By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the State Legislative Board of Railroad Employees, urging the passage of House bill 10302 and Senate bill 3604, requiring common carriers to report to Interstate Commerce Commission the details of all injuries to employees—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of Paige Street Free Baptist Church, of Lowell, Mass., in favor of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANE: Resolution of the Commercial Club of Muscatine, Iowa, in support of the appropriation for celebrating the Louisiana purchase—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MEEKISON (by request): Petition of G. N. Lewis and other druggists of Defiance, Ohio, for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK: Paper to accompany House bill to increase the pension of S. B. Hench—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to John Culp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters of Moline, Ill., for the building of one or more new war ships in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Resolution of McMahon Post, No. 208, of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Church of Christ of Ann Arbor, Mich., urging the passage of the House bill prohibiting the sale of liquor in the Army and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TONGUE: Remonstrance of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Canyonville, Oreg., against the sale of liquor in Alaska and in our new possessions—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of D. H. Squire and others, of Ashville, Ohio, for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petitions of the First Parish Sunday School and the Congregational Church of Westford, Mass., for the passage of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Granville Grange, No. 257, and Columbia Grange, No. 83, Patrons of Husbandry, State of Pennsylvania, in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Affidavits to accompany House bill No. 9278, to correct the military record of George W. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the State Legislative Board of Railroad Employees of Pennsylvania, urging the passage of House bill 10302 and Senate bill 3604, relating to accidents to railroad employees and reporting the same to the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the State Legislative Board of Railroad Employees of Pennsylvania, in favor of a law that will prevent the issuance of injunctions upon employees, and giving to them the right of trial by jury in cases of contempt—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *May 4, 1900.*

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 996) providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8188) to amend the act approved March 3, 1893, for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SIMON presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Canyonville, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the Colorado Society, Sons of the American Revolution, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the desecration of the American flag; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Denver, Colo., praying that an appropriation be made for the continuance of the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, Soldiers' Homes, immigrant stations, Government buildings, and upon all grounds and premises used for military purposes by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the printing of the label of the Allied Printing Trades on all publications issued by the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

MISSOURI RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. ALLISON. I present sundry documents and papers relating to the Missouri River at or near Rulo and Nebraska City, Nebr., showing a special necessity for an early appropriation in order to preserve and protect the work already done and to preserve the channel from great damage likely to result if the work suggested is not done. I move that the papers be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WOLCOTT. By direction of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads I report back, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, with a report, which I ask to have printed, and to have the bill printed with its amendments; and I have also to request that the testimony taken before the committee be likewise printed for the use of the Senate.

I give notice to the Senate that I shall be necessarily absent from the Senate for a few days, and I shall call the bill up for consideration on the 15th or 16th, probably on the 16th of May, at which time other members of the committee who will be temporarily absent from the Senate will be present to participate in its consideration. I beg to say to the Senate that there will be no unnecessary delay caused by this postponement, as there is a good deal of printing to be done, and Senators will, I know, want to consider the bill more or less before it is taken up.

Mr. CLAY. I ask the Senator if the 17th would not do as well as the 16th?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would rather leave it the 16th, if I can, and I will meet the views of the Senator when the time comes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar and printed with the report, under the rule. The Senator from Colorado asks that the testimony taken by the committee be printed for the use of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MONEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 597) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3754) for the erection of a public building at Florence, Ala., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3278) to authorize the laying and maintaining of a pneumatic-tube system between the Capitol and the Government Printing Office, in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, asked to be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Printing; which was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the resolution submitted by Mr. HAWLEY on the 14th ultimo, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had by the committee or its subcommittees in connection with bills pending before the committee, and to have the same printed for its use, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the stenographer who reported the hearing already had before said committee be paid from said fund.

PAYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. PROCTOR on the 2d instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to pay for stenographic work done before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, February 7, 1900, in relation to the agricultural interests of Alaska.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 20th ultimo, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the assistant clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,800 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

COURTS IN WISCONSIN.

Mr. SPOONER. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4450) to provide for the holding of a term of the circuit and district courts of the United States at Superior, Wis., to report it with an amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was to add as an additional section the following:

SEC. 3. The Attorney-General is hereby authorized to rent such room or rooms in said city as may be necessary or convenient for holding the terms of said court by the provisions hereof authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 4564) to remove charge of desertion now standing against James Hennessy on rolls of the War Department; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 4565) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Drake; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4566) for the relief of the estate of William Griffith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 4567) for the relief of W. B. Moses & Sons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (for Mr. WARREN) introduced a bill (S. 4568) granting a pension to William Hayden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 4569) granting a pension to Eugene J. Oulman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 4570) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $15,000 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to change the characteristic of Cape Cod light, at North Truro, Mass., from a fixed light to a flashing white light, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 for the purchase of a site and construction of a public building at Lawrence, Mass., in addition to the sum now authorized by law, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KYLE submitted an amendment authorizing the continuance of the Industrial Commission until December 31, 1901, with all the powers and duties imposed upon it by the acts of June 18, 1898, and March 3, 1899, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $30,483,000 for inland transportation by railroad routes, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $12,500 for the necessary surveys, erection of buildings and other structures, and for the proper equipment of a station for the investigation of problems connected with the marine fishery interests in the Middle and South Atlantic States at some point in North Carolina, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $4,000,000 toward the armament and armor of domestic manufacture for vessels authorized by the acts of July 2, 1895, June 10, 1896, March 3, 1897, May 4, 1898, March 3, 1899, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

VIVISECTION REGULATIONS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have here testimony taken before the Committee on the District of Columbia on the bill (S. 34) for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia. There is a demand for this document from libraries of the country to some extent as well as from individuals, and I ask that 1,000 copies of it be printed in cloth and 1,000 copies in ordinary form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator any estimate as to the cost? Will the cost be over $500?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; but the cost will come easily within $500.

There being no objection, the order was reduced to writing, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the hearings on S. 34, for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia, be printed; also that 2,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 1,000 to be bound in cloth and 1,000 in paper.

HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL CAPITOL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and it is hereby, authorized to obtain such photographs as may be necessary to complete Senate Document No. 60, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, at an expense not to exceed $300, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLICS.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask unanimous consent to call up a very short bill.

Mr. TELLER. I will ask my colleague to wait just a moment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. The resolution about the Boers that I introduced was laid over until this morning. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] is anxious to call up the measure he has in charge, and if I can have permission that the resolution shall go over under the same conditions until to-morrow morning, I will consent to that course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the resolution of the Senator from Colorado be laid on the table, subject to his call?

Mr. TELLER. Until to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BERRY. I understand the Senator from Colorado desires to have it understood that the resolution will be called up to-morrow morning.

Mr. TELLER. To-morrow morning, after the routine business.

Mr. BERRY. It will be called up after the routine business to-morrow morning.

SOLDIERS' HOME NEAR DENVER, COLO.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask unanimous consent, inasmuch as I am compelled to be away from the Senate for a week and more, going to Colorado, that I may call up a very short bill, which it will take but a moment to pass. I am sure there will be no objection to it. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4039) to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at or near Denver, Arapahoe County, Colo.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Board of Managers of the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to locate a branch of the Home at Denver, Arapahoe County, Colo., or within a radius of 10 miles thereof. The same shall not be located on a tract of land less than 300 acres

in extent. Within six months, or as soon thereafter as practicable, from the approval of this act the Board of Managers shall commence the erection of or purchase a suitable building or buildings on the grounds so purchased for the use of the Branch Home, and the sum of $250,000 is appropriated for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned and the improvement of the grounds of the Branch Home.

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

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 3d instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 51) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson;* of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgsdon, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila.

ARMY REORGANIZATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PROCTOR. The bill has once been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move, on page 2, line 1, after the word "corps," to insert the words "that can not be filled in the manner hereinbefore provided." It is merely an explanatory verbal amendment.

Mr. SEWELL. After what word?

Mr. PROCTOR. After the word "corps." I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that it is the amendment proposed by him.

Mr. SEWELL. Let the clause be read as it would read if amended. Should it come in after the word "corps" or after the word "occur?"

Mr. PROCTOR. It comes in after the word "corps."

Mr. SEWELL. It will then read:

Except that of the chief of the department or corps, that can not be filled in the manner hereinbefore provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. In section 14, page 7, line 21, after the word "the," I move to insert the word "rank;" and in the same line, after the word "captain," to strike out the word "mounted" and insert the words "of infantry without command;" so as to read "the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain of infantry without command."

I will state that the purpose of this amendment is to make the pay of chaplain for volunteers and regulars the same.

Mr. SEWELL. I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that by that amendment he is appointing chaplains to cavalry regiments and not giving them a mount. They ought to be provided for differently from infantry.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think the suggestion of the Senator is a sound one, and I will accept such an amendment if he will prepare it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont withdraw his amendment?

Mr. PROCTOR. No; let it stand agreed to for the present. The Senator from New Jersey will modify it, perhaps.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is the bill open to further amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. TILLMAN. In section 15, page 8, line 4, after the word "major-general," I move to strike out all of the section down to the word "Commanding," in line 9; so that it will read:

That the senior Major-General Commanding the Army shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a Lieutenant-General, and his personal staff shall have the rank, pay, and allowances authorized for the staff of a Lieutenant-General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 15, page 8, line 4, after the word "Major-General," strike out the words—

now commanding the Army shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a Lieutenant-General, and on retirement shall have the retired pay of a Lieutenant-General; and his personal staff shall have the rank, pay, and allowances heretofore fixed by law for the staff of a Lieutenant-General; and thereafter the General.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will not object to that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the section as it will be if amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEC. 15. That the senior Major-General Commanding the Army shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a Lieutenant-General; and his personal staff shall have the rank, pay, and allowances authorized for the staff of a Lieutenant-General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There must be better order in the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask that the amendment be read again as amended. I could not hear it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The section will be again read as amended.

The Secretary again read section 15 as amended.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to make a motion to strike out section 15 altogether, if it is in order at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment, which will be read.

Mr. BERRY. I am opposed to that section of the bill. One reason is that I do not think there is any necessity for a Lieutenant-General.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I wish that we could have some order in the Senate. I do not like to complain about it, but yesterday all day there was so much confusion in the Senate that the reporters stated to me that it was quite impossible for them to report accurately the proceedings of the Senate.

Looking over some brief remarks I made yesterday I find some very material mistakes, not the fault of the reporters, but the fault of the Senate itself, on account of the confusion and the loud talking and the continual moving about. This has grown to be so intolerable that I notice now what formerly was never known to take place, that the reporters are often obliged to take a seat near the speaker. That has been going on here for several months, and it seems to me that we have reached a point where there must be order maintained in the Senate. When the Senator from Arkansas rose to speak nobody could hear him in my vicinity, and I suppose he could not be heard anywhere else for the noise that was prevalent all over the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas proposes an amendment that will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, it is proposed to strike out all of section 15.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, it is not my intention or purpose to make any speech on the question. I do not think there is any necessity for a Lieutenant-General. There can be no reason for it except to give the Major-General Commanding increased pay, together with his staff. I see no good that could be subserved by it. That is the only reason that I care to state. I give that as a reason why I think it should be stricken out.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I am no partisan especially of the present senior Major-General Commanding the Army, but it seems to me that our military organization, present and prospective, has come to be of such importance that the commanding officer ought at least to have the rank of Lieutenant-General. Comparing it with the rank of the Navy and with the rank of commanding officers of other armies, certainly we are far below them in that respect. Everyone must admit that the present Major-General Commanding the Army is an able and excellent soldier, every way deserving of this rank, and it seems to me it should be made permanent. It is not personal to him, but hereafter our Army should have that rank for its commanding officer.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President——

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. May I make an inquiry? Has there ever been a permanent officer of this rank, or have all the appointments to this rank been temporary heretofore?

Mr. SEWELL. They have been permanent. General Grant's appointment was permanent, and General Sherman's; Lieutenant-General Sheridan's was a permanent appointment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I know; but when General Grant resigned——

Mr. STEWART. General Sherman was appointed.

Mr. BATE. I wish the Senator from Connecticut would speak louder. What is the question asked by the Senator?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. My question was whether by previous legislation of Congress we had made the commanding officer of the Army in general terms a Lieutenant-General or whether our previous legislation on this subject had been to make the officer then commanding the Army a Lieutenant-General, so that the rank failed with his death. That is the question.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I am one of those who do not believe in the necessity of having this increased rank. I think the history of this country with all its wars and in all its regulations and organizations of the Army shows conclusively that there is no necessity for this increase of rank. The major-generals of the Army have been assigned to the command of the Army at the discretion of the President, and they have generally been successes.

Why do we now at this time propose to change the law and increase the rank of the major-general who may now or hereafter be in command of the Army? I think the history of the country,

the experience we have had, the character of those who have as major-generals filled this place by assignment of the President, have shown that there is no necessity for this increase of rank.

The truth is, Mr. President, there seems to be a tendency to increase the rank of almost every officer in the Army. There has been a general effort, even a push, in that direction; and not only so, but it seems that there is a general tendency to increase the strength of the Army even in time of peace, as well as to add to its official organization. I believe this is error. We have had success so far, very marked success, as I said, with those who have commanded the Army. Nearly all of them were major-generals, not Lieutenant-Generals, and why at this time should we make a Lieutenant-General? You have no war now of any consequence. We are obliged, or at least we ought to lessen the strength of the existing Army; and the people of this country will cry out for it louder than they are doing. Why need we now increase the rank over that of a major-general when we never have done so except when some major-general was retiring from the command of the Army—like General Schofield and some others.

Mr. BERRY. Like General Sheridan.

Mr. BATE. Like increased rank conferred on General Sheridan just before he died, and done to give the rank to him and the increased pay to his widow. This official rank has heretofore died with the man. So it has been all along the line, and why need we now give it to any man and make the law permanent?

I wish to say in this connection that I understand the effect of the amendment, which has already been adopted, to be a little different from what it appears to be as interpreted by the Senator from Vermont. It seems to me it is left discretionary with the President as to who shall command the Army, but the commander shall have the rank of Lieutenant-General. He can appoint the man now there, or he can appoint some one else. It does not confine him to one person.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, my memory, like that of many other gentlemen here present, extends back to the civil war when the organization of the Confederate army had nineteen lieutenant-generals and eight generals, a general being equal to the late promotion we made of Admiral Dewey; lieutenant-generals being the same as vice-admirals of the Navy, of which we have none at the present time. There were several officers promoted. The memory of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] does not go back to it, but General Grant was a Lieutenant-General and afterwards a General. General Sherman commanded the Army as Lieutenant-General, if I remember aright, and so did General Sheridan.

Mr. BATE. I think General Sheridan never commanded as Lieutenant-General. He was given the rank just before he died.

Mr. SEWELL. I think he was given the rank of Lieutenant-General before. I was present here at the time. He was given the rank of General the day he died.

Mr. BATE. I may be mistaken about that. I remember his promotion to some rank just before his death.

Mr. SEWELL. Now, as to the personality of the present officer in question, I beg to say that I remember him as a lieutenant of volunteers, promoted more rapidly by reason of the distinction attained, his adaptability in every sense for the position of a soldier than any other officer in the Army. General Miles, if my memory serves me aright (I have not the figures, but I think I can find them) was promoted from a lieutenant, and he was a major-general at the age of 26. Everybody knows that he has devoted his best efforts from that day to this to the position he held in the Army. He was distinguished beyond measure as an Indian fighter. He is distinguished in every sense in relation to his profession, greatly to his honor, as he has educated himself in the line of duty of a soldier and an officer.

