has a million and a half acres of coal land and an amount of coal in sight worth \$10,000,000. She has one and a half million of cattle and nearly 6,000,000 head of sheep. In four years 737 corporations, with a capitalization of \$413,884,866, were organized to develop the great resources of this Territory. In four years insurance companies wrote, in New Mexico, policies aggregating \$66,511,000. She maintains 15 Territorial institutions, whose buildings and grounds are valued at \$2,200,000. She has school property of the value of \$2,071,000. In three years she has expended for her public schools \$1,168,224. She has a school population of 75,000, with 54,000 in attendance. She has 225 churches. She has institutions for the insane, the blind, and the deaf and dumb. She maintains now a normal school and a normal university. She has a military institute, an agricultural and mechanical college, a school of mines, and a Territorial university, all under Territorial control, and all well equipped and well patronized.

With all this array of facts before us, all attesting the intellectual and moral development of these Territories, and all evidencing the marvelous material prosperity they are enjoying, who can say that these people are not now thoroughly equipped for statehood?

Has each of these Territories a sufficient population to justify statehood? Let us examine this proposition in the light of rules that have been applied in the past. Congress has heretofore adopted two rules to govern the admission of Territories into statehood, so far as population is concerned. The ordinance of 1787 fixed the conditions upon which States might be carved out of the Northwest Territory, which Virginia and others had so generously surrendered. After this ordinance had provided for the future division of this Territory into not less than three and not more than five States, and had fixed the boundary of three of them, namely, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, it contained this provision:

And whenever any of the said States shall have 60,000 free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted, by its delegates, into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, and shall be at liberty to form a permanent constitution and State government: *Provided*, The constitution and government so to be formed shall be republican and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles; and so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the Confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000.

This ordinance was afterwards extended so as to apply to the territory south of the Ohio River and later to Oregon. Under its authority Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Oregon were admitted. Under this ordinance it was conceded that when a Territory attained a population of 60,000 free people it had a right to demand immediate admission. Tennessee was the first to apply for admission under authority of this ordinance. She proceeded, without any enabling act from Congress authorizing it, to hold a convention in which she framed a constitution, and then she chose a legislature and elected her Senators and Members of Congress. She notified Congress of her action and advised that upon a certain day her Territorial government established by Congress would cease and she would take her

place as a State. She took her own census and notified Congress that she had 54,000 whites and 6,000 free negroes. George Washington transmitted this constitution to Congress with the following message:

Gentlemen of the Senate and House of Representatives: By an act of Congress passed on the 26th of May, 1790, it was declared that the inhabitants of the territory of the United States south of the river Ohio should enjoy all the privileges, benefits, and advantages set forth in the ordinance of Congress for the government of the territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio; and that the government of said territory south of the Ohio should be similar to that which was then exercised in the territory northwest of the Ohio, except so far as was otherwise provided in the conditions expressed in an act of Congress passed the 2d of April, 1790, entitled "An act to accept a cession of the claims of the State of North Carolina to a certain district of western territory."

Among the privileges, benefits, and advantages thus secured to the inhabitants of the territory south of the river Ohio appear to be the right of forming a permanent constitution and State government, and of admission as a State by its delegates into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever when it should have therein 60,000 free inhabitants: *Provided*, The constitution and government so to be formed should be republican and in conformity to the principles contained in the article of the said ordinance.

As proofs of the several requisites to entitle the territory south of the river Ohio to be admitted as a State into the Union, Governor Blount has transmitted the return of the enumeration of its inhabitants and a printed copy of the constitution and form of government on which they have agreed, which, with letters accompanying the same, are herewith laid before Congress. (United States, April 8, 1796. G. Washington.)

Tennessee did not come as a supplicant begging for admission. She came demanding it as a right, because she had the requisite 60,000 of population.

But under this ordinance a population of 60,000 was not essential to admission into statehood. It provided: "And, so far as it can be consistent with the general interest of the Confederacy, such admission shall be allowed at an earlier period and when there may be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than 60,000."

Under the authority of this last proviso Ohio was admitted in 1802 with a population of 45,000, and Illinois in 1818 with a population of 55,000.

It will thus be seen that the ordinance of 1787 provided not that there must be 60,000 people for a State, but that there must be a State for 60,000 people, leaving Congress free to create a State for a Territory having less than that number of people if it was deemed advisable to do so.

Now, what was the other rule that Congress has prescribed upon this subject? By the treaty of 1803 the territory of Louisiana was purchased by Mr. Jefferson, and out of this a number of States have been carved. In this treaty the following language occurs:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess.

In 1819 a treaty was made with Spain under which Florida was ceded to the United States. This treaty contained the following:

The inhabitants of the territories which His Catholic Majesty cedes to the United States by this treaty shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States as soon as may be consistent with the principles of the Federal Constitution and admitted to the enjoyment of all the privileges, rights, and immunities of the citizens of the United States.

In 1848 the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, under which a great area, including New Mexico and Arizona, was ceded to the United States, was made, and this treaty contains the following:

The Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution.

I have quoted the provisions of these several treaties to show that in each of them it was contemplated that the territory secured should at the earliest practicable moment be carved into States. The language in each was a covenant and promise that this would be done. In one it was stipulated that the people should be "admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States," and substantially the same language was used in the other treaties.

Arkansas was the first of this territory to seek admittance as a State, and it was necessary for Congress to interpret the meaning of the phrase, "according to the principles of the Federal Constitution." After protracted discussion it was agreed that it meant that when a people in an area called a

"Territory" reached the point in population where this population was equal to the number of people required for a Congressional district in a State, then that they should be admitted as a State.

Under the ordinance of 1787, while a Territory had a right to demand admission as a State when its population reached 60,000, yet such Territory could be properly admitted by Congress when it had a much smaller population, and likewise Congress interpreted the provisions in these treaties to mean that while a Territory could demand admission into the Union as a matter of right when its population was equal to the unit of representation in Congress, yet Congress could admit such Territory when its population was far below the point named. The instances of such admission when the population was far below the unit of representation prevailing at such time are numerous. Florida when admitted had a population of 54,000, when the basis of representation was 70,000; Oregon came in with 52,000 people, when the unit was 93,000. Nevada was admitted in 1864 by the Republican party for partisan purposes, with a population of only 6,800 at the preceding census, when the unit of representation was 127,000; and in 1866 both Houses of Congress passed a bill admitting Colorado when her population was less than 30,000, when the basis of representation was 127,000. The next year Nebraska was admitted when her population was only 60,000. I call attention to the fact that all the territory that came to us as a result of the three great treaties named has been carved into States except that embraced in this bill. With respect to all the balance the rule I have been referring to was the only one applied; but now, when the last of all the Territories are seeking admittance, Republicans demand a new rule and a severer test than have ever been applied to any other people. The same party that admitted Nevada in 1864, when in 1860 her population was less than 7,000, to serve a mean partisan purpose, does not hesitate now to serve a purpose equally mean and sectional by refusing admission to Arizona with her 180,000 people and to New Mexico with her 300,000 people unless they agree to come in together.

We oppose the union of New Mexico and Arizona because New Mexico, if a free expression of her will could be secured, opposes the union. She feels that she is entitled to separate admission. More than fifty years ago she adopted a constitution, elected her Senators and a Member of Congress, and hand in hand with California sought admission. California was admitted and New Mexico was rejected, though both came supported by the solemn treaty obligation that they should be admitted. For fifty years with patient earnestness she has waited and waited for the fruition of her hopes. She has built up her own institutions, maintained her own civilization, and wrought out her own destiny, and now it is proposed to destroy her identity and her very name. She protests against it; protests against the violation of public faith, and protests to the President against the violation of the promise he voluntarily made her. At Las Vegas, in 1899, in the course of a speech, President Roosevelt said:

All I shall say is that if New Mexico wants to be a State you can count me in, and I will go to Washington to speak for you or do anything you wish.

The President has not kept that promise.

We oppose this union because Arizona opposes it. She opposes it, because for almost fifty years she has been led to believe that she would ultimately receive in fullest measure the blessings of statehood.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman permit just one more interruption?

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON. In reference to the statehood of Arizona I want to call the gentleman's attention to this language of the act of February 4, 1863, organizing the Territory of Arizona and separating it from New Mexico:

Provided, That nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed to prohibit the Congress of the United States from dividing said Territory or changing its boundaries in such manner and at such times as it may deem proper.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I am entirely familiar with that provision, but there is another provision in that same act creating the Territory of Arizona, which the gentleman does not read, which gave those people a solemn promise that they should finally be admitted as a State. [Applause.] If gentlemen desire to be fair in their discussion of this question, let them submit all the facts, omitting none.