Miles lost his great opportunity to distinguish himself still further by the closing of the war in such short order. To a student of military history he had made the most excellent disposition from his landing to the capture of Porto Rico, having on different roads concentrated Schwan on one side and Henry on another, and several other officers, so that just as he was ready, having all his dispositions made without the loss of a man practically, having his guns shotted on the main line of defense, came the courier that the war had been closed. It reminds me of a little incident that occurred to me in support of a cavalry raid under Averell. Crossing the Rappahannock River in 1863 with a thousand picked men, about 100 from each regiment, the choice of the Army, I commanded two regiments of cavalry in support, and was about to lead them when a courier arrived countermanding the whole expedition. We were called in by Averell for advice. The first officer who was spoken to was a distinguished cavalry officer from Rhode Island, who has since been in our consular service. When this officer was asked, "What would you do?" he said, "Shoot the courier." I think I would have been inclined if I had been in Miles's position to have shot the courier.

We have to-day an Army of 100,000 men. In any well-organized army in Europe there would be ten major-generals; there would be two lieutenant-generals; there would be one general, and there would be a field marshal. Why is it that we can not hold out the glittering stars of glory for the advancement of a soldier? Why is there no reward? Why is it that the Army is treated so? Why is it that the Navy has sixteen or seventeen major-generals and sixteen or seventeen brigadier-generals and one general, a rank above that asked for the commanding officer of the Army, while they have 20,000 men and the Army has 100,000?

Mr. President, history will look upon the change in our Army from 25,000 to 275,000 odd within one hundred days as the greatest achievement in a military line that has ever occurred on the face of the earth; and we give them no credit for it. We abuse them for canned beef or something of that kind, but no credit for gathering that great mass of men and holding them in readiness to send to our foreign possessions.

It is not so much the army in Cuba, where they distinguished themselves very gallantly indeed, that made Spain abandon that island. It was the 200,000 men from the slopes of the Alleghenies down to the everglades of Florida who were ready to advance. Those are the men who conquered the war. That was the policy that did it. Who is entitled to the credit? The Major-General Commanding the Army ought to have his share, and the staff corps. They are the men who created the Army, who won the victory without a shot, and now, with 100,000 men in the field it can not be denied that we who have pride in the Army and in its glory should at least have rank of Lieutenant-General for the commanding officer and that of major-general for his chief of staff.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume the time of the Senate long on this subject. I trust the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to take any time to discuss the question, for I have no doubt the Senate is ready to vote, but I should like to have one single letter read which is embodied in a House report, which I have marked. I ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS SECOND CORPS,
Thoroughfare Gap, June 24, 1863.

SIR: Col. Nelson A. Miles, Sixty-first New York Volunteers, a son of Massachusetts, has distinguished himself on many fields; at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville he won his promotion. The official reports of his brigade, division, and corps commanders are so singularly marked in his case in reference to Chancellorsville that no other recommendation should be required.

He is one of the bravest men in the Army; a soldier by nature. Had we all such men in command of our troops, we could never suffer disaster. He is one of that class of commanders who seek the enemy and fight him—never hides his troops when the cannon sounds in his ear.

It would be one of the most meritorious actions of that person's life who secured his appointment to a brigade and would redound to his own credit, for if Colonel Miles lives he will be one of the most distinguished officers in the service.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
WINFD. S. HANCOCK,
Major-General, Commanding Corps.

Hon. HENRY WILSON,
Senator from Massachusetts, Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BERRY. Let us have the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I am going to vote to give to this officer the rank the committee have recommended. It strikes me that if we are looking to the future of our Army, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] says, it is well enough to gratify a laudable ambition by giving them an opportunity to achieve a rank of this character.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about General Miles. There was some disposition in this country during the last war to underrate his service. I am one of those who believe that if he had been called into the councils of the Government as he should have been and put to the front, some difficulties that we are now encountering might have been saved.

When Mr. Cleveland came into power the first time he found difficulties in the Southwest with the Indians. There had been difficulty there for many years. He sent for the Secretary of War, and he said, "I want an officer who can quiet affairs in Arizona." General Miles was sent there, and he did what other officers of great renown and reputation had failed to do. He compelled a peace that has lasted from that time to this. If there is any man in the public service to-day who deserves a recognition of this kind, it is the Major-General now commanding our Army.

To a soldier the question of rank is more important than to us civilians. We, brought up in the pursuits of peace, care but little about the name. To a soldier rank is everything. It is a recompense for deprivations and sufferings and services that he looks forward to with great and proper ambition. Why should we deny it? Why should we say that it is not republican? Should

we adhere to the notion that republican simplicity consists in low names and not in recognition of the services of our people? Not at all.

Mr. President, for many years it was one of the theories that republican simplicity required us to treat our ministers abroad as ministers and not as ambassadors. The official positions of American representatives, representing the greatest nation in the world, were such that when there was a pageant which they were obliged by the custom of the court to which they were accredited to attend, they were compelled to follow in rank the representatives of Haiti and governments of that size, simply because those petty governments had designated their ministers as ambassadors; which we declined to do.

Mr. President, there is not any republican simplicity in this method. These men are entitled to this rank. It costs us so little that it is a matter which no one need consider. It is a recompense for their services; and I repeat that there is no man in the Army and no man in public life who deserves this recognition more than the General now commanding our armies.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] alluded to the fact that the Confederacy had lieutenant-generals. That is true, but that was during war. What would have been done in time of peace, had the Confederacy succeeded, is another question. But though, during the war, we on the Confederate side had a lieutenant-general, on the Federal side there was, as I understand, no lieutenant-general at all until after the battles in 1863 or early in 1864, when General Grant alone was made a lieutenant-general, if I am not mistaken.

I will say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], in regard to the inducements to these men to make them excellent in their line, if there is one thing we should be careful about, to inspire energy and proper equipment for official place such as that of a lieutenant-general, a general, or a major-general, it is that we should keep these major-generals all upon a line except as to seniority, and let the one who shows himself to be the most efficient at least have a chance, through the assignment of the President, to take charge of the Army. That has been the course heretofore; it has been a success; and I see no reason why it should be changed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to have the amendment again stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is to strike out all of section 15 as amended.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], who seems to be absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BURROWS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CULBERSON (when Mr. CHILTON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CHILTON] is paired with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS].

Mr. ELKINS. Not on such a question as this. Our pair is a general pair.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. I take the liberty of transferring that pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who is absent, and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KENNEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN]. I do not see him present, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I have a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD]. I understand he has not voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Idaho has not voted.

Mr. PLATT of New York. If he were present, I should vote "nay;" but in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. Although I feel, under my agreement with him, that I have the liberty to vote, I prefer not to do so.

Mr. RAWLINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR. I would ask the Senator from Utah if we can not transfer our pair so that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] will stand paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], which will enable the Senator from Utah and myself to vote, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. BERRY. I suggest that that would simply give two votes to one side, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] says he would vote "nay." That is a kind of pairing I do not understand.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator is not paired——

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator from Massachusetts will excuse me, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. The Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] announces that if at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay." The Senator from Vermont would also vote "nay." The result would be that there would be two negative votes and the Senator from Florida would be left unpaired.

Mr. HOAR. There is nobody with whom that Senator would be paired on this vote; and the two votes "nay" would not change the result.

Mr. BERRY. That is a question for the Senator from Vermont to settle, not for the Senator from Massachusetts or myself either.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

Mr. RAWLINS. I am paired, as I have announced, with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TURLEY], who is necessarily absent from the city. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON], who is absent. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BERRY. My colleague [Mr. JONES of Arkansas] is necessarily absent from the Senate to-day. I think that he has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. ELKINS. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], under a misapprehension, announced my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON], who is absent. That is a general pair on political questions. I do not regard this as a political question, and I desire to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BURROWS. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY] that he transfer his pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY], so that we may both vote, if agreeable to him.

Mr. KENNEY. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BURROWS. Then I vote "nay."

Mr. KENNEY. I vote "yea."

Mr. PROCTOR. With the consent of the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS], I transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA], so that the Senator from Utah and I may both vote.

Mr. RAWLINS. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. PROCTOR. I vote "nay."

Mr. RAWLINS. I vote "nay."

Mr. LINDSAY. I will ask the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] if he knows how his colleague, if present, would vote on this question?

Mr. BURROWS. I think, if present, my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. LINDSAY. I announce that if I had the right to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. BURROWS. I will take the responsibility of saying that my colleague would vote "nay," if present.

Mr. LINDSAY. Then I vote "nay."

Mr. HALE. I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. It is a very liberal kind of a pair. It goes on the presumption that each Senator may vote when he pleases. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas or I has announced that pair on the floor of the Senate in the last two years, either of us in the absence of the other, in all a half dozen times. On all party matters we look out for each other. I do not notify the Senator from Arkansas when I am to leave the Chamber nor does he notify me. We have a pair that leaves it discretionary; we have a pair of such a nature that it prevents what is constantly occurring here—that lack of a quorum by Senators announcing pairs upon matters which are not party matters and thus suspending the action of the body. I had a similar pair for years with the late distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Beck, and, after that, with Senator Ransom, of North Carolina.

I was absent the other day when very important matters came up, not on party lines, and the Senator from Arkansas voted, as

he ought to have voted; and I voted on that consideration to-day; but if his colleague says that my pair desires in this case that I shall announce the pair, I shall certainly do so.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I have no desire in the world that the Senator shall announce the pair, but I thought it due to my colleague [Mr. JONES of Arkansas] to announce how he would vote on this question if he were present, and I said he would vote "yea." As a matter of course, I have no objection in the world as to the Senator from Maine voting. His vote does not affect the result in any way, and even if the pair were not the kind of a pair the Senator has stated, he would have a perfect right to vote. I make no kind of objection, but I wanted it to go on record that if my colleague were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HALE. That, of course, is very proper; and I will let my vote in the negative stand.

Mr. BATE. In that connection I beg to say that my colleague [Mr. TURLEY], whose pair has been announced, if present would vote "yea."

Mr. BACON. I desire to inquire if any Senator on the other side of the Chamber is authorized to give an assurance as to how the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE] would vote on this question if present?

Mr. ALLISON. I think I can give the assurance that the Senator desires.

Mr. BACON. I desire to know how the junior Senator from Rhode Island would vote if present?

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt the junior Senator from Rhode Island, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. BACON. If I can act upon that assurance, I desire to vote; and I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. When the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] left the city he requested that I should announce that he has a standing pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. SIMON. I desire to announce that if my colleague [Mr. MCBRIDE] were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. BEVERIDGE] is unavoidably absent from the Senate.

Mr. MONEY (after voting in the affirmative). The Senator from Oregon [Mr. SIMON] has announced that if his colleague [Mr. MCBRIDE] were present he would vote "nay." I am paired with that Senator and have voted "yea." I did so because we were paired only upon political subjects. If this is a political question, I will withdraw my vote, but I do not consider it such.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator will not withdraw his vote. I do not think it is a party question.

Mr. MONEY. I desire to protect my pair; but we have a distinct understanding that either may vote in the absence of the other on any but political questions.

Mr. SIMON. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that if he desires to vote on this question he is at liberty to do so; and I think it will be perfectly agreeable to my colleague.

Mr. MONEY. Very well. Then I will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 44; as follows:

YEAS—8.

Bate,	Butler,	Culberson,	Money,
Berry,	Clay,	Kenney,	Vest.

NAYS—44.

Allison,	Foraker,	Kean,	Proctor,
Bacon,	Foster,	Kyle,	Quarles,
Baker,	Frye,	Lindsay,	Rawlins,
Bard,	Gallinger,	Lodge,	Ross,
Burrows,	Gear,	McComas,	Sewell,
Chandler,	Hale,	Mason,	Shoup,
Cockrell,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Simon,
Davis,	Harris,	Perkins,	Stewart,
Deboe,	Hawley,	Pettigrew,	Teller,
Elkins,	Hoar,	Pettus,	Wellington,
Fairbanks,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—35.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	McMillan,	Sullivan,
Allen,	Depew,	Mallory,	Taliaferro,
Beveridge,	Hanna,	Martin,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Heitfeld,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Carter,	Jones, Ark.	Penrose,	Turley,
Chilton,	McBride,	Platt, N. Y.	Turner,
Clark, Mont.	McCumber,	Pritchard,	Warren,
Clark, Wyo.	McEnery,	Scott,	Wetmore.
Cullom,	McLaurin,	Spooner,	

So the amendment of Mr. BERRY was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. KENNEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to come in on page 7, line 18, after the word "transfer."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, in line 18, after the word "transfer," it is proposed to insert:

That the Veterinary Corps shall consist of—

A chief veterinarian with the rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel, United States Army.

An assistant chief veterinarian with the rank, pay, and allowances of a major, United States Army, to be promoted in 1905, after competitive satisfactory examination, from the grade of veterinarian and captain.

Four veterinarians with the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain of cavalry, to be promoted in 1903, after competitive satisfactory examination, from the grade of assistant veterinarian and first lieutenant.

Ten assistant veterinarians with the rank, pay, and allowances of a first lieutenant of cavalry, to be promoted, after satisfactory examination, from the grade of assistant veterinarian and second lieutenant after one year's service in this grade.

Twenty assistant veterinarians with the rank, pay, and allowances of a second lieutenant of cavalry, to be appointed after satisfactory examination: *Provided*, That these twenty positions shall include the veterinarians, first class, provided for in the act of March 2, 1899, who have passed satisfactory examinations, and also the six veterinarians, second class, who are now employed in the Army under said act of March 2, 1899.

All rules and regulations governing the Veterinary Corps shall be made by the Secretary of War, and the chief veterinarian shall report directly to that officer.

For pay of officers of the Veterinary Corps, $33,500.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate at any length by remarks on the amendment which I have just offered.

In any scheme for the reorganization of the Army of the United States there is no question that deserves more consideration than does that of a properly organized and commissioned veterinary corps. This country is alone in all the world in maintaining a great army without a properly organized and commissioned veterinary corps. In our Army to-day veterinarians are nothing more than civilian employees, hired from day to day, without any responsibility, and practically without authority.

The amendment which has just been read would increase the expense necessary to that corps over what is to-day being expended for the civilian service not more than $6,000, while it would give to the service a corps commissioned and with all the responsibilities and with all the powers that go to commissioned officers.

I fail to understand what legitimate objection can be urged to the substitution in the Army of the United States of a corps like the one proposed by the amendment just read for that which to-day obtains in our service.

I have made a statement of the strength of the armies of the leading countries of the world, together with the number of veterinarians employed in those armies, which is as follows:

Staffs of various armies, January, 1899.

Country.	Strength, active army.	Medical officers.	Strength, cavalry.	Veterinary officers.
Austria-Hungary	305,735	1,385	47,380	180
Belgium	51,302	150	6,064	35
Denmark	13,734	55	1,390	14
France	617,959	1,485	80,048	*a* 432
Great Britain	222,301	1,580	17,586	136
Greece	24,076	(*a*)	4,877	(*a*)
Holland	78,093	184	4,193	(*b*)
Italy	230,760	691	23,507	189
Japan	87,560	(*b*)	3,500	(*b*)
Prussia	443,516	(*c*)	53,270	(*d*)
Roumania	127,984	73	16,053	44
Russia	868,672	(*c*)	90,000	(*c*)
Spain	128,153	793	14,376	236
Sweden	38,854	(*c*)	5,269	(*c*)
Switzerland	144,822	(*c*)	3,972	(*c*)
Turkey	276,000	(*c*)	21,800	(*c*)
United States	100,000			(*e*)

a Increased in 1899 to 603.—*Thierartz-Wochenschrift.*

b Number not given.

c Classification given by corps, division, brigade, and regimental staffs; to each of which medical officers and veterinarians are attached.

d Increased in 1899 to 501.—*Thierartz-Wochenschrift.*

e Irregular number of civilian employees.

And so, without reading this list, Mr. President, I may say every civilized country in the world does maintain, organized and commissioned, a proper veterinary corps.

Mr. President, in support of my amendment, I desire to have incorporated as a part of my remarks letters from distinguished officers of our Army, beginning with General Merritt. I will not read the letters now. They are from Gen. John R. Brooke; Gen. James H. Wilson; Gen. J. C. Breckenridge; Gen. Wallace F. Randolph, colonel of the First Artillery; Gen. Charles King, formerly captain of the Fifth Cavalry, now brigadier-general, United States Volunteers; Col. O. L. Hein, lieutenant-colonel of cavalry and commandant of cadets; Gen. James A. Beaver, ex-governor of Pennsylvania; J. G. C. Lee, colonel and assistant quartermaster-general, United States Army; Col. D. D. Wheeler, deputy quartermaster-general, and Maj. John W. Pullman, quartermaster, United States Army. All of these officers have not only approved this by word, but have written strong letters favoring the establishment of such a corps.

The letters referred to are as follows:

[From Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt.]

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE EAST,
Governors Island, New York City, February 15, 1900.

SIR: In reply to your inquiry, I have the honor to state that I am heartily in favor of the organization of a veterinary corps for the United States Army.

The need of a properly organized corps has long been recognized, especially by officers whose service has been with mounted troops. The cost of such a corps would be small, compared with the increase in the efficiency of the animals of the mounted and transportation services, and the value of what it would save to the Government. To make such a corps properly effective, the veterinarians composing it should of course have commissioned rank.

While I favor the establishment of an adequate veterinary service, I desire it to be understood that I am unalterably opposed to any legislation that would tend to increase the number of bureaus in the War Department.

Very respectfully,

W. MERRITT,
Major-General, United States Army.

Col. R. S. HUIDEKOPER,
Hotel Chamberlin, Washington, D. C.

[From Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke.]

HEADQUARTERS DIVISION OF CUBA,
Habana, December 4, 1899.

DEAR COLONEL: Replying to your communication of the 26th ultimo, relative to the establishment of a veterinary service in our Army, I desire to inform you that I have given this subject much consideration and thought in the past, and am greatly interested in the data you have collected from Europe, as well as your own views as set forth in the documents forwarded to me. I have always favored more scientific care of our Army transportation as well as cavalry mounts, and believe it would be to the interest of the Government to establish a veterinary corps on the lines set out by you.

All efforts heretofore set forth in this direction seem to have failed, but the results of the last war and the large, possibly unnecessary, loss of animals for want of proper care, would seem to make this a proper time to bring the matter up for the consideration of Congress. I assure you I am heartily in sympathy with your project and would be glad to see it successful. As to the details of the bill, I can not give my opinion, as I have no time to study them, but you are at liberty to mention me as an advocate for the establishment of a proper veterinary corps for our Army.

Very respectfully,

JOHN R. BROOKE, *Major-General.*

Col. RUSH S. HUIDEKOPER,
Hotel Bellevue, Philadelphia, Pa.

[From Maj. Gen. James H. Wilson.]

HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF MATANZAS AND SANTA CLARA,
Matanzas, Cuba, January 2, 1900.

MY DEAR COLONEL: Replying to your letter of November 26, in reference to the establishment of a veterinary service in our Army, I take great pleasure in saying, from an extended experience as a commander of cavalry and from my observations as a corps commander of infantry, that there is no branch of the service so neglected as that of veterinary science and attention to the animals used in connection with the Army.

I heartily join in giving my commendation to the measure which is proposed in reference to the organization of a permanent veterinary corps as a part of the war establishment of the United States. Every encouragement should be given to this branch of the service. The officers should be duly commissioned, have promotion in their own corps, and be paid as high salaries as the corresponding grades in the Medical Department. They should of course be rigidly examined, not only for admission into the service, but for each promotion which might be made in their own corps.

Trusting that Congress will give favorable attention to this matter, and that you will pardon the delay in replying, I am,

Very truly, yours,

J. H. WILSON,
Brigadier-General Volunteers.

Col. RUSH S. HUIDEKOPER,
Hotel Bellevue, Philadelphia.

[From Brig. Gen. J. C. Breckinridge.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, INSPECTOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 18, 1899.

DEAR COLONEL: Your lettter of the 16th instant has been received.

The establishment of a corps of veterinary surgeons to render systematic veterinary service in the Army would, I think, be of much value to all branches affected. I wish you every success in your undertaking. It is a matter of growing importance.

Very truly, yours,

J. C. BRECKINRIDGE.

Col. RUSH S. HUIDEKOPER,
1120 Vermont avenue, Washington, D. C.

[From Brig. Gen. Wallace F. Randolph.]

NEW YORK, *December 15, 1899.*

MY DEAR HUIDEKOPER: I am glad to learn that there is a movement on foot to establish a veterinary corps in the Army upon something like a practical basis. Every other country appears to have appreciated the necessity for thoroughly educated veterinarians, and I have for years seen the fallacy of our system. Not alone do we require competent men to care for the health of Government animals, but they should be qualified to lecture intelligently upon the subject of hippology to officers and enlisted men, the majority of whom have little or no knowledge upon the subject.

During the six years that I was in command of the Light Artillery School at Fort Riley, Kans., we had two veterinary surgeons, both graduates of good schools, stationed there, and while they were what might be called good "horse doctors," they utterly lacked ability to impart their knowledge to others. I believe that a course of instruction at West Point is absolutely essential to fit officers of the cavalry and light artillery not only to care for but also to select the animals to be purchased for the service. It would effect a great saving to the Government, and be an additional safeguard against dishonest dealers.

Sincerely, yours,

WALLACE F. RANDOLPH,
Colonel First Artillery.

[From Brig. Gen. Charles King.]

MILWAUKEE, *January 2, 1900.*

MY DEAR COLONEL HUIDEKOPER: I am really glad to hear that you have so earnestly taken up the matter of the establishment of a veterinary corps for service in our Army.

In my years on the frontier in the cavalry as well as the two years or more that I spent with Light Battery K, of the First Artillery, I was constantly impressed with the need of skilled veterinarians. As you say, it is not only necessary to have men who can practice, but those who can teach, and until we have such a corps as you contemplate our mounted forces will continue to be seriously handicapped in the future as they have been in the past. I wish you every success.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES KING.
Formerly Captain Fifth Cavalry and Brigadier-General, U. S. V.

[From Col. O. L. Hein, commandant of cadets.]

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES CORPS OF CADETS,
West Point, N. Y., November 30, 1899.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 25th ultimo, inclosing your paper on "Army veterinary service," read at the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the Army Veterinary Medical Association, New York, September, 1899, I have the honor to say that I am heartily in accord with the views expressed therein on the necessity of a proper veterinary corps in our Army and your proposed organization of same.

In my opinion it is very important that each cavalry regiment should have two veterinary officers, the light batteries a suitable number, and the Military Academy, the Leavenworth and Riley service schools each one, and an additional number be available for service with remount purchase boards, and a school of farriery (which should be established), etc.

The subject of hippology has been given some attention here, as much as the limited time available for such instruction permits, and I hope to be able to extend the scope of this very necessary instruction next summer.

Wishing you success in your laudable efforts to obtain for the Army the much-needed corps of veterinary surgeons, I remain,

Yours, faithfully,

O. L. HEIN,
Lieutenant-Colonel of Cavalry, Commandant of Cadets.

Dr. RUSH S. HUIDEKOPER.

[From Gen. James A. Beaver, ex-governor of Pennsylvania.]

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
JUDGES' CHAMBERS,
Philadelphia, Pa., December 8, 1899.

I am greatly interested in the effort now being made to provide a scientific and practical veterinary department for the Army. Important as such a department is at all times, it becomes an absolute necessity in view of Army operations in the West Indies and in the Pacific islands, where our animals for the cavalry and transportation department are unacclimated and require the most careful professional attention.

* * * * * * *

Very respectfully, JAMES A. BEAVER.

[From Col. J. G. C. Lee, assistant quartermaster-general.]

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE LAKES,
OFFICE OF CHIEF QUARTERMASTER,
Chicago, Ill., December 11, 1899.

MY DEAR COLONEL: Yours of December 5, enclosing your address on "Army veterinary service" before the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the American Veterinary Medical Association, last September, has been received. In reply I beg to say that I regard the establishment of a systematic veterinary service in the Army of great value. Such a system should be broad enough to provide a corps for the needs of the cavalry and artillery and the Quartermaster's Department.

On reading your proposed bill I am of the opinion that it should allow more rank to the officers. The senior veterinarian for a regiment should be at least a captain and his assistant a first lieutenant. And I think it will be well to add one officer, say, with the grade of major, who should be the inspector of the veterinary service.

I wish you every success in the creation of this branch of the service, and if created, I should be very glad to see you placed at the head of it.

Very sincerely, yours,

J. G. C. LEE,
Colonel and Assistant Quartermaster-General, U. S. A.

Col. RUSH HUIDEKOPER,
Washington, D. C.

[From Col. D. D. Wheeler, deputy quartermaster-general.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, DEPOT QUARTERMASTER'S OFFICE,
St. Louis, Mo., December 13, 1899.

MY DEAR COLONEL: Your letter of the 5th instant, with inclosure, was duly received.

I have followed your efforts and those of the veterinarians of the Army and others in civil life, always hoping that you might succeed in getting Congress to pass an act giving the veterinarians in the Army the rank of commissioned officers.

I would not have a separate corps like the Adjutant-General or Commissary-General, as you suggest, but would have the veterinary surgeons a division of the Quartermaster's Department, to consist of a lieutenant-colonel, a major, and such number of captains, first and second lieutenants, and citizen veterinarians on probation as the authorities may determine, who would be assigned to stations and duties upon the orders of the Secretary of War.

Appointments to the original vacancies and promotions to fill vacancies in each grade to be made according to existing law after a careful examination. The citizen veterinarians to serve two years on probation, when they would be examined and appointed to fill vacancies in the lower grade.

One could cover pages with arguments for commissioning veterinary surgeons.

* * * * * * *

With all good wishes, I am, truly, yours,

D. D. WHEELER,
Deputy Quartermaster-General, United States Army.

Col. RUSH SHIPPEN HUIDEKOPER,
Hotel Chamberlin, Washington, D. C.

[From Maj. John W. Pullman.]

QUARTERMASTER'S OFFICE, JEFFERSONVILLE DEPOT
OF THE QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT,
Jeffersonville, Ind., December 23, 1899.

DEAR COLONEL HUIDEKOPER: I am heartily in accord with your efforts looking toward the organization of a veterinary corps for our Army. Over thirty years' service as a commissioned officer of the mounted branches of the service enable me to speak with some knowledge on this most important matter. Never once in any phase of my duties as a cavalry officer on the

frontier for fifteen years, and as a quartermaster having the care of stock for fifteen other years, have I been free from the anxieties which my responsibilities as in charge of public animals have thrust on me, and which were caused by the daily need of skilled veterinary assistance.

I have seen horse after horse, mule after mule ruined and lost because efficient veterinary help was not available at the proper time. I have seen numbers of animals killed by the ignorant treatment of our so-called veterinary surgeons; "horse carpenters," our men derisively called them. But they were the best our laws of organization enabled us to have. The salary was small, the social and official position galling and unsatisfactory, and graduates of ambition, skill, and fidelity would not take the positions. There were some few exceptions under my observation, but very few. We were and are generally forced to depend on company farriers, enlisted men—horseshoers—selected for supposed knowledge of animals, acquired almost entirely by experience.

I have witnessed often ridiculous and lamentable results of this crude veterinary department. I recall an instance where one of our "horse carpenters" considered it necessary to give a valuable horse an injection. He applied the syringe to the rectum with such force and ignorance of the anatomy that the point of the syringe perforated the intestine, and the poor animal, in his muscular efforts to relieve himself, ejected the small intestines until they protruded and hung down a couple of feet; the animal had to be killed. Again, another "farrier" on the frontier, when asked what he administered to a sick horse, replied: "Oh, I give him the proper medicine." When pressed to name the remedy he had given, replied that he had given him the remedy marked for the trouble, but it had a Latin name, and he didn't know what it meant. And so on. The troubles we had in caring properly for our stock can be imagined. As remarked before, the pay, official and social status offered veterinary surgeons under existing laws do not attract the proper men, and we can not get them in emergency when needed.

During the late war with Spain we felt the need of competent veterinarians seriously. In Tampa, not having any for the Fourth Army Corps, I tried to get two from civil life in Mobile for the corps quartermasters, and could only get one to accept the job, and this after the most strenuous exertions and pleading. For my own use, in care of the quartermaster's depot stock, I had to satisfy myself with a "horse carpenter" to take with me to Porto Rico, and while chief quartermaster, Department of Porto Rico, after the occupancy of the island by our forces in August, 1898, I fell in charge of some 3,000 head of public animals. I had not a single veterinary surgeon to depend on. The animals were all more or less broken down by injury and disease, and, worst of all, glanders appeared in the corrals.

I had to send to the United States finally and have four veterinary surgeons sent to me. The delay was expensive. We lost hundreds of valuable animals.

Had we had a proper veterinary corps or department much money would have been saved and the military machine have been much more effective. War may be likened to a huge living monster, one of whose main arteries of efficient, successful, working life is its transportation and mount. The animals pertaining to an army should be well and properly and intelligently cared for and kept in working condition. This is essential. The general is indeed hampered who has a broken-down wagon and pack train, a corps of disabled animals for his mounted force.

I consider an army organization seriously incomplete without an efficient veterinary corps. Modern European armies have them; why should not the United States? We are modern and progressive and leading in all military matters, skill, and competency; why should we be behind in this?

Our veterinary corps, to be efficient, should be complete, and it can not be complete unless it is independent. Therefore it should be a separate corps—like the Medical Corps, the quartermaster's corps and the other separate and independent staff corps—necessary for a complete working military establishment. It should have a head, a professionally skilled, intelligent, directing, responsible head. Its members should be graduated veterinary surgeons and commissioned officers. They should be commissioned officers because of their constant close dealing and intercourse with enlisted men and camp followers, and their need, therefore, of a commissioned status to enable them to enforce, under military laws, their responsible, serious duties. There should be, in my judgment, no veterinarian with the grade of noncommissioned officer or any other enlisted or civil status, for if there were, there would be no improvement over present conditions, and present evils would still obtain. To make the corps efficient there should be in it a sufficient number of veterinarians to admit of the assignment of two to each mounted regiment in the field, one to every military post having stock, one to each depot of transportation of animals, and one to each depot for purchase and care of stock, and the necessary number to each stock hospital.

The separate and independent organization is necessary to enable its chief to intelligently and effectively direct individual assignment of members of his corps to positions, stations, and duties fitting the special skill, experience, and reputation of each member, and permitting useful changes and transfers when necessity arises and the needs of the service and altering circumstances develop. In no other way and under no other system can this be advantageously accomplished.

I trust the bill you have outlined will be speedily passed into law. It would be a most desirable consummation for the certain substantial good and improvement of our military establishment.

I am, very truly, yours,

JNO. W. PULLMAN,
Major and Quartermaster, United States Army.

RUSH S. HUIDEKOPER, M. D.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. KENNEY. An amendment offered by me to the Army appropriation bill and also one offered to the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] went to the Committee on Military Affairs, but had no consideration, as I understand. I now propose this amendment to this bill, which, I understand, is for the reorganization of the Army and for the betterment of the service. If its title means anything, then there is no branch or arm of the service that needs more consideration than does the Veterinary Corps.

I hope that Senators in passing upon this question will take into consideration that in the establishment of this corps it is not going to cost the Government of the United States a sum larger by more than $6,000 than that which is to-day being paid for the kind of service the Government is receiving.

In this connection I might say that there are not to-day in the Army service veterinarians who are able to give that consideration and examination to the great question of Army foods that are required. Many will remember the very disagreeable criticism that was passed upon the administration of our Army during the Spanish-American war in regard to the food that was furnished to our armies. I desire to say—and I believe it to be true—that if we then had a commissioned veterinary corps under proper regulations, that criticism would never have been had.