Mr. HAMILTON. In fairness to both of us I will quote the language of the statute.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I have it here, and will read it for the benefit of the House. Speaking of the government of Arizona, it says:

That said government shall be maintained and continued until such time as the people residing in such Territory shall have the consent of

Congress to form a State government, republican in form, as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, and apply for and obtain admission into the Union as a State.

The people of Arizona have believed that this obligation meant something. They have recognized that Congress reserved the right to divide her territory if it should be considered too large, but they have never recognized the right of Congress to merge her with a Territory still larger. They have conceded that Congress has the right to change her boundary lines, but they have never believed that Congress would blot out the line of division made when she was separated from New Mexico. For more than forty years Arizona and New Mexico have walked apart, each working out its destiny in its own peculiar way. Their customs and habits, their hopes and ambitions, their language and religion, their history and their traditions have all been different, and the conditions that required their separation more than a generation ago still require it now. The God of nature and of nations decreed that they should live apart. The great continental divide of mountains has created a mighty barrier between them that the puny hand of Congress can not destroy. People of the western counties of New Mexico and people of the eastern part of Arizona, though near together, when measured by miles are yet as far apart as though an uncharted ocean rolled between them.

It has never been the policy to unite two political divisions into one in order to create a State. Why should it be done now? Territories, and even States, have been divided, but never two united. Vermont separated herself from New York before the Constitution was adopted. For political purposes Maine was created out of the larger part of Massachusetts. When Texas was admitted it was upon condition that she might make of herself five separate States. While the passions of war were rife the Republican party laid its cruel hand upon Virginia, the dear old mother of so many States, and tore from her side the State of West Virginia. Out of Dakota two States, North and South Dakota, were formed. The rule has always been that of division, not addition; separation of one into two political divisions, not the combination of two into one.

But gentlemen from the East say that these Territories are barren, desolate, and unproductive for the most part, and can never separately become worthy to wear the crowns of statehood. New England has prophesied before. If the Government should do no more for New England than it has done for these Territories a great part of New England would become barren and unproductive waste.

In 1811, when Congress was considering the question of admitting some of the territory purchased from France by Mr. Jefferson as a State into the Union, Mr. Josiah Quincy said:

If this bill passes it is virtually a dissolution of the Union. It will free the States from their moral obligations and, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, definitely to prepare for a separation—amicably if they can, violently if they must.

This first threat of secession was made by a Member from Massachusetts. And for what reason? Because Congress was preparing to admit into the Union some of the great West. Mr. Chairman, without the great West, which New England so despised, to feed and clothe her New England would be hungry and shivering to-day and her cities would be silent in the stagnation of death. That great West has been the brawn and muscle, the heart and brains of this nation. In peace it has made her prosperity the marvel of the world, and in war it preserved her from dissolution and death. Without the Lincoln of the West, the Grant of the West, the Sherman of the West, and the legions upon legions of soldiers from the West who marched to the music of the Union, the men who followed the strains of Dixie would have knocked at the gates of every city in the Eastern and Middle States and would have swept their armies off the field of battle.

When California sought admission, men from the East, among whom was Webster, said that a large portion of it was destined to remain a desert. The strong and rugged men of that State have answered the charge by making that very portion of California by far the richest of all. The "wise men of the East" once called a great part of the country west of the Mississippi River "the Great American Desert." That "Great American Desert" lives only in memory now. Men have waged war with the desert and have made it yield abundant harvests. West of the Mississippi River two-thirds of the area of this country is located, and toward this section the great tides of population and development are flowing. Under present conditions a comparatively small part of this country is controlling its legislation, while that controlling portion is itself controlled by the basest influences in American politics. While this condition prevails it is not surprising that a few are favored while the many are forgotten. This is the last opportunity that will ever exist to correct some of these inequalities of representa-

tion in the United State Senate, to escape in some degree from the dominion and control of those who believe that the world is bounded on the east by Cape Cod and on the west by the Alleghany Mountains.

We oppose this bill because, considering their rough and mountainous character, the union of New Mexico and Arizona will make a State of unwieldy proportions. Communication between its different parts will be too difficult and too expensive. The two combined will make a State containing 235,000 square miles. It will be as large as all of the New England States with New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, and Indiana added. From portions of Arizona to the proposed capital is as far as from Washington to Boston, or from Iowa to New York. It will be larger than the whole of France by 28,000 square miles; 27,000 square miles larger than the entire German Empire in Europe; 88,000 square miles larger than Japan with the island of Formosa added; twice as large as Italy with 15,000 square miles over; 40,000 square miles larger than Spain. It will be six times as large as Portugal; 63,000 square miles larger than Sweden; twenty times as large as Belgium; ten times as large as Greece; fifteen times as large as Denmark; four and a half times as large as England; eight times as large as Scotland; seven times as large as Ireland, and twice as large as the entire United Kingdom.