It is fresh in the minds of many Senators what great loss the Government sustained in the death of the cavalry and artillery horses stationed in Florida. That loss was largely due to the lack of veterinary treatment. In the United States to-day the value of army animals is so large that it seems to me any legislation which would aid in the preservation and protection of the property of the United States in these animals would be the strictest sort of economy.

I do not desire to go into a more extended argument in favor of this proposition.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I believe this is about as important a matter as any other connected with the Army. Having some knowledge of veterinarians in general, I think that that service ought to be improved. The men who are hired as veterinarians do not generally have such an education as would fit them to act in the examination and purchase of horses for the Government and in the care of such horses. The Government suffers great loss, and the Army is crippled and inefficient. On the mere matter of purchasing five or six or eight or ten thousand horses the Government will save more than the amount it would pay for a proper organization in the way of a veterinary corps to examine the horses.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator from Nevada allow me?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think the veterinarians are now examined. Their pay has been increased, so that the veterinarians of the first class receive $125 a month, the pay of an officer. Those of the second class receive $75 a month. I know it has been insisted upon for a long time that they should be graduates of veterinary colleges, and they are examined, I am sure, before they are taken into the service.

Mr. STEWART. It may be sufficiently provided for already, but my observation is to the contrary. I have heard a good deal of complaint in regard to it. I know that during the civil war the Government was largely imposed upon by the want of an experienced, organized veterinary force. If it is organized, then in order to make it efficient there should be an inducement to men of the first class to educate themselves, because in that regard a high standard of service is important to the efficiency of the Army. If it is thoroughly provided for, I have nothing further to say, although I know it is of great importance.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say to the Senator that there has been an entire change since the civil war. Then they had about the pay of a sergeant. Now those of the first class have the pay of a commissioned officer, a first lieutenant.

Mr. KENNEY. I desire to state that I understand there are but five or six veterinarians in the United States Army to-day who have passed an examination, and I think about three or four, not exceeding five, who are in the service by reason of long service, who failed to pass an examination.

Mr. FORAKER. I desire to ask the Senator having this bill in charge what is the distinction between the classes? The bill speaks of veterinarians of the first class and veterinarians of the second class.

Mr. PROCTOR. Those of the first class are those who have been longer in the service and are better entitled for that reason and for their proficiency to have that higher position. Of course that is open to the promotion of those of the second class.

Mr. FORAKER. It does not imply a difference, then, in the qualifications, I presume.

Mr. PROCTOR. Not necessarily.

Mr. FORAKER. All are supposed to be educated and capable and to have passed the examination, I presume.

Mr. KENNEY. I will ask the Senator in charge of the bill one question. That is, whether to-day there is or not a commissioned veterinarian in the United States Army?

Mr. PROCTOR. They are not commissioned officers. Those of the first class are paid the pay of a commissioned officer.

Mr. STEWART. Has this matter been considered by the Quartermaster's Department, which has particular connection with it? Has it been considered by the General of the Army or those having the matter particularly in charge? Have they been consulted in regard to this matter?

Mr. PROCTOR. This proposed amendment was before the Military Affairs Committee in the form of a bill, and was carefully considered, and I for one, and I think other members of the committee, visited the War Department and asked whether it was a thing desired for the Army, and they insisted that the present arrangement was entirely satisfactory.

Mr. COCKRELL obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator who insisted that that was the fact, inasmuch as almost all the higher officers of the

Army have written letters and personally have said that they desire this to be accomplished?

Mr. KENNEY rose.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator from Delaware, I am sure, has those letters in his possession.

Mr. KENNEY. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri was recognized.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, the Committee on Military Affairs considered the general bill creating this corps of veterinary surgeons and voted against recommending its passage. I am opposed to the amendment, and I wish to say to the Senate that they probably have very little conception of the pressure that is brought to bear upon the Committee on Military Affairs to create additional corps in the Army. There are proposed a veterinary corps with a colonel at the head of it, a dental corps with a colonel at the head of it, a nurse corps with a colonel at the head of it. All these have been attempted to be ingrafted onto the Army to create separate and independent corps, and the Committee on Military Affairs thus far has not deemed it necessary to make any of those additions.

We have not recommended a veterinary corps because we do not believe a corps organization for the veterinary service is necessary. We already have under existing law veterinarians, two for each regiment of cavalry, and have had ever since the 3d of March, 1899. They are provided for in the bill that was passed for the reorganization of the Army. One of them has the pay of a lieutenant and the other one has $75 per month. In this bill we create veterinarians for the horse artillery. I suppose there is no necessity that the heavy artillery should have veterinarians when they do not use horses.

There are two veterinarians of the first class and two of the second class, the first class receiving the pay of a lieutenant, the second class $75, and they shall have the pay and allowances of veterinarians of cavalry of corresponding classes. We think this is an ample provision for the veterinary service. As I understand it, these veterinarians to be appointed have to be examined by a board to be constituted by the Secretary of War. I know a number of veterinarians from Missouri who were seeking these places, and on presenting the applications to the War Department they said they would make no appointments—that was last spring—until they had adopted rules and regulations and a board for their examination. I have not asked whether that has been done or not, but I presume it is in operation to-day, and that every veterinarian who has been appointed since the passage of the act of 1899, or who will be appointed under the provisions of this bill, will be those who have passed a satisfactory examination. I doubt not that examination will require that they shall be graduates of a veterinarian institution of this country or Canada.

Mr. President, we can see no necessity for a colonel to have charge of veterinarians throughout the Army. Those two veterinarians to each regiment go with the regiment. They are there; the horses are there; they are there to attend to them; and in the artillery the veterinarians will be in the same way. We can not see any necessity for or any benefit or any advantage from this. The only thing, it seems to me, will be the creation of a few officers with rank and pay and the privilege of retirement, and I do not believe that is either fair or just. It is purely a civilian employment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I do not think the advocates of this amendment should be driven from its support because of the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri and others that opening the door to the appointment of a veterinarian staff would likewise lead to the appointment of a dental staff. It would not frighten me, for I recognize in the dental profession a body of educated and cultivated gentlemen whom I should be very glad to have represented with official rank in the armies of our country, especially since we are reaching out to distant colonies where treatment such as is obtained at home is impossible. But in the consideration of this amendment we need not dwell upon the possibilities of other open doors.

Mr. President, the fighting of this world, as is now being demonstrated in South Africa, is largely cavalry fighting. I think that it is becoming more and more evident to every student of wars, and if it is, there is no profession in the world that needs such encouragement and such advancement as that of the veterinarian, who can see that the horses of the Army are fit to fight with.

There is not another civilized country in the world that does not recognize veterinarians and give them commissions. It is true we have a few veterinarians. They are called farriers, I think, in the Army, and we put them down in the rank of privates or sergeants. We pay one of them, it is true, the salary of a first lieutenant, and we give the other $75 a month, but that does not compensate a man who is a member of an honorable and educated and an intelligent profession. As was said here this morning by my colleague in reference to another subject, it is the rank that counts. I think that a little consideration will convince every member of the Senate, who is not already convinced, of the great importance of the service which the professional veterinary renders and might still further render in the armies of the United States.

It is not alone in the treatment of the live stock of the Army. He deals also with the food that goes to our troops. He passes the meat on inspection. Every pound of fresh meat that is served to our soldiers passes under his intelligent inspection. All cattle that are bought upon the hoof and carried with the Army, to be killed as the necessity requires, must be treated by him; and any man who knows of the danger of contracting disease and sickness from diseased cattle can realize somewhat of the necessity that rests upon the Government to see that intelligent men deal with this question.

This Government has now, in times of peace, so far as its use of cavalry is concerned, more than $3,000,000 invested in horses and mules. Unintelligent shoeing, unintelligent acclimatization, unintelligent treatment, ignorance in the purchase of horses, not only costs us hundreds and may cost hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, but in time of war would lead to endless and disastrous consequences. In England the head of the service ranks as colonel. In Germany they enter as subordinate officers and are promoted as high as the rank of major. In France and Italy and every other country the veterinarian is recognized by his official title.

I tell you, Mr. President, this whole question is not, in the minds of those who are considering it, I fear, a question as to the necessity of the service and the necessity of the intelligence of it, but it is a question whether or not the man who is vulgarly called a horse doctor ought to associate with officers who may be graduates of West Point.

Mr. President, we do not realize the growth that has taken place in that profession. There are to-day veterinary surgeons graduates of every college and university in the United States. I know men graduates of Harvard University living in Massachusetts who are to-day devoting their lives to the veterinary service. If it were not for the presence here of distinguished alumni of Harvard University I would almost be inclined to say that the flower of the university largely went into the veterinary service. I know graduates of Princeton and other colleges who adorn the profession.

All these professions are matters of growth and slow growth. To-day the medical profession is recognized as one of the noblest and best and most sacrificing methods by which a man may devote his life to the cause of his country. It is not a hundred years since skilled physicians used to prescribe powdered snail shells for disease and certain herbs plucked at a certain stage of the moon's phases. There are to-day men traveling around in some of the Southern and Western States, physicians admitted to the profession, with madstones in their pockets to cure hydrophobia. The profession is a noble profession, and it is growing, and it is recognized, and we are proud to have our brothers and our relatives and our friends members of it.

So the veterinary profession is growing, and if it be noble to devote one's self to ameliorating human suffering, it is greater and nobler in some respects to devote your life to the amelioration and the relief of the sufferings of dumb animals. That is what is going on in the profession to-day. Men from colleges and universities come out from them intending to devote their lives to the welfare of mankind and the advancement of the world. They find their mission in looking after the dumb animals who can not tell their sufferings, and in trying to make them better able to bear the burdens which man puts upon them.

I say, Mr. President, that it is not fair to relegate these men as farriers and put them in as noncommissioned servants. An American officer is a gentleman by his conduct and not by his designation. The skilled veterinarians of the Army are as much entitled to the rank of officers as West Point men are, if they are gentlemen and fill the duties they are called upon to perform. The officers of the Army do not object to associating with them. From General Sheridan's time to now there has been an earnest effort by every general who has ever fought with cavalry to have the veterinarians recognized as an official branch of the service. I am surprised to hear the Senator from Vermont say that he made a call on the War Department and found somebody in charge there opposed to it. For one, I should be glad to know who it is at the War Department who does not think a veterinarian ought to have the official rank and pay and be entitled to associate officially with other officers of the Army.

So I say all of us recognizing the usefulness of this profession, all of us recalling the fact that the officers of the Army do not object to the veterinarians having name and rank and place as officers of the Army, we can afford to give them the title and the rank, and it means no increase of appropriation.

Mr. PROCTOR. That the Senate may understand the present

provision I will read a line or two from the act of March 2, 1899, in regard to veterinarians:

Provided, That the veterinarian appointed to the first grade shall not be so appointed until he shall have passed an examination, to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, as to his physical, moral, and professional qualifications.

Now, in regard to this matter, I will say that a bill precisely like the amendment, as I understand it, came before the Military Affairs Committee, and came through the War Department. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] wishes to know what officials there oppose it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. PROCTOR. It came through the War Department strongly indorsed, as I recall it (I will have the indorsements in a few minutes), and with the indorsement of the Secretary against the creation of this corps.

I will also say that it seems to me that this bill is not the proper place for this question to be tried. This bill only increases the field artillery, which is the only force that would require veterinarians, by what is the equivalent of a regiment and a half, and four veterinarians are appointed for that force, more than there would be for the same number of cavalry. When there is a general reorganization and increase of the cavalry, of course there will be a large increase; and it seems to me it would be more appropriate to be considered then.

I will say that all the officers at West Point are instructed very carefully in the care and treatment of diseases of the horse, of course.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, there has been an effort for two or three years past, last year particularly, on the part of private gentlemen outside to create this corps. I have never known any measure brought before Congress that had so much manufactured support from outside to further it. It proposes to create a colonel, a major, 4 captains, 10 first lieutenants, 20 second lieutenants—36 additions to the veterinary corps of the Army, now consisting of 20. One is to have the rank, pay, and allowance of a second lieutenant and one that of sergeant-major. The Army has existed——

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from New Jersey allow me to ask him a question? How many men would these officers whom he has just enumerated have under their command?

Mr. SEWELL. There are ten regiments of cavalry.

Mr. LODGE. I mean how many men would be in the corps?

Mr. SEWELL. Thirty-six.

Mr. LODGE. They are all officers?

Mr. SEWELL. Yes; they are all officers.

Mr. HALE. Just as surgeons are all officers.

Mr. SEWELL. I want to say, from long experience in connection with cavalry, that the veterinarian of the cavalry is the captain of the troop. He is the man who knows the condition of his horses. He has been in the cavalry fifteen years—seven or eight years as second lieutenant, seven or eight as first lieutenant—before he becomes a captain. He knows more by reason of his study, and we have the most advanced books on that science; and as his life depends upon his horses and upon having them in good condition, there is no man more interested than the commanding officer of the troop. He is delegated often to buy his own horses by reason of his knowledge; some more, some less.

But he ought not to be interfered with by a lot of youngsters who come out from a college, where they have been taught to dissect, but whose knowledge is not of a particle of use to the troop. The old veterinarian, commencing with the farrier, has forgotten more than he would learn of the care of the horse, not in the dissecting of his foot in case it is broken, not in scraping his kidneys or his liver, something that is of no use, because you can not resurrect a horse after he has broken his leg. He has to go down.

Mr. President, this is just an attempt to legislate 36 officers, a new corps, into the Army, without the desire of the Army, without the sanction of the Secretary of War, without any indorsement except the gentlemen who want to fill the positions, very nice ones, to be sure, but without any necessity, in any sense. They tell us that the armies of Europe all have veterinarians. They have. They have a great many other things we do not want. It would pay the English Government to send over here and get forty of fifty or a hundred farriers to go down there and save their horses now from the veterinarians who graduated from their colleges. We have no use for this. As I say, it is the desire of some gentlemen to have commissions. That is all it is.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President, in reply to the discussion as to who favors it, or whether there is an indorsement of this amendment by the War Department, I desire to say that from General Miles down, including every head of a bureau in the War Department—I mean the Quartermaster-General, the Inspector-General, General Miles himself, and others whom I can not now call to mind—they have stood ready and willing to indorse to the Secretary of War, or to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate or the House, this proposed legislation if an opportunity had been given to them so to indorse. But on no occasion has the Secretary of War or the Adjutant-General or the Assistant Secretary of War, or, as I understand it, the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, called upon General Miles or the Quartermaster-General or the Inspector-General or any of these officers to whom I refer to know whether or not they do or do not indorse this proposed legislation.

On the contrary, I have here introduced as a part of my remarks, letters from General Brooke and other Army officers, too lengthy to read, but which will be printed in the RECORD to-morrow, showing that they do, outside of the indorsement to the Secretary of War or the Committee on Military Affairs, heartily and fully indorse this scheme. That is true all the way down from General Sheridan's time, and had it not been for his untimely death I have not the slightest doubt but that to-day, and long ago, we would have had in the Army of the United States a properly organized and commissioned veterinary corps.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] speaks of the interference of these young men of the veterinary corps with the captain of the troop. That can not be so. He will be the commander of the troop, company, or battery, and these men will have the same relations with him that the surgeons in the Army have. There has been no contention that there is friction between the surgeons or assistant surgeons in the Army and the colonels commanding the regiments and the captains of companies or troops or batteries. Then why should there be more friction between these commissioned officers, if they should be made so, than in the case I have referred to in the Medical Department? There will be none.