This proposed State will be twenty-five times larger than Vermont; twenty-five times larger than New Jersey; thirty times larger than Massachusetts; sixty times larger than Connecticut; one hundred and seventeen times larger than Delaware, and one hundred and eighty-eight times larger than Rhode Island. It is even several times larger than the State of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. KLEPPER. You could make five States the size of Maine out of Texas.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Why, my dear sir, you have but a poor conception of the size of Texas. Instead of five you could make about eight. In fact, Texas would have to "spread herself" but just a little to make five States like Missouri. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, references have constantly been made during this debate and in committee to the size of Texas and her refusal to permit herself to be divided. The conditions existing in Texas and that have always existed are so different from the conditions in New Mexico and Arizona that any argument based upon an attempted comparison must, of necessity, be faulty. Arizona and New Mexico might be fused into one great, prosperous, and harmonious State if conditions prevailed there like those in Texas—if they had a homogeneous people, alike in race and religion, with the same interests and industries, and the same memories and traditions. But this is not the case. Their people are unlike; their institutions are different; their religions are in conflict, and their interests clash.

It is not so with Texas. Before the white man came it was Texas then. It was Texas when, as a part of Mexico, it came out from under the dominion of Spain. It was our Texas that defied the rule of Mexico. It was our Texas that existed for ten years as a separate and independent republic. It was our Texas that came into the Union and afterwards linked her fortunes with the Confederacy and then came again into the Union. Amidst the shock of her revolution her flag bore a single star, and it blazes upon her flag now. The same threads run throughout all of her history, and these conditions have begotten a sentiment in Texas that makes division impossible. I observe that gentlemen smile at the thought of such a sentiment controlling a people upon so great a question, but so long as we exist as a people, venerating our institutions and honoring our past, such sentiments as I have named will thrill our hearts and ennoble our lives. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, upon every side we see some manifestation of the spirit to which I have alluded. The flag that hangs in graceful folds above your chair is but strips of silk that separate and apart mean nothing. Combine them and let the stars flash from a field of blue and you have the flag of our country, at the very sight of which our souls are filled with patriotic fervor. Let it be one tattered and torn by the strife of battle and we touch it reverently and kiss it tenderly, because there is a sentiment that hallows it.

A few days ago something occurred here with reference to the old ship *Constitution*. A great petition was presented against its destruction. What is that old ship that it should be preserved? It is but a dismantled and rotting mass of wood and iron. In the marts of trade, in the markets of the world, it would have but little intrinsic value. We could construct a vessel of equal value and send it out upon the deep to be destroyed by American guns and nobody would protest against it. But this is "*Old Ironsides*," that rode the waves amidst the thunder of battle a hundred years ago; the blood of dying men stained

and hallowed her decks, and when it is proposed to ruthlessly destroy her the voices of our living and the memories of our dead protest against it. [Applause.]

So it is with Texas. If area alone were considered, Texas could be divided. You could divide her forests and her prairies, her mountains and her valleys; but there are some things about Texas you can not divide. There is her Alamo—greater than the Thermopylae of old. The babes of Texas have been taught to hush the names of Travis and Crockett and Bowie and the others who died there. The Alamo belongs alike to all, and no son of Texas would be so unworthy as to surrender his claim to it. There is Goliad and there is the field of San Jacinto. In dividing Texas could these battlefields be divided also and their glories parceled out to different States? There is the memory of Houston; of Austin; of Burleson; of Rusk; of Albert Sidney Johnston; of Roberts, the "Old Alcalde;" of Reagan, the "Grand Old Man," who loved Texas and who was beloved by Texas, and a great host of other illustrious ones. Can such memories be weighed and measured and apportioned to different sections? The soldiers who went from Texas homes mingled in the tumult of every great battle of the war between the blue and the gray, and they sleep upon every field from Gettysburg to the Gulf. Will anyone be found so base as to give up the memory of their deathless deeds?

No, Mr. Chairman, to give up any of these to one section would be to impoverish all others. They belong to Texas—to all of Texas, and not a part of Texas. They were given to us by the fathers, and we must hand them down to our children. They belonged to Texas in her weakness; they must still be hers in her strength. They comforted and blessed her in her night of sorrow; they must adorn her in her day of triumph. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRUMPACKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration, under the special order of the House, House bill 12707, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SELECTION OF JURORS IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. BIRDSALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5289) to provide for the selection of grand and petit jurors for the district court in the Territory of Oklahoma.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman? This bill comes from the Judiciary Committee with a unanimous recommendation for its passage. It is very much needed in order that the laws of Oklahoma may be enforced. A decision of the court out there has set aside the present jury law, so that they have no law for the selection of jurors, and this bill is to provide a system for drawing grand and petit jurors for the trial of cases, and I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will not object.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I did not rise to object, but to get some information about the matter. If it is the unanimous report of the committee, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That until otherwise provided by the legislature of Oklahoma it shall be the duty of the judge of the district court in each judicial district of the Territory of Oklahoma to appoint in each county of his district two discreet, honorable, and reputable persons of opposite politics, and having the qualifications of jurors as prescribed by the laws of said Territory, and not interested in any cause, civil or criminal, pending in the district court of the county for which he is appointed, which two persons, together with the clerk of the district court, or his resident deputy, in such county, shall constitute a board of jury commissioners. Said commissioners shall meet at the office of the clerk of the district court upon the order of the judge of said court at least once each year, at such time as the judge shall designate, and after having taken and subscribed an oath that they will honestly, faithfully, and impartially discharge their duties as such jury commissioners, shall proceed to select from the names recorded upon the poll books of persons who voted in said county at the last preceding general election held for the election of county officers the names of not less than 300 nor more than 325 persons, having and possessing the qualifications of jurors as prescribed by the laws of said Territory of Oklahoma. Said names for jurors shall be apportioned to and selected from the several voting precincts in said county as near as practicable according to the voting population of each precinct. The board of jury commissioners shall make a list of said names, showing the election precinct from which each juror was selected, and shall certify to the same and file said list in the office of the clerk of the district court for the county for which said names were selected. The clerk shall record said list upon the journal of the court and certify to the cor-

rectness thereof. As soon as said list is completed and recorded the clerk of the district court shall forthwith write each of said names upon a separate slip of paper, which slips shall be of uniform size and color, and shall fold said slips and place them in a box provided with two locks and keys of different designs and securely lock the same, leaving no opening. When said box is closed and locked, the key of one lock shall be retained by the clerk and the other shall be delivered to and retained by the sheriff of the county. Prior to any term of court at which a grand or petit jury will be required the judge of the district court shall certify to the clerk of the district court the number of jurors that will be required for either a grand or a petit jury, and direct said jury to be drawn and summoned at such times as he shall direct. Upon receiving such order the clerk of the district court shall notify the sheriff of the time of the drawing of such jury, and the sheriff or one of his deputies, and the clerk of the district court or one of his deputies, shall take said box containing the names of the jurors so selected and thoroughly shake the same. They shall then together, in the presence of each other, open said jury box, and after placing the same in a position that neither can see into it, shall draw therefrom alternately one name at a time and record the same until the number of jurors have been drawn required in the order of the judge, which may be not to exceed thirty persons from which to select a grand jury and not to exceed forty persons from which to select a petit jury. As soon as said jurors are drawn and the names recorded, the slips shall be destroyed and the box securely locked and retained in the custody of the clerk, one key being retained by the sheriff. Upon the completion of such drawing the clerk shall issue separate venires for the grand and petit jurors, returnable at such time as the judge shall in his order direct. The first names drawn to the number stated in the judge's order shall be summoned as grand jurors, and the grand jury shall be empaneled from said persons: *Provided*, That additional and other drawings may be had at such times as the court or judge may order for the completion of the panel of either the grand or petit jury, or for the empaneling of a new grand jury during any term of court, if, in the judgment of the court, the same shall become necessary, or if, for any cause, the court, in its discretion, shall deem other jurors necessary. The court may excuse or discharge any person drawn and summoned as a grand or petit juror whenever, in the discretion of the court, such action may be deemed expedient: *Provided further*, That at any time during a term of court after a petit jury has been drawn and summoned in the manner as herein provided, when for the trial of any cause, civil or criminal, the regular panel of jurors shall appear to be insufficient, the jury may be completed from talesmen or the court may direct that an open venire issue to the marshal or sheriff for such number of jurors as may be deemed necessary to be selected from the body or any portion of the county.