I desire, in order to show just what great amount of money the United States has invested in Army animals, to read a table from the annual report of the Quartermaster-General of the United States Army in 1899, showing the purchase during the year from July 1, 1898, to June 1, 1899, which was practically after the close of the Spanish war:

	Number.	Total cost.	Average per head.
Cavalry horses	2,094	$219,727.17	$104.94
Artillery horses	775	96,374.04	124.35
Riding horses	176	22,730.00	129.15
Draft horses	15	2,496.50	166.43
Pack horses	71	3,595.00	50.63
Bell horses	1	50.00	50.00
Draft mules	3,834	416,131.50	108.54
Pack mules	301	28,294.00	94.00
Oxen	16	1,600.00	100.00
Total	7,283	790,998.21	

There remained on hand at the close of the fiscal year, June 30, 1899, 12,622 horses and 13,158 mules, valued at over $2,500,000.

I addition to this enormous investment in animals for the cavalry, artillery, and transportation, the Army purchases large quantities of animal food, the quality of which requires inspection.

To show exactly the difference that there will be in the organization of a commissioned corps from that which we have to-day, in cost and number of officers, I desire to submit the following:

For the first year under this amendment, should it become a law, there would be 1 colonel, at $3,500 a year; 20 second lieutenants, with salaries amounting to $30,000; 14 quartermaster veterinarians, at salaries amounting to $25,200; making $58,700, as against the present system of $51,000, or a difference after the first year, should the amendment be enacted into law, of $7,700.

Now, if you will examine the amendment you will find that there will be a difference after the first year, by promotion from one to the other of the ranks, of more than a thousand dollars. The amendment after the first year would provide for a colonel and 4 captains, 10 first lieutenants, and 20 second lieutenants. That would be a corps consisting of 35, at a cost per annum to the Government of $57,500. The present system after the first year would be 15 civilian quartermaster employees, at $150 a month, or $27,000 per annum; 10 senior veterinarians, at a cost of $15,000 per annum; and 10 junior veterinarians, at a cost of $9,000 per annum; making $51,000 that the present system will cost the Government against $57,500 after the first year under this organized and commissioned veterinarian corps, or a difference of $6,500.

Now, can it be successfully contended that there can be, in a comparison of service to the Army, that one is equal to that of the other? It can not be so. It would be as right to contend that there is no need for a first and second lieutenant in the companies of infantry, the troops of cavalry, and batteries of artillery. They might be noncommissioned officers, if you please. There is no more sense in the one contention than in the other. The gentlemen who go into the Army of the United States and pass the examination required under the provision of this amendment are the sons of gentlemen throughout the country, men who are graduates of the greatest and best universities and colleges in the

United States, and they stand shoulder to shoulder as gentlemen and as educated men with any man who comes from West Point or from any other walk of life.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, in regard to the reference of this question, I will state that it is not customary for the Committee on Military Affairs to consult all the officers of the Department. There is a regular channel. Bills are referred to the Secretary, and he calls on such officers as have to deal with the subject for their reports. When this bill was before the committee it was referred in the usual course to the War Department, and I will read the indorsement of the Secretary:

WAR DEPARTMENT, *March 26, 1900.*

Respectfully returned to the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, calling attention to the foregoing indorsement.

The foregoing indorsement was that of the Adjutant-General, of course, and was largely quotations from the law, showing that the veterinarians were increased in importance by the act of March 2, 1899. The Adjutant-General says:

The act of March 2, 1899, "For increasing the efficiency of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes," provides (section 2) for two veterinarians in each cavalry regiment, one with the pay and allowances of a second lieutenant of cavalry and one with pay at the rate of $75 per month and the allowances of a sergeant-major, and provides "that the veterinarian appointed to the first grade shall not be so appointed until he shall have passed an examination, to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, as to his physical, moral, and professional qualifications;" and "*Provided further*, That the veterinarians now in service who do not pass such competitive examination shall be eligible to the position of the second class under such rules as are now prescribed by the regulations."

Upon full consideration of the subject at the time it was believed that this provision would provide for efficient veterinarian service for the cavalry regiments.

Now, the Secretary of War says:

The Army is urgently in need of more artillery, more staff officers, and more line officers than it now has, and of more soldiers than it will have after the 30th of June, 1901, unless the fighting force of the permanent establishment shall be largely increased by Congress. No bill of this kind ought to pass until these matters of real importance have been provided for. If there is to be any increase, as there should be, it ought to be in the directions indicated. No such rank as is provided for by this bill ought under any circumstances to be given to the veterinary corps. If the country is willing to pay for more colonels and majors and captains, the money should be expended upon the fighting force of the Army to furnish opportunity for promotion to the hundreds of gallant fellows who have been enduring hardship and facing death on the battlefield.

Nor do I consider that a separate veterinary corps is desirable. There are already too many separate organizations reporting to the Secretary of War.

That, I believe, everybody will admit is a truism.

One of the evils of our organization is that of multiple command; that in every geographical or technical organization there are so many officers who are not commanded by the commander, but report directly to Washington.

This provides that the chief veterinarian shall report directly to the Secretary of War.

The result is that it is very difficult to fix responsibility as to the condition of anything, and there is a weakened sense of responsibility everywhere. The Secretary of War ought not to be responsible for the condition of the horses of a cavalry regiment; the colonel of the regiment should be held responsible for them, and the duties of veterinarian should be performed by men who are under his orders reporting to him, and not by members of a corps reporting separately to the Secretary of War. The bill is distinctly a step in the wrong direction, and I hope it will not receive favorable consideration. Due provision is made for veterinary service in the bill referred to by the Adjutant-General in the first indorsement hereon, to which I beg to invite the attention of the committee.

ELIHU ROOT, *Secretary of War.*

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that there is one very serious objection to this proposition. No one can deny the importance of veterinarians; no one can deny the importance of having well-educated men for those positions; but the objection to which I refer is the tendency to multiply civilian corps and then load them with rank. We have a civilian engineer in the Navy now with the rank of admiral, a man who never went to sea, whose duties are concerned in civil engineering in yards and docks, no doubt a most excellent officer. We have, if I am not mistaken, paymasters who carry so much rank that they can not go on a ship. There is a tendency to build up these civilian corps, to load them with rank, and then, of course, as has been pointed out in the letter of the Secretary of War, there is just so much less opportunity for the combatant force.

I think, Mr. President, it is a great mistake to go on with this multiplication of civilian corps with this high rank. Here is a whole corps of officers made, beginning with a colonel and coming down to some twenty second lieutenants. I do not think that we want to enter on the increase of the civilian corps attached to the Army and Navy. We ought to give the rank to the men who are in the fighting line, on the ships and on land, and not multiply it for all these various corps. If one comes in, that is a ground for another to come in. I do not believe we should get any better service by this method rather than by giving good veterinarians suitable pay and the recognition to which I freely admit their profession is entirely entitled. Give them a separate rating, if it is so desired, but do not put them in with a colonel at the head responsible only to the Secretary of War, making another conflict of authority in the organization of the Army.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single word. When the proposition was presented to the Senate to create a Lieutenant-General for the Army, we were told that it was important to have it done because European nations had lieutenant-generals in their armies. When this proposition is presented to the Senate, we are told by a distinguished member of the Military Committee and a distinguished soldier that we do not want to imitate the methods of European countries and that we could send over some of our farriers to the Transvaal to teach the educated veterinarians of England important lessons in taking care of their horses.

Now, Mr. President, I do not apprehend that that is so. The fact is, as I understand it, that every army in continental Europe has a corps of veterinarians substantially the same as is proposed in this amendment, and it is clear to my mind that such would not be the fact if they did not find it to their advantage to have these educated men to care for their animals.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has covered this question so clearly and so ably that I do not wish to traverse that ground, but I will venture to add that to my mind it is exceedingly important that we should have educated men in our Army to care for the animals. It is a fact, as stated by the Senator from Colorado, that the veterinarians of this country to-day, those who are properly recognized as such, are men of equal culture and equal education to those of the medical profession or the legal profession or of any other profession that is recognized in the United States. They are men who have given a great deal of time to the study of medicine, medicine in its broadest sense, and to all the specialties that are recognized as being necessary to educate a man to understand the diseases of the human family, as well as those of the brute creation.

I know some of these men who are graduates of universities and who have given long years of study in this country and in Europe to qualify them for the performance of their duties as veterinarians. And yet we hear them spoken of, and it has been spoken in my presence to-day in a whisper by more than one Senator, that we propose to give rank and commissions to horse doctors. Well, Mr. President, they are horse doctors, I suppose, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, but they are more than that. They are educated men who have an ambition to distinguish themselves in their chosen profession, and that profession is just as honorable as any other.

Mr. SPOONER. They are horse doctors in the same sense that other doctors are man doctors.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely; and they have educated themselves just as thoroughly to discharge their duty as the man doctor has educated himself to discharge his duty.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that no valid objection has been raised against this amendment. The Secretary of War, it is true, seems to have reported against it; but I take it that the Secretary of War knows less about this subject than General Sheridan, or General Miles, or the Quartermaster-General, or men who have been educated in military science know about it. Hence I certainly can not lay as great stress upon his opinion as I lay upon the opinions of those great officers who were thoroughly acquainted with the needs of the Army and who speak from actual observation and experience.

I will esteem it, Mr. President, a privilege to vote for this amendment, and I trust that it shall be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in and to the government of the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that that may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the merit of veterinarian surgeons. I think that has been well set forth by those who have spoken in behalf of this amendment. I should like to vote for the amendment if it could be amended so as to avoid creating a separate corps and taking the veterinarian surgeons out from under the authority and direction of the regimental and other Army commanders and be so limited as simply to give to them rank. I rise for the purpose of suggesting that to the Senator who has offered this amendment.

I think the men who are to perform this service ought to be recognized as entitled to rank as well as pay. It is proposed by this legislation, as it has already been provided by the legislation that this refers to, to give them the pay and the allowances, and I see no reason why we should not give them the rank as well.

Mr. KENNEY. I will suggest, in reply to what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said, that I will accept an amendment, so that my amendment would read like this:

There shall be in the Army the following:

And by striking out in lines 13 and 14:

And the chief veterinarian shall report directly to that officer.

So as to read:

All rules and regulations governing the veterinary corps shall be made by the Secretary of War.

Therefore it would place it entirely in the hands of the Secretary of War to direct how the force should be used and through what channels it should report.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will allow me, what provision will he make for rank?

Mr. KENNEY. I leave the rank just as it is, but I am willing to strike out the words "That the veterinary corps shall consist of" and subsitute in lieu thereof "There shall be attached to the Army a chief veterinarian with the rank, pay, etc.," and then provide for all as my amendment did originally.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the rank?

Mr. KENNEY. First, a colonel, 2 captains, 20 first lieutenants, and 10 second lieutenants.

Mr. SPOONER. That makes a corps. I understood that it was the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio to give these veterinarians now in the service an appropriate rank.

Mr. KENNEY. They are provided for, you will find.

Mr. SPOONER. Some of us are willing to vote for a proposition like that who are not willing to vote for a colonel, a lieutenant-colonel, a major, and so on.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask the Senator from Delaware what use have we for a colonel? If these officers are to be subordinates to the captain or colonel of the cavalry or artillery regiments where they have horses, merely an appendage, so to speak, like any other subordinate officer, what use have we for a colonel anywhere in this business, or any other officer other than the veterinarian, who shall rank along with the lieutenant or captain, if we choose, and perform a specific duty? I can see the necessity for some rank, because otherwise the privates will not pay the same respect to orders and will not care for their horses under instructions unless the veterinarian appeals to the officer in command; but I really do not see any use of a corps here, and I do not see any use for any higher officer than lieutenant or possibly captain.

Mr. FORAKER. The remarks of the Senator from South Carolina meet the suggestion I made exactly. It is my chief objection to this amendment that it provides a corps and takes a veterinary surgeon who belongs to the regiment out from under the command and authority of the colonel and other officers of that regiment.

Mr. TILLMAN. It puts somebody supposed to be very skilled in veterinary surgery at the head of a bureau here in Washington to sit down here with a salary and do nothing, and to that I object. I will vote for some rank for these officers and a reasonable number of them, but I do not see any sense in forming a bureau of veterinary surgery here in the War Department.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I suggest that we vote on the amendment as it stands.

Mr. KENNEY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware demanded on this amendment the yeas and nays. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TILLMAN. What is the shape in which the proposition is now to be voted on?

Mr. KENNEY. As originally offered.

Mr. TILLMAN. Just as it was originally offered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the original amendment without modification. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURROWS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY].

Mr. CULBERSON (when Mr. CHILTON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CHILTON] is unavoidably absent on account of illness.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], and I will take the liberty of transferring that pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN], and withhold my vote.

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). With the consent of the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS], I will make the same transfer of pairs I did before and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). Does the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] know how his colleague [Mr. TURLEY] would vote?

Mr. BATE. I do not. He would not object, I am sure, to the Senator's voting on this question.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON]. He is absent, and I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE]. This is a question so purely nonpolitical that I will allow my vote to stand, as I am authorized to do under our agreement.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BUTLER. I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON], and I therefore withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—25.

Allison,	Frye,	McCumber,	Taliaferro,
Bacon,	Gallinger,	McEnery,	Teller,
Baker,	Gear,	Morgan,	Turner,
Chandler,	Hale,	Nelson,	Wolcott.
Clay,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	
Culberson,	Kenney,	Quarles,	
Foster,	McComas,	Stewart,	

NAYS—23.

Bard,	Foraker,	Pettus,	Shoup,
Bate,	Hawley,	Platt, Conn.	Spooner,
Cockrell,	Kean,	Proctor,	Sullivan,
Deboe,	Kyle,	Rawlins,	Vest,
Depew,	Lodge,	Ross,	Warren.
Fairbanks,	Pettigrew,	Sewell,	

NOT VOTING—39.

Aldrich,	Clark, Wyo.	Jones, Nev.	Platt, N. Y.
Allen,	Cullom,	Lindsay,	Pritchard,
Berry,	Daniel,	McBride,	Scott,
Beveridge,	Davis,	McLaurin,	Simon,
Burrows,	Elkins,	McMillan,	Thurston,
Butler,	Hanna,	Mallory,	Tillman,
Caffery,	Harris,	Martin,	Turley,
Carter,	Heitfeld,	Mason,	Wellington,
Chilton,	Hoar,	Money,	Wetmore.
Clark, Mont.	Jones, Ark.	Penrose,	

So Mr. KENNEY's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL. I now desire to perfect the amendment in section 14, line 21, by inserting after the word "the" the word "rank;" so as to read "the rank and allowances of a captain mounted."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that that amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL. I wish to go on and perfect it further, so as to make it read a chaplain mounted for each cavalry regiment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read for the information of the Senate the amendment which has already been adopted.

The SECRETARY. On page 7 section 14 has been amended to read:

That the President is hereby authorized to appoint for each regiment in the United States service one chaplain with the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain of infantry without command: *Provided*, That the office of post chaplain, etc.

Mr. SEWELL. I wish to amend that, and the Senator in charge of the bill is perfectly willing. I wish to arrive at this idea, that the chaplains of cavalry shall be mounted and the chaplains of infantry shall be dismounted. I wanted to leave the word "mounted" in.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to know how that amendment is.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to withdraw the amendment to the bill that was made, striking out the word "mounted" and inserting "of infantry without command," and after "mounted" to insert a comma and the following:

Captain mounted for each cavalry regiment, and one chaplain with the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain of infantry for each regiment of infantry.

Mr. PROCTOR. I do not object to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask the Senator who has offered that amendment whether the proviso as it was amended this morning is in the form he would like to have it stand? I do not remember just what the language is that was employed to amend.

Mr. SEWELL. The proviso was not amended at all. The amendment comes in before the proviso.

Mr. FORAKER. I know the amendment just now adopted comes in before the proviso, but was not the proviso amended this morning?

Mr. SEWELL. No.

Mr. FORAKER. Should it not be amended? I understood that it was so amended. What is the rank a post chaplain now has?

Mr. SEWELL. The position of post chaplain by the proviso is abolished altogether.

Mr. FORAKER. I know it is abolished; but if he is ordered to report to a regiment, what rank will he have? He already has a rank, I suppose?

Mr. COCKRELL. He has the rank of captain now.