SEC. 2. That the commissioners shall each receive as compensation for his services the sum of \$10 per day for each day actually and necessarily employed in the discharge of their duties, to be paid upon the order of the judge of the district court, either by the United States or the county, as the judge in his order shall direct. The venires for juries, grand or petit, may be served by either the United States marshal or the sheriff of the county, as the court or judge shall order.

SEC. 3. That all laws of the Territory of Oklahoma inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The following amendments, recommended by the committee, were read:

Insert after the word "That," in the third line on page 1, the words "until otherwise provided by the legislature of Oklahoma."

Strike all after the word "select," in line 4 on page 2, down to and including the word "officers," in line 7 on page 2.

Insert after the word "county," in line 23 on page 4, the following: "And provided further, The probate judges of the several counties may order a jury drawn in like manner from said jury box for any term of the probate court or for the trial of any cause in said court wherein a jury is authorized by the laws of Oklahoma to be drawn from such box."

Insert after the word "duties," in line 2 on page 5, the words "the time necessarily employed to be determined by the judge and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, change of reference was made of the bill (H. R. 64) making an appropriation for the administration and improvement of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

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

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to authorize use of transport *Sumner* to convey members of Santiago Battlefield Commission and others to, Cuba and return.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GOEBEL was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of bill H. R. 5649 (granting a pension to Martha Kates), first session Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Also, to Mr. GOEBEL, to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of bill H. R. 5648 (granting an increase of pension to William Hand), first session Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are a number of requests for time to speak upon the statehood bill, I ask unanimous consent that the House come in to-morrow at 11 o'clock instead of 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the House meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock instead of 12 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation for equipment of the new public building at Seattle, Wash.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with recommendation, a draft of a bill relating to the custody and control of certain buildings at Perry and Kingfisher, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for the Southern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—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 third secretary of embassy to Japan—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. BRANTLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12843) to amend the seventh section of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 542); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10129) to amend section 5501 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 545); 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. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7641, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 183) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of James N. Richards, accompanied by a report (No. 533); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7645, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 184) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of John Williams, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 534); which said resolution 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. 11901, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 185) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of D. L. Pritchard, deceased, accom-

panied by a report (No. 535); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 8260, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 186) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the legal representatives of J. H. Brantly, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 536); which said resolution 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. 9559, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 187) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mrs. Sarah C. Bryan, accompanied by a report (No. 537); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 6438, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 188) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Joel Cross, accompanied by a report (No. 538); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1276, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 189) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mrs. L. E. Boatwright, accompanied by a report (No. 539); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3975, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 190) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of M. F. Thomas, accompanied by a report (No. 540); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5923, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 191) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of M. J. Conley, heir of Harmon Conley, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 541); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Texas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12560) for the relief of John C. Lynch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 543); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2, Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9992) for the relief of John Beasley, of Rhea County, Tenn., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 527); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8211) for the relief of the estate of H. S. Simmons, deceased, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 528); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8476) for the relief of Mrs. R. N. Pharr and Mrs. H. B. Fant, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 529); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8261) for the relief of the legal representatives of Nalote Biraghi, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 530); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7644) for the relief of the estate of C. H. Medlin, deceased, late of Crockett County, Tenn., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 531); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7638) for the relief of Mathew Williams, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 532); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

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. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 12972) making appropria-

tions to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for prior years, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 12973) to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers into the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 12974) to authorize the Washington, Spa Spring and Greta Railroad Company, of Prince George County, to extend its street railway into the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 12975) making an appropriation for the improvement of grounds within the Presidio Military Reservation, at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McCARTHY (by request): A bill (H. R. 12976) for the restoration of annuities to the Mdewakanton and Wahpookta (Senate) Sioux Indians declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12977) to provide for the erection of a public building at Carthage, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12978) to provide for the erection of a public building at Gallatin, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12979) to provide for the erection of a public building at Gallatin, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12980) to provide for the erection of a public building at Cookeville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12981) to provide for the erection of a public building at Gainesboro, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12982) to provide for the erection of a public building at Dayton, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 12983) providing for the erection of a public building at Poplar Bluff, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 12984) authorizing a public building at Burlington, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 12985) making an appropriation for New York custom-house—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 12986) to provide for the proper lighting and repairs of the Statue of Liberty at Fort Wood, Bedloes Island, New York Harbor—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 12987) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 12988) to establish a life-saving station at or near Menominee, State of Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 12989) for the erection of an addition to the post-office in the city of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 13085) to provide souvenir medallions for The Zebulon Montgomery Pike Monument Association—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 13086) requiring shippers and manufacturers of medicine for interstate shipment to label said medicine and print thereon the ingredients contained in such medicine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 183) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 7641—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A resolution (H. Res. 184) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 7645—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 185) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 11901—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 186) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 8260—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 187) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 9559—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A reso-