Mr. SEWELL. The chaplains all have the rank of captain. If a chaplain is ordered to report to a cavalry regiment, he will be allowed a mount, and if he is ordered to report to an infantry regiment he will not be.

Mr. FORAKER. That is to say, the rank of post chaplain is captain, and according to where he is ordered, whether to a cavalry or an infantry regiment, he will have certain allowances?

Mr. SEWELL. Yes.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. BATE. Is the bill now upon its passage, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is passing from the Committee of the Whole into the Senate.

Mr. BATE. I desire to say a word, Mr. President.

There are some things in this bill of which I approve very highly—we had them before us in the Committee on Military Affairs—and there are some to which I object. I do not approve of the proposition to increase the Regular Army, as is proposed in this bill, by enlisting 5,000 men. It is not the Volunteer Army but the Regular Army which is increased by this bill by 5,000.

Neither is the number to be reduced when the volunteers retire in 1901, but it is a permanent increase of 5,000. I do not think there is any necessity for it, for the simple reason that we have now a very large army. If certain duties requiring experience and skill have to be performed, it would be very easy to take from one arm of the service certain select men and place a sufficient number of them in another arm of service without permanently increasing the Army.

We have already in the service about 98,000 troops. There are 63,000 in the Philippines; there are 3,300 in Porto Rico; 250 at Honolulu, Hawaii; 9,595 in Cuba; and there are 21,000 at home in the United States, scattered from post to pillar, making about 97,000 or 98,000 troops already in the military service of the country. I think this proposition to increase the Army by 5,000 for the purpose, as is alleged, of manning the coast defenses, is not necessary and ought not to be approved by the Senate.

There are to be 18 batteries of field artillery under this bill. We have now 12 batteries; so that there is an increase of 6. At the outbreak of the Spanish war we had but 5 batteries; and we had 10 regiments of cavalry and 25 regiments of infantry. This bill adds to the artillery and increases it about 17,500 in the artillery service alone.

There has always been an observance in the organization of our Army—as is the case in every well-organized army—of a certain strength or relative proportion of infantry, cavalry, and artillery. Our proportion heretofore has been of infantry to artillery about 4 to 1 or more, and with the cavalry about 2 to 1 or more. If you go on that ratio, when the time of the troops is out, in 1901, it will be necessary to continue them in the service or to recruit more men for the purpose of increasing the infantry and cavalry force to correspond with the artillery service. If that is so, it will require a Regular Army of more than 100,000 men—about 127,000 on the calculation I have made upon the same ratio we had when the Spanish war broke out.

I think, Mr. President, that there is no necessity for increasing the number of regular troops by 5,000. I believe that these coast fortifications should be properly manned. But we have all this force of nearly 100,000 to draw from, and we can select such men as are known to be suitable from this coast-defense service and can put them into that service. It seems to me that it would be better to do so than that we should order the enlistment of raw recruits for that particular service all around the country.

Therefore I think it will inure to the advantage of that particular service not to do what is here proposed, but to select the necessary men from the vast number of troops we now have in the service of the Government in different places, comparatively idle, and put them in this particular service. There are 21,000 enlisted men now located in various places here at home. Why can we not select from that number 5,000 and utilize them in this particular way?

Mr. President, two years ago, just before the outbreak of the late Spanish war, there was a call for two regiments of artillery from the Commander of the Army, indorsed by the Secretary of War. There was a disposition on the part of certain officials then to increase the Army, and it obtained to a limited extent outside of official circles, but was not agreeable to taxpayers and therefore made but little headway. They first called for one regiment of artillery and then for two, and urged the passage of the bill in this Senate on the grounds that they were needed to man the batteries on the coast defenses.

Finally on that plea they got the two regiments, and have them now. Where are they? Scattered from the Philippines to Cuba. Yet they were raised for the particular purpose which it is alleged in this bill that these 5,000 now asked for are to be raised. This mode of increasing the Army by calling for troops to care for and work the guns in our coast defenses is not a new mode. Let those of us opposed to increasing the Army be on the lookout.

That being so, Mr. President, and there being such an aversion in this country among those we represent, especially among the taxpaying portion of our people, to the increase of the Regular Army, we ought to be cautious how we deal with this question.

An increase of the Regular Army by 5,000 men two years ago would have astonished the people, but now it comes along easily and gracefully and hardly excites attention. It is made on the plea that these men are to be used for the special purpose of putting them in artillery stations for coast defense as artillerists. It may be all right, Mr. President. It may so turn out, but I fear not.

I believe the guns to be used on our fortifications ought to be manned by men who are experts and who have been educated in that duty; but I think they can be found among the men in the Army as it now exists, for 21,000 of them are now in the United States practically doing nothing, and 5,000 can be selected from that number if they are needed and put in these places better than we can obtain them by enlisting recruits, ignorant of Army duties, at various recruiting stations.

There seems to be a growing tendency to increase the Army. I am opposed to that. I hope the day will come when we will get back to the old standard of the Army, 27,000 men, or 25,000, as it was just before the raising of the two additional artillery regiments. I hope to see that day come; but this bill puts it beyond our power, for it calls for an increase of 5,000 men in the regular service over what we had then.

This is a step in that direction. It is a kind of vanguard, as it seems to me, to a vast standing army in time of peace. I oppose it for that reason if for no other. It is an adroit flank movement to circumvent that mountain of opposition in the hearts of a liberty-loving people to a large standing army. It is being done under the special plea that these men are intended for a particular service and much needed for it. It can not be denied that it will increase the Regular Army in number 5,000.

Another thing I object to in this bill is the provision in relation to the appointment of cadets. Where is the necessity for the increase of more than 100 cadets to be appointed? Under this bill each State will be entitled to 2 cadets and the President to 30, which means that each Senator is to have the appointment of 1. That will make 90 cadets, and the President has 30 appointments, which is 10 in addition to what he now has. This is very much larger than the number now allowed.

The purpose is presented here in a graceful and insinuating manner, but is nevertheless increasing the influence of the military power in this Republic. Apprehending that, I propose to check every step in that direction if I can with propriety as a Senator, and when I do that I believe I am representing the almost unanimous wishes of my people and serving the best interest of my country.

If we have this increase of cadets, then we must have somebody for them to command. These things go step by step, by slow degrees, until at last the object which is so objectionable in the popular mind is attained, as I have said, by an adroit flank movement.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I desire to dissent from these provisions in this bill. I am not disposed to call the yeas and nays, for it would, no doubt, be useless, but I desired to give my opinion in regard to this increasing of the Regular Army, and put myself on record in opposition to it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I think this increase of the artillery is absolutely necessary. I believe my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] is entirely mistaken in thinking that a detail of men from the artillery and the cavalry would accomplish this purpose. I am in favor directly of this increase of the artillery branch of the service; but I am not in favor of any increase of the infantry or cavalry. This is not a step in that direction; and if my friend will look at it in its broader sense he will see that it is a step in the other direction.

There is no necessity for an increase of the infantry or cavalry to correspond with this proposed increase of the artillery, because this is for fortifications; and when you come to counting relatively the strength of artillery and infantry and cavalry, it is the forces in the field which are counted, and the fortifications are never considered.

Mr. President, we have, according to my recollection, undertaken a system of fortifications around our coast to cost, at the time the calculation was made, $125,000,000. That system has been in operation until over $50,000,000 have been expended in the erection of fortifications to strengthen the seaports of the United States. We have gone at an enormous expense to the manufacture of the most improved system of fortification artillery, of siege guns. We have constructed the most complicated machinery for the handling of those guns. They are to be handled by machinery, and not by hand, as the field guns are handled. The ammunition is also to be handled by machinery, and the men who must man

those fortifications and use those guns must have a degree of experience far beyond that which is required in the infantry or the cavalry. They must have had some experience.

We have erected those fortifications around our coast. We have gone to the expense of manufacturing the guns, the carriages, and the machinery for handling them and placing them in the positions where they now are. Shall we leave them there to rust and decay, or shall we care for them? That is the question that is presented to the Senate to-day. We have only made the increase which is necessary for the performance of this one class of duties. If we were to have war we would have immediately to increase the artillery for the fortifications. We have given the least number that can man and care for the guns and keep them and the fortifications in proper condition. Are we to refuse that? Is that a step in the direction of creating a large standing army? On the contrary, it is a protection against it, for when we have our entire seacoast line fortified no enemy can enter it.

Why, then, does the Senator fear an increase of the cavalry and infantry because we have made this increase to protect from the possibility of the approach of a foreign enemy upon any of our seacoasts? No, Mr. President, I think it is right; I think it is proper that we should give this increase of the artillery; and therefore I am heartily in favor of that provision of this bill.

I am also in favor of the provision in regard to the interchangeability of the staff. I am not in favor of the provision of the bill which gives to each Senator the right to appoint a cadet at the Military Academy. I do not myself think that is necessary. If the Senator from Tennessee will direct his attention to that, and move to strike that provision out, I shall heartily join him in it; but I shall vote for the bill even with that provision in it, though I hope it will be stricken out.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that this amendment will not prevail. We have embarked upon a costly system of coast fortifications.

Mr. BATE. I will say to the Senator that I have not moved an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. HAWLEY. I thought an amendment had been proposed.

Mr. BATE. No, sir; I have not offered an amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, we have embarked upon a costly system of coast defenses under the advice of the most skillful men to be found in the service. We have already fully mounted 491 splendid pieces; and they are at fifty-eight different localities in twenty-five different harbors on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific seaboard, and represent only the armament actually in place on April 1, 1900. When all the work now in hand, and for which appropriations have been made, shall have been completed, there will be mounted 949 pieces of artillery, running from Maine all around our coast.

It is impossible for us to take care of the guns we already have with the artillerists we have. There are not troops enough—men to afford a relief for each gun. To leave these defenses without these additional forces will make it impossible for us to guard those costly guns, with the elaborate and complicated machinery by which they are worked, against the sand and the salt spray. They are required to be handled very frequently, to be wiped and sponged and oiled, and the machinery worked to see if it be in order.

We have gone too far to object to adding to what we now have. Not a very great sum is required nor a very great number of men. I think 5,500 or 6,000 additional men will answer our present purposes. It will not be enough to complete our scheme. It seems to me it is impossible for us to refuse this little addition.

Mr. PETTUS. In section 17, on page 8, line 24, after the word "Columbia," I move to strike out "two from each State at large;" and also to strike out from the same section, on page 9, line 4, the words "or of the States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 24, section 17, after the word "Columbia," it is proposed to strike out "two from each State at large;" and on page 9, line 4, after the word "Columbia," to strike out "or of the States."

Mr. HOAR. I suggest that each amendment be stated by itself and acted upon by itself. The Senator has proposed two amendments instead of one.

Mr. PETTUS. It is only one amendment in fact.

Mr. HOAR. But they are two amendments in the parliamentary sense.

Mr. PETTUS. The second amendment is intended merely to strike out words which will have no meaning after the first shall have been stricken out.

Mr. HOAR. The reason for my making the suggestion is that I want to move an amendment before the Senator's amendment is put to the clause proposed to be stricken out, which would take precedence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 17, on page 8, line 24, after the word "Columbia," it is proposed to strike out "two from each State at large."

Mr. HOAR. Before that question is put, I move to amend that clause by inserting, after the words "at large," the words "to be appointed on the recommendation of the governor of said State."

Mr. COCKRELL. From what States will they be appointed?

Mr. HOAR. Two from each State at large. I move to amend that clause by providing that they shall be appointed on the recommendation of the governor of said State. This makes a similar provision to that which exists at the Naval Academy in regard to the appointments by members of the House of Representatives, who make the recommendations.

Mr. President, I may say in support of this proposition, that unless my amendment be adopted the two cadets appointed from each State at large would be recommended by the Senators, as the practice has grown up, though I believe there is no sanction of absolute law for it, at the Military Academy, where appointments are always made on the recommendation of members of the House of Representatives if the persons recommended be found suitable. I suppose the Government would naturally, almost as a matter of course, in dealing with these two cadets at large invite the recommendation of Senators. I do not believe that that would be a good arrangement. I do not believe that it would be, on the whole, agreeable to Senators to undertake to make such selections. I think it a very good thing indeed, if this number of cadets shall be increased, to have the executives of the various States take the responsibility of the appointments.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me to suggest a better way than that?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. We have now in each State of the Union a land-grant college, where military tactics are taught under the requirements of the act creating them, and where, when the supply of officers will permit, a graduate of West Point, a Regular Army officer, is detailed to teach military tactics. Instead of putting these appointments as a part of the patronage of an executive, should we not make provision here for the appointment of those cadets from military schools, these land-grant colleges, whose pupils are under military discipline and tutelage, and have shown aptitude and love for military work? It would be a great spur to those cadets; it would remove the odor of politics from the appointments, and would leave it to the best talent in those schools to win this prize of a cadetship at West Point, simply by reason of their superior skill and ability.

Mr. HOAR. I think the governor of a State would naturally consider very strongly the capacity and training of such pupils.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. I will, if the Senator will allow me to answer the Senator from South Carolina in the first instance.

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. On the other hand, it does not seem to me that we ought to incorporate into legislation a preference for some particular school, which is not at all——

Mr. TILLMAN. Except that it would be supposed naturally that a school where an Army officer was detailed to instruct the pupils must be the best military school in that State.

Mr. HOAR. But that would not be a school under any Government authority or control. It seems to me it would be hardly wise to undertake to distinguish between private institutions, which have no relation to the Government, except so far as they have been beneficiaries of the Government, and other institutions. For instance, there was in the State of Vermont—I do not know about the present condition; but the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] will know—a very distinguished military academy, known as the Norwich Military Academy.

Mr. PROCTOR. It is there now.

Mr. HOAR. There is also an admirable military school in my own city of Worcester. I would hardly be prepared to consent that the agricultural college in Massachusetts, though it is a college for which I have the profoundest respect, should have absolute precedence as of right over the military academy at Worcester. There are some especially able young men educated at the latter institution who would be disqualified from receiving this appointment; and so as to the military school at Norwich. The military school at Norwich has educated a large number of young men who have entered the military service.

Mr. PROCTOR. It has furnished over 500 commissioned officers for the Army and the Navy.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator says over 500 officers of the Army and Navy have come from that school, and it has educated some of our most accomplished soldiers. One gentleman, Prof. Alden Partridge, who has served as an instructor there, was one of the best instructors in the world, I suppose.

Mr. PROCTOR. He was formerly a professor at West Point.

Mr. HOAR. Yes; but the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] seems to me not a proper one. It does not seem to me that it is a thing which ought to be put into inflexible law.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, would it not meet the Senator's objection if some provision were inserted which would require the governor to appoint after a competitive examination, instead of making it a football for politics, and giving the governor the power to select the cadet among the class of his bosom friends or his party friends?

Mr. HALE. That is all done away with now.

Mr. HOAR. Well, Mr. President, without any provision of law for competitive examinations, that has substantially become the universal rule in the country. I do not believe, if we are going to provide for competitive examinations, there ought to be a general provision as to all appointments.

Mr. TILLMAN. So far as I know, all the cadets who are appointed from our State to either the Military Academy or to the Naval Academy are chosen after competitive examination.

Mr. HOAR. No governor would disregard that principle and appoint his personal friends; and no governor could sustain himself in public opinion who did disregard it. I think if this recommendation should be made by the executive, it should be made under a law applicable to all such cases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] offers an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, at the end of line 24, after the words "at large," it is proposed to insert "to be appointed on the recommendation of the governor of said State."

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, this is a change from the custom which has prevailed for so many years, and I do not think it is wise to enter upon it. Ever since that Academy was established the President has appointed the cadets. He has appointed them, it is true, on the recommendations of the Representatives from the Congressional districts. That has been a custom that has grown up. There is no law requiring it, but the President has submitted to it so long that I suppose it could now be considered as common law. But here is an innovation proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], whereby it is proposed to go to a State to get a recommendation for a United States officer. That is an innovation that I do not think it best we should adopt. The President is the head of the Army.