lution (H. Res. 188) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 6438—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 189) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 1276—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 190) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 3975—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 191) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 5923—to the Private Calendar.

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. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12990) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Criddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 12991) granting a pension to Christopher Buchanan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 12992) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Klink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 12993) to correct the naval record of Alfred Burgess—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12994) granting a medal of honor or certificate of merit to Frederick Meng—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 12995) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Kromer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 12996) granting a pension to Eugene B. McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12997) granting a pension to John S. Draper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12998) granting a pension to Ann Bart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 12999) for the relief of the estate of William Keith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13000) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan H. Ellison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13001) for the relief of the estate of Solomon Kean—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13002) for the relief of the estate of Wade Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13003) for the relief of the estate of Andrew Reece—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 13004) granting an increase of pension to John W. Risher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13005) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13006) for the relief of Levi W. Stalnaker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13007) for the relief of the heirs of Abraham Parsons, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13008) for the relief of the heirs of Elias W. Phares, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 13009) granting a pension to Clara T. Leathers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13010) granting an increase of pension to Alice B. Hartshorne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13011) appropriating money to pay William Tucker for services and expenses as acting captain and drillmaster of Company D, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 13012) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 13013) for the relief of the heirs of Matthias Price, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13014) granting an increase of pension to Humphrey N. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13015) granting an increase of pension to James Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13016) granting an increase of pension to John D. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13017) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13018) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McCain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13019) granting an increase of pension to George Whitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13020) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieben Frey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13021) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Rucker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 13022) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Ghrist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 13023) for the relief of the heirs of William Henry Saddler—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13024) granting a pension to William J. Beach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13025) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13026) granting an increase of pension to J. Bailey Orem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13027) granting an increase of pension to Susan H. Donaldson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 13028) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 13029) granting an increase of pension to Betsey M. Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13030) granting an increase of pension to John C. Heney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13031) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Leslie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 13032) granting an increase of pension to Stewart McKeney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 13033) granting an increase of pension to William A. Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 13034) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hildenbrand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 13035) granting an increase of pension to Maggie D. Russ—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 13036) granting a pension to John Barry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 13037) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jane Kearney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13038) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 13039) for the relief of Lina Hennig—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 13040) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of detonating fuses at Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., of February 5, 1903—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 13041) for the relief of Richard H. Marshall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 13042) for the relief of Alexander C. Landis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13043) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Smink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13044) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Gratz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 13045) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jacob Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13046) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Staubs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13047) granting an increase of pension to Walter Saunders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13048) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Sedgwick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 13049) granting an increase of pension to William Gable—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 13050) granting an increase of pension to William G. Crockett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13051) granting an increase of pension to J. P. George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13052) to remove the charge of desertion against John Mervine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 13053) granting a pension to Eli Bunting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13054) granting a pension to James M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13055) granting a pension to Anna M. Kitchen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13056) granting a pension to Sarah B. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13057) granting an increase of pension to James S. Salsberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13058) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Baum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13059) granting an increase of pension to Kate O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13060) granting an increase of pension to Henry De Graff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 13061) for the relief of W. M. McKie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13062) for the relief of the estate of Abner W. Lanier, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13063) for the relief of the estate of Harriet W. Fleming, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13064) for the relief of the estate of Mark M. Harwell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13065) for the relief of the estate of Francis S. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13066) for the relief of the heirs of William Bailey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13067) granting a pension to Hiram Roe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13068) granting an increase of pension to Esther Crane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13069) granting an increase of pension to Friend S. Esmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13070) granting an increase of pension to Marquis D. Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13071) for the relief of William C. Armstrong—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 13072) granting a pension to Laura S. Ware—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13073) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. W. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13074) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Arrand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 13075) granting an increase of pension to Pard Lamoreux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 13076) for the relief of Hosmer, Crampton & Hammond and others, and providing for the adjudication of certain claims by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13077) granting an increase of pension to James S. Prose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 13078) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Parten—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13079) granting an increase of pension to James H. Griffin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13080) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. B. Thorne—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13081) granting an increase of pension to Orren R. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13082) granting an increase of pension to Herbert Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13083) granting an increase of pension to Mordical B. Borbee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13084) granting an increase of pension to William Dixon—to the Committee on Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5058) granting a pension to Bernard Sutton—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9216) granting an increase of pension to Cath-