Mr. HOAR. May I suggest to the Senator that under the provisions of the Constitution the executive of the State appoints in some cases, and he even appoints Senators themselves?

Mr. PETTUS. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. I will not delay the Senator by repeating it.

Mr. PETTUS. I am opposed to the innovation, Mr. President, because we have never tried it. We have tried the other plan. I want this number reduced; that is, I want that part stricken out which contemplates that Senators shall appoint. It is evidently put in here with the idea that Senators should nominate the cadets.

You will notice, Mr. President, that this bill increases the number of cadets outside of the 90 to each class. The amendment I propose strikes out 90 per class, but in addition to that the President is authorized to appoint 30. What was the number before?

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say to the Senator that it is an increase of 10.

Mr. PETTUS. That is in itself an increase of 10, and all together it is an increase of a hundred to a class. It seems to me that is going entirely too fast. I am perfectly willing that the increase which is given to the President shall remain, but this step of 90 to a class is rather too far, Mr. President. It is an extravagant allowance, and I am inclined to think, if you are going to have the 90, you had better then say the President shall have the authority to appoint or name them. I desire a separate vote on the amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. Unless the growth of the Army will furnish commissions for the graduates of West Point and the classes now in existence or the present number of cadets will not furnish enough properly qualified material to receive their commissions, there is no excuse for increasing the number at all.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator allow me for a moment?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. PROCTOR. There have been in the last two years 369 lieutenants appointed from civil life.

Mr. HALE. That was in time of war.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understand, but that is not the normal condition.

Mr. PROCTOR. At the present time in the infantry there are very few second lieutenants who are graduates of the Academy. Many of the infantry regiments are without a single second lieutenant graduated from the Academy. In previous times there never has been any surplus. In fact, ten years ago there were many appointments from civil life. I know that at the time I was in office at one time something over 25 appointments from civil life were made. That is aside from promotions from the ranks, which are provided for.

This provides for an increase of artillery. There is no prospect at all but that all the graduates of West Point will be required, and more, too, in years to come.

Mr. TILLMAN. To pursue the thought I was entering upon, I say unless the present classes will not furnish the material which will be required for officers, there is no excuse for the increase.

Mr. PROCTOR. They certainly will not.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well. That depends upon whether the Army shall remain at approximately its present strength. Now, we are confronted with this condition: We have a vast number of men who are in the Army temporarily, we hope, and they are serving their apprenticeship to the service of war. They will like it so well, especially being in Uncle Sam's service and getting better pay than they can get in civil life, that there is going to be terrible pressure for any vacancies whenever the Army is disbanded. I refer to the present excessive force over the regular establishment. Whenever there is a reduction by disbandment or mustering out of the excessive number now on hand, we are going to have the worst half hour or week or two of our lives in this Chamber and in the other to get the few score of places, or the two or three hundred places, that may be then vacant, from the men who have won their spurs, so to speak.

I confess it appears probable upon the face of the case, with the new line of policy we are already upon, that the Army will remain at its present size, and after making provision for the additional number of officers necessary out of the men in the Army now, who, as I said, are serving their apprenticeship and learning how to be soldiers in that field which is the most efficacious in creating officers, I do not see why we should rush into a project which will increase the corps of cadets at West Point. The only excuse for it is that the increase in population in the past has always called for a reapportionment of the House of Representatives, and it has gone on increasing with the country itself in the last seventy-five years. Thus there has been given a natural growth to the corps of cadets by reason of the additional number of Representatives in the other House.

But we are face to face with the fact that that Chamber is about full, and it is hardly probable that there will be any reapportionment after the next census which will increase the number of Representatives. If so, it can be to a very limited extent. Therefore there must be some increase in the material out of which to make officers if the Army is to be increased or to remain at its present figures.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me to make a remark?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. FORAKER. There must be some misapprehension, either on the part of other Senators or on the part of myself. It has been stated by Senators that this provision provides for an increase of a hundred cadets for each class. I would inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill if that is true? My understanding is that it means simply an increase of a hundred. I think that is correct.

Mr. TILLMAN. In the entire corps.

Mr. FORAKER. For the four years, which would be an increase of 25 for each year and each class.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator from Ohio is correct. It is practically an increase of 25 annually.

Mr. FORAKER. That, it seems to me, is a very slight increase under all the circumstances.

Mr. BATE. Wherever there is a resignation or they get out of the service in any way and a vacancy occurs, he has the right to appoint again to keep it up to that number.

Mr. FORAKER. That is true as to the present provision.

Mr. TILLMAN. Looking to the fact that there has been a natural increase in the corps hitherto, which has been brought about by the reapportionment every ten years, and the increase in the number of Representatives, and feeling that it is about to cease and that the growth of the number of cadets through that source will no longer take place, I am inclined to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, that these additional men may be appointed by the governors, taking it for granted that it will be through competitive examination.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama says we might as well let the President appoint. The President does appoint these cadets. I do not know how the custom grew up that they were to be nominated by the Representatives in Congress. I do not think there is anything in the statute authorizing it.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is nothing in the statute.

Mr. TELLER. The custom grew up.

Mr. BATE. It is a courtesy.

Mr. TELLER. The custom has grown up to have competitive examinations. In Colorado I know it has been the custom ever since the admission of the State. The Representative who is entitled to name a cadet gives notice that at a certain time and a

certain place certain gentlemen will examine the applicants, and they go there and pass the examination, and then one is suggested, I suppose, to the President. Then he goes to West Point, and the examination is made there; and if he passes, he becomes a cadet.

As stated, this is only 25 a year; that the young men are appointed to a class, and it takes four years for the class to graduate. We have had more graduates from West Point for a good many years than could be utilized. We provided several years ago that after being graduated they should receive certain marks of favor and wait then until there was opportunity to utilize them. That is the fact. If it shall be found that there are more than we need—and there will not be enough, in my opinion, under this bill—all we have to do is to let them step aside and wait until there is a vacancy.

The country will not suffer by the education of a few more young men at the National Academy at West Point. They will get an education there that will fit them for certain classes of business thoroughly and excellently, and it seems to me there can be no objection to the number. It may be that we will not increase the Army; I hope we will not above what we are increasing it in this measure, which I heartily approve, because I know we can not make artillerymen of raw recruits. You can make soldiers of citizens in ninety days if you have an officer who understands his business. We have demonstrated that fact in this war.

So far as I am concerned, I hope the Army will be maintained practically where it is. I believe it is wise for us to increase the number of cadets at West Point, so that in case of war and we call the citizen soldiery into the field, we shall have trained men to take charge of them. Whatever you may say about training soldiers, everybody knows you can not train an officer as readily as you can a soldier to fight. The training at West Point is invaluable. I do not mean that there have not been just as good volunteer officers as those from West Point, but as a general rule I think, as to the men from private life who had never been at West Point and who went into the Army and won distinction, the service would have been benefited if they had had military education at West Point. I think there is a lack in this bill of a sufficient number.

We do not need necessarily to increase the Army to occupy these young men. If there are more of them than we need, they will find places in the ordinary pursuits of life. There are thousands of corporations and thousands of industrial enterprises that are glad to take young men fresh from a school where they are educated upon every question which they are to meet in an active life and are taught it in a very excellent manner.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, it does not necessarily increase the Army to increase the number of cadets, but it is an inducement to do so, and I object to it on that account. Now, to have an excess of officers with no commands and nothing to do would be embarrassing to both the officers and the Government. That was the case with us before the war broke out. We had extra officers; one or two skeleton regiments.

Now, if you have this surplus, this increased number, and the war being over in June, 1901, the army disbanded, what are you going to do, then, with extra officers? You will have an excess. What is to become of them? They will be idle and drawing pay all the while. You can not dispose of them, because they have been educated by and belong to the country. They will have to be supported. I do not want to see this excess grow up in that manner; but if it has to grow, there is another mode, which has not been spoken of yet in this debate, through which I think it ought to increase.

The statute allows certain men who are in the ranks as noncommissioned officers to undergo competitive examination after they are in the service two years, and a board is organized at different places for the purpose of examining them. They undergo the most critical examination, and when they do so successfully they are recommended for appointment in the regular service. I think that should be looked to and encouraged, if you want to increase the number of cadets.

I believe that is a better channel for the cadet, and that will keep it away from the governor and Senators and put it in the competitive channel. It will be an encouragement to the young men who are in the Army, and induce others to enter it, to prepare themselves thoroughly for military life, and because they will have open to them this avenue for success and the gratification of their ambition.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado said he did not want to increase the Army, but yet approves of this 5,000. That is certainly a poor way to show opposition to such increase. I must correct the impression that was sought to be made by my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] in assuming that I did not want these coast-defense guns taken care of. I do not oppose taking care of these guns.

That certainly ought to be done, but we have 98,000 men in the field to draw these capable men from, and I say these are men already trained soldiers, and are capable of taking care of these guns better than any you can get from recruiting stations. You can spare them for that duty and not lessen the efficiency of the service and not increase your Army. They have been trained as soldiers and they can be assigned to this duty without detriment to the infantry or cavalry or field artillery service. That is the source from which I think the guns in our coast defense should be manned and cared for.

But, according to the philosophy of the Senator from Missouri, these guns will keep off armies from us. Mr. President, there is no trouble with infantry landing in this country, regardless of these coast guns, if an enemy saw fit to do so, for they can be easily flanked. But if you are going to have an army to keep away your enemies, build up your Regular Army, and let it be a vast one and it will intimidate your enemies and keep them at bay. I believe such apprehensions are groundless. No army will come upon us.

These cadets are splendid young men generally, and the Army of the United States is a very remarkable one. There is esprit de corps which is very marked, and I am proud of it, and I want to see them properly educated. But I think we are going to have too many, and there will be a surplus upon the hands of the Government. That will be the embarrassing situation after June, 1900.

That being so, we had better not increase that number now, but let the law remain as it is. It is a good law. Nobody can object to it as it is. Let well enough alone.

I do not care to say anything further about these amendments other than that I am opposed to the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts, but very favorably indorse the proposition of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I have been at West Point two or three times, and I have been on the examining boards, and every time I have been there on a board or otherwise I have thought what a waste of capital there is. We might as well educate many more men there. We have not educated enough to supply the Army. We go into the ranks and systematically winnow out some of the capable sergeants and put them in as second lieutenants. They are good men as a rule, and they would be very much better for the education.

I do not think this enlargement here will give a surplus of officers to the Army. But suppose it should. What happens? What has happened before? As a rule, the men who have gone out of our Army into civil life, the moment they heard the drum of approaching war, rushed to Washington or by telegraph offered their services. Practically every man in civil life whose health remained to him would offer his services to his country. There is nothing wasted by graduating a few men, if we do not need them at the time, after being educated at that institution, which is the best of its character, in my judgment, in the world. There is land enough there. There are professors enough to educate many more men, to the great benefit of the country and to the great benefit of the Army.

I am satisfied with this increase. I do not think it would trouble the Senator very much if he had a chance once in four years to recommend a cadet. It is a very easy thing to do. Neither do I believe in a competitive examination. I have had the pleasure of sending into the Navy two young men and into the Army one, whom I recommended. Each of the three has justified my choice. They are admirable officers, and the manner in which they have been received and disposed of in the Army and in the Navy shows what the Government thinks of them. I did not have a competitive examination. Excuse me if I go into the details a little bit. As to the first one I had to appoint, I said nothing about it. I did not advertise it. I made a few inquiries of the educators about the State.

I went to the very accomplished principal of our fine high school in Hartford. I said, "I do not want this made public. I am not going to have a competitive examination; but I have to nominate a young man for the Annapolis Academy. Perhaps you can give me just the man." It is a fine school. They graduate fine young men there. "I want a boy who will not lie and who is not afraid and who is liked by his comrades. I do not say he must be the head boy in his examinations." Sometimes a man can pass an examination intellectually—I had seen that in the Volunteer Army—who turns out to be lacking in the very qualities essential to make a soldier. I knew one man who graduated from the normal school and was teaching in an academy who passed a better competitive examination than any of the other 14 competitors. I was one of the judges. He was not nearly so well fitted for the life of a soldier as some of the others.

But that is a matter which each Senator can settle for himself. He can have a competitive examination if he prefers. The Senators and Representatives can settle that. I confess I should be delighted to have a chance to select a young man who would suit me, and I think I could find out not only whether he had the intellectual qualities, but whether he had the peculiar qualifications of manhood and character that make the officers.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let the pending amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend section 17, page 8, by adding after the words "at large," at the end of line 24, the following:

To be appointed on the recommendation of the governor of said State.

Mr. PETTUS. What is the parliamentary rule? Which question comes first?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has a right to perfect the portion of the bill which the Senator from Alabama moves to strike out.

Mr. PETTUS. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PETTUS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KENNEY. Let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will again be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend section 17, on page 8, line 24, by striking out, after "Columbia," the following:

Two from each State at large.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which has been stated, on which the Senator from Alabama demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, for one I hope this amendment will be adopted. In the present condition of the Army, particularly with 300 civilian appointments having already been made who are now in the Army, who are becoming practiced officers, who are getting indurated by military life and who will make a valuable force in the Army for the future, considering the likelihood that at some blessed day, if it shall ever dawn upon us, we may reduce the Army. I do not think there is any need of providing more cadets to be educated at West Point. I do not think the future has in it any demand of this kind, and I wish the committee, in their project of establishing the Army as it ought to be and duly increasing it in the artillery branch, had left this feature of West Point alone and had brought in nothing. This amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama practically disposes of a large portion of the objectionable feature of this section. That the President may have a few more, I do not object.

Mr. PETTUS. Twenty.

Mr. HALE. Twenty more?

Mr. PROCTOR. Ten more.

Mr. HALE. Whatever it may be, I do not object.

Mr. BACON. Twenty altogether.

Mr. HALE. I do not think, to repeat myself, there is any reason now in the condition of the Army why this innovation should be established and that Senators should be called upon to nominate cadets at West Point. Personally I do not desire it. It is a matter of the greatest relief to me now, in answer to the 50 letters I get every year, that Senators have no appointments at West Point; that it is all left to the popular branch, and the boys are designated by the Representatives of the several districts, as they ought to be, and the Senate is left outside of all that. I should be glad to see it left as it is now.

Therefore I am heartily in accord with the Senator from Alabama, and I hope his amendment will be adopted to strike out "two from each State at large;" and then following that he wants to strike out the words, in line 4 of the next page, "or of the States, respectively."

Mr. PROCTOR. I have only a word to say. All these cadets are appointed by the President. I presume if this measure is adopted as it is, if any Senator does not choose to make a recommendation of course the President would make the appointment.

Mr. HALE. Everybody will understand that the appointments at large are to be made upon the recommendation of Senators, and it will be so expected.

Mr. BATE. He can not decline to do it. He has to take action. He can not dodge.

Mr. PROCTOR. I said if he should decline. I do not expect he will. West Point has been a representative institution. I do not see any reason why Senators, representing the States, should not have appointments there the same as Representatives; but I am not at all particular about the method. It is very important that there shall be a fair proportion of educated officers in the Army. This bill practically increases the Army just about an even 20 per cent, and inasmuch as with the Army, as it has been, there has been a deficiency of educated officers, it seems to me very important that we should have a larger number.