erine R. Michell—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12902) for the relief of Frank W. Tucker—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred 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 the SPEAKER: Petition of C. H. Hampaugh, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Commercial Club of the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., for union statehood of New Mexico and Arizona—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Clearing House Association of Banks of Philadelphia, relative to bank legislation—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AIKEN: Petition of James P. Lattimer et al., for repeal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEDE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of H. G. Klink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of F. Meng—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Petition of Methodist Preachers' Association of New York City, against liquors for soldiers on Army transports—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of Hall of Order of Railway Conductors, for bill H. R. 9328—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hall of Order of Railway Conductors, for bills H. R. 239 and S. 1657—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against a Federal law relative to prohibition in the States—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

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

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Daniel C. McEwen for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTOR: Petition of the Philadelphia Clearing House, favoring an amendment to the national-banking act—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Spring Garden Council, No. 18, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHANEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Risher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of the Commercial Law League of the United States, for the Lodge bill on the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 3024—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsburg, on the McCumber-Sperry bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsburg, for the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Christ Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, Pa.; and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pittsburg, favoring prohibition in the Indian Territory as a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Commercial Law League of America, favoring the consular bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Vesuvius Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and the Woman's Home Missionary Society, for the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Emory Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., against sale of liquor on Army transports—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Mrs. Charles A. Wright et al., for prohibition in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lucinda Gain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frances P. McMurtrie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Commercial Law

League of America, for a law to reform the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Dr. Edw. F. Janeway and 25 others, for a pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, relative to the interstate-commerce bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Albert Crandell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of N. W. Plymate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Smith Brothers & Sparks, of the National Stock Yards, for an amendment to the law governing the time stock may be kept in cars—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Alaska, relative to legislation for that Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, against recognition of persons affiliated with the Mormon Church—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT: Petition of citizens of South McAlester and Indian Territory, for union of statehood of Indian Territory and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of Summit Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry, for passage of bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Manton and Mount Pleasant, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Phenix, R. I., against liquor traffic in Indian Territory and Oklahoma as States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Union Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Washington, R. I., against liquor traffic in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 12897) for relief of Robert B. Malone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary C. Spangler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Monitor Council, No. 61, Order United American Mechanics, of Glastenbury, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of the Farmers' Institute of Western, relative to railway freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Farmers' Institute of Western, favoring power for the President to adjust the tariff with foreign nations by reciprocal measures when the interests of the people demand—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William C. Butler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Mount Hope Grange, No. 902, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. T. Johnson and 35 others, of Catskill, N. Y., for an investigation of the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petitions of Barnes Corners, Star, and St. Lawrence granges, Patrons of Husbandry, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of 16 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief of heirs of victims of the *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James D. Blanding—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Grange No. 1282, of Altenwold, Pa., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Hall of Order of Railway Conductors, for bills H. R. 239 and S. 1657—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hall of Order of Railway Conductors, for bill H. R. 9328—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William N. Hughes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Samuel E. Light, against any bill for free denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Elizabethtown (Pa.) Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Master Grange, No. 88, of Benton, Pa., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: Papers to accompany bill to equalize rank and pay of certain retired officers of the Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Worthington Goldsboro—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: Petition of New Maysville Council, No. 395, Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Abner W. Lanier—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Patti Rodgers Crawford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. C. Marr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Mrs. Harriett W. Flemming—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mark M. Harwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Francis S. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. M. McKie—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Henry Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. B. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Winans—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Bayles E. Cobb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Milton R. Dunagan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. W. McQuire—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Pinneo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of 16 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of the Commercial Law League of America, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 25, 1906.

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

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

Mr. TILLMAN. Have we reached the order of petitions and memorials?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will first lay before the Senate an executive communication.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Commissioner of Patents for the year ended December 31, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5289) to provide for the selection of grand and petit jurors for the district courts in the Territory of Oklahoma; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) to authorize the use of the transport *Sumner* to convey members of the Santiago Battlefield Commission and others to Cuba and return, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.