I have run over the Register to see how it is with the infantry. I make it out that with 25 regiments there are only 34 second lieutenants West Point graduates, only about 10 per cent, as the full quota of second lieutenants would be 300. Some regiments are without a single one, and no regiment has more than three graduates of West Point among the second lieutenants. It seems to me very important that there should be a larger number of educated officers in those regiments in proportion.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, Senators have called your attention to the large number of thoroughly educated young men now taking their graduating course in actual service. I am very much obliged for the suggestion. You old soldiers know, every one of you, that you may establish any school you please for training men for fighting, but there is no school on earth like doing the work itself. You let a man be shot at for a year or two, and he is the best engineer you ever saw to protect himself from the bullets. There is no school on earth that educates a man so fast to be a soldier as being shot at by the enemy. These men ought to have a chance to go into the Army if the President finds them fit

Mr. HAWLEY. We can not afford to keep up a war for the sake of educating young men. We want in time of peace a good body of men. Of the men who go out of West Point, about 40 per cent get commissions. Such is the severity of the closing examination. Forty per cent of those who enter get appointed.

Mr. MONEY. I suppose the Senator in charge of this bill is accurate in his statement, but I want to ask him if it is correct that the President has the appointment of the cadets in case the Representative fails to appoint? I know it is not so as to the Naval Academy, where the Representative fails to appoint by a certain date, and then the Secretary of the Navy has the appointment. I do not know whether it is true of the Secretary of War or not.

Mr. PROCTOR. The President has the appointment of all of them at West Point. As to the Representatives, that is a mere custom which has grown up by courtesy to allow them to recommend. The appointing power is entirely with the President by statute.

Mr. MONEY. As I said, I do not know how it is at West Point, but as to Annapolis the law allows the Secretary to appoint if the Representative fails. I know that to be the fact, because I myself had the law amended confining the Secretary in his choice to the district that was vacant. They had been in the habit, by looking back to the record, of appointing people from Washington here instead of the district which they represented, or appointing from the Secretary's own district, or from his circle of personal friends. That had been the custom, and I recollect very well that I introduced and put through the House a bill, and it afterwards went through here, that confined the Secretary to the district in which the appointment had failed to be made by the Representative.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator will allow me, I will read the statute. It is section 1315:

SEC. 1315. The corps of cadets shall consist of 1 from each Congressional district, 1 from each Territory, 1 from the District of Columbia, and 10 from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and shall, with the exception of the 10 cadets appointed at large, be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or of the District of Columbia, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed.

Mr. MONEY. That is a general law. I understand it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is that for Annapolis or West Point?

Mr. PROCTOR. West Point.

Mr. MONEY. When the Representative fails to appoint, then the President appoints.

Mr. PROCTOR. The President appoints whether the Representative fails or not. The Representative merely recommends.

Mr. HOAR. I understand it is a mere custom which has grown up, and that there is no law whatever for appointment by the Representative, nor has there been from the beginning. For more than sixty years, certainly, the President has invited the appointment by Representatives.

Mr. MONEY. I understand very well the rule for appointments at Annapolis.

Mr. HOAR. For Annapolis there is an express provision of law.

Mr. ALLISON. The rule I think is invariable that when a cadet at West Point or Annapolis fails the Representative is notified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy that a failure has taken place.

Mr. MONEY. That is not the failure I am speaking of, if the Senator will excuse me. In that case the Secretary has a right to nominate him, and the Secretaries have heretofore been confining their choice to their own districts or to their personal friends here in Washington or elsewhere, without regard to the district of the Representative who failed to appoint. That has been amended as to Annapolis.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator that it rarely ever occurs, and when it does occur I have no doubt the Secretary of War makes a recommendation, having all the applications, etc., in his office, to the President and the President appoints.

Mr. MONEY. We understand that of course—we know that, but the nomination is an appointment in the case of the Representative or Secretary.

Now, further, Mr. President, I desire to say a few words. I do not like this feature of the bill allowing Senators to appoint the cadets to West Point and Annapolis, not because it is not a privilege that should be appreciated, and I have been informed by the superintendent of both academies that they very much prefer to have the Representatives select the young men who come there; and as to the young gentlemen who present themselves after competitive examination, and while they get in that way the largest percentage in the long run, they did not keep up as well as those personally selected.

Now, if the Army continues to grow there will be not enough of cadets to officer the Army in its lower grades, but I desire that as many places as can be, allowing the Representatives to select as under the law at present, shall be left for the rank and file and noncommissioned officers.

There is nothing so stimulating to the private soldier or the noncommissioned officer as the hope of a commission, which is not only something in money, but it is an elevation in the social scale. A man who has been a private in the Army, and I have been a private in the Army, knows exactly what it is. I was a private in the most democratic army that ever was in the world, for there was not a man in the regiment who thought himself better than I. Still there is a great deal of difference between the private and an officer. It is a distinct raising in the social scale, as well as an appreciation of salary.

There is another thing about that. It makes good soldiers to hold this hope out before them. Some military critic said that the invincibility of the army of Napoleon was that every private soldier carried the baton of a marshal in his knapsack, and if it could be understood that every private soldier in the United States Army could carry the baton of a major-general in his knapsack I think you would have better soldiers.

As far as I am concerned I have no desire to disparage the life of a soldier. It is not to be despised. Mr. President, I think something more ought to be left to the noncommissioned officers and the rank and file than there is proposed under this bill.

I shall therefore, with great deference to my friend in charge of the bill, vote against the appointment of cadets by Senators. I do not think that any private soldier or any organization has been heard here on this subject. I have had letters, though, myself, and I have had the pleasure of assisting two or three young gentlemen who are in commission from the ranks of noncommissioned officers; and their records show that they are good officers. We all know, and every one of you knows personally, young men of good families, of good ability, who prefer the profession of arms, and who enter the Army as private soldiers in the hope of winning a noncommissioned place and afterwards a commission.

Of course this sort of a bill will, in a great measure, deter that class of men from entering the Army as privates; and while I would not advise any young man to go into the Army as a private, yet still if those young men choose that profession and want to serve their country in that way, I think the inducements ought to be offered to them, so that they can feel not only an ambition to distinguish themselves if they have an opportunity in the service of the country, but I think that the argument ought to have some weight with the Senate, for we certainly must know what is due to the private soldier. I believe it was Napoleon who said that an army of sheep led by a lion is better than an army of lions led by a sheep. But, nevertheless, it is the individuality of the man, not the rank, that gives the Army renown. We all recognize the fact that we have got to have good material there.

Mr. TILLMAN. Along the same line that has just been suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, I would remind those who are solicitous for Army officers to be educated at West Point that the present head of the Army, if I am not mistaken, is not a West Pointer.

Mr. TELLER. No; he is not.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is indicative of the fact that the soldier is born rather than manufactured; and if we will give those men in the ranks who are striving for commissions an opportunity by examination to fill any vacancies that would follow by reason of not increasing the corps, we will have done a good thing for the Army.

Mr. MONEY. I will add, if the Senator will allow me, that not only is the present head of the Army not a graduate from West Point, but neither is Adjutant-General Corbin, who has been made major-general to-day, nor General Shafter, who was put in charge of the campaign at Santiago, nor General Schwan, nor was gallant Lawton. Not one of these men were West Pointers.

I think the greatest genius of the late civil war was a man who never saw the inside of a college, West Point or other, who did not pretend to grammatical construction of his sentences, and who spelled his words as often wrong as right. That was N. B. Forrest. I never knew a greater fighter or a greater general. He was a born soldier.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, as to the matter of promoting men from the ranks, I have the assurance of a man who knows as well as anybody in the whole Army—an officer of the War Department—that they have been striving to get men from the ranks to make lieutenants of, and can not get enough.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Connecticut guarantee that there is no prejudice or feeling of caste or aristocracy on the part of the examining board against these men coming up?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then you guarantee a great deal more than I will be willing to undertake to vouch for.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of taking from the ranks occasionally a young man who is fitted for that place. I have had a little observation and experience in assisting some of them. I want to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi what the difficulty will be if we are ever to have a large army. With an army of 25,000 men we find that very few young men go into the Army in time of peace, or if they do, they are incapable of becoming lieutenants under the strict regulations which necessarily must be adopted in the Department. In the first place, they must have an education to a certain extent. Then they must have a physical development.

My attention was called not long ago to a young man of very good family who had entered the Army and who passed all the intellectual examinations, but lacked the physical, and there was so much of a disposition on the part of the official to help him out, which I think exists always, as near as I can learn, when a young man shows he is qualified, that he said to him, "You are not as heavy as the regulations require. Take time now and increase your weight if you can." He succeeded in doing that and got into the Army.

Now, in time of war you can not train men in the Army for lieutenants and ultimately for captains. If we had an army of 100,000 men or 50,000 men, you would get enough young men who would fill the bill to come in as lieutenants; but if you have an army of 50,000 or 100,000 and you add 500,000 to it, as we might, or if you go from 25,000, as we did, to 275,000, you can not train men then. You have to train them beforehand.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I know if the Senator will think for a moment he will agree with me that if we are ever to have such an army as that it must be composed of volunteers, and I contend that the volunteer is a better soldier than any regular ever born, if you will train him right.

Mr. TELLER. There is no question about the volunteer soldier, and the Senator can not get up any dispute with me on that point.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not trying to get up any contention, because I know the Senator will agree with me.

Mr. TELLER. I agree with that, and we demonstrated it in the recent war. We demonstrated it in the civil war. I had occasion to speak of the volunteer soldiers, but I do not think they are any better than the regulars. They are not a bit better.

The Senator says that men are born soldiers—that they are born, like poets, I suppose—and I think they are; but when you open the door to every young man in the country by competition and do not allow a Senator or a Representative to name the favorite son of some favorite of his, when you carry out the policy that has existed in this country that the poorest boy in the community has the same right that the son of the highest man in the community, you are going to get the men who have an ambition to be warriors. They are the men who are going to come in then, and that is the beauty of the competitive system.

The objection to the system the Senator from Connecticut says he has adopted, to pick out the men, is that he may pick a man who does not want to make a warrior of himself. Open the door and let every young man who has the ambition to become a warrior go in; give him the same chance, although he may not have the advantages of high society, relatives, and friends to push him forward; and you will get the men who are born with the instincts of a warrior; and you will not get them by any other system either, Mr. President.

I do not care how this is left—whether the Senators are to appoint them or anybody else. I should like, though, to see a provision that this competitive system, now resting only in tradition and custom, should be made an absolute provision of law. But in my State there would not any Representative in Congress think of shutting the door against them and picking out a young man. There will be thirty or forty of them sometimes wanting these places, and no Representative would have ever dared in Colorado to have said: "I have picked out a favorite of mine and I will put him in the office, and the rest of you can not have a chance." They assert that as a right. I suppose most of them think it is the law, but it has become, as somebody said, the common law at least as to the appointment of those, and I want to see it the common law of every one who goes in there, except the thirty that are left for the President. As to those I suppose we can not help ourselves, and if he picks out those who do not make very good soldiers, all right, but that provision was put in the law originally that the President of the United States might take the sons of distinguished officers who do not live in any Congressional district and have not any Representative that they could appeal to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The

Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS].

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In section 17, page 8, line 24, it is proposed to strike out, after the word "Columbia," the words:

Two from each State at large.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. DEPEW (when the name of Mr. PLATT of New York was called). My colleague [Mr. PLATT of New York] is paired.

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MCLAURIN], who is necessarily absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TURLEY], who is absent. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

I will announce, while on my feet, that my colleague [Mr. MCLAURIN] is absent on account of illness.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] that we transfer our pairs and vote.

Mr. PRITCHARD. That course will be agreeable to me, Mr. President. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN. I vote "yea."

Mr. PETTUS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. I voted without observing that he had left the Chamber. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEY (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], but I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." I will therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the affirmative). This being a question purely nonpolitical, I allow my vote to stand, although the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE] is absent, our agreement permitting it.

Mr. MONEY. My colleague [Mr. SULLIVAN], who is absent on important business, is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 33; as follows:

YEAS—13.

Bacon,	Cockrell,	Pettigrew,	Vest.
Bate,	Frye,	Platt, Conn.	
Berry,	Hale,	Rawlins,	
Clay,	Lodge,	Tillman,	

NAYS—33.

Allison,	Fairbanks,	Kyle,	Ross,
Bard,	Foraker,	McComas,	Sewell,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	McCumber,	Simon,
Butler,	Gear,	McEnery,	Stewart,
Culberson,	Hanna,	Nelson,	Teller,
Davis,	Harris,	Perkins,	Wellington.
Deboe,	Hawley,	Pritchard,	
Depew,	Kean,	Proctor,	
Elkins,	Kenney,	Quarles,	

NOT VOTING—41.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	Mallory,	Sullivan,
Allen,	Foster,	Martin,	Taliaferro,
Baker,	Hansbrough,	Mason,	Thurston,
Beveridge,	Heitfeld,	Money,	Turley,
Caffery,	Hoar,	Morgan,	Turner,
Carter,	Jones, Ark.	Penrose,	Warren,
Chandler,	Jones, Nev.	Pettus,	Wetmore,
Chilton,	Lindsay,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott.
Clark, Mont.	McBride,	Scott,	
Clark, Wyo.	McLaurin,	Shoup,	
Cullom,	McMillan,	Spooner,	

So Mr. PETTUS's amendment was rejected.

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.

FREE HOMES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill received from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 996) providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose, was read twice by its title.

Mr. NELSON. There is a Senate bill on the Calendar which is similar to the bill received from the House of Representatives. I ask that the House bill may be substituted for it, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks that the bill from the House of Representatives, the title of which has just been read, may take the place on the Calendar of the bill (S. 17) to provide free homes on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserve the public lands for that purpose, as Order of Business No. 75, and that Order of Business No. 75, being Senate bill No. 17, be indefinitely postponed. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HEIRS OF BENJAMIN WILSON.

Mr. PERKINS. In pursuance of the notice heretofore given, I ask the Senate now to proceed to the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. I ask the Senator to yield to me that I may request unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1864) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Wilson.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PERKINS. I will yield to the Senator from Kentucky, but after that I trust that Senators will permit us to proceed with the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be read in full for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 1864) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Wilson; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. PETTUS. I should like to hear the report read in that case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. LINDSAY on the 23d of April, 1900, as follows:

The Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1864) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Wilson, deceased, and the petition of Rachael Wilson, his daughter, having examined the same, report as follows:

The bill is the same as one reported favorably in the Thirty-fourth, Thirty-fifth, and Thirty-sixth Congresses, and is a bill to pay the heirs in general of Col. Benjamin Wilson, a Revolutionary soldier, for services as an officer of Virginia militia, called into Federal service under an order of April 13, 1790, in protecting the frontier against the Indians.

The petition of Rachael Wilson, his daughter, asks to have this money paid to herself, instead of to the heirs generally, and as Colonel Wilson had 29 children, and his heirs or distributees are very numerous, so that the small amount claimed, $2,998.80, would, if divided among them, be of no benefit to anyone, and as, moreover, three grandsons (Col. Benjamin Wilson, of Clarksburg, W. Va., formerly a Representative in Congress, Hon. B. Wilson Smith, of Indianapolis, and Hon. Gideon C. Wilson, of Cincinnati, Ohio) make affidavit that the family desire that the money shall go to Rachael Wilson, your committee recommend that the payment be so made, instead of to the family in general.

Col. Benjamin Wilson was evidently a man of great prominence and value on the frontier. He was a member of the convention of Virginia which ratified the Constitution of the United States in 1788, and several times a member of the general assembly of Virginia. About the beginning of the Revolutionary war he removed from the Valley of Virginia, west of the Allegheny Mountains, to a point near the present city of Elkins, now in Randolph County, W. Va., where he constructed a fort for the protection of settlers against Indian incursions, and from that time on, on what was then the extreme western frontier, he served his State, and when called upon by the Federal Government he served his country in the most dangerous and trying and useful way.

As the particular service for which pay is now asked by his surviving daughter, who, as your committee learn, is impecunious and bedridden, is fully explained in the three reports referred to, made prior to the civil war, your committee append and make part of this report the earliest of those three. The others are House Report No. 279, Thirty-fifth Congress, first session, and House Report No. 78, Thirty-sixth Congress, first session, made in the year 1860, just prior to the great war which suspended all interest in matters of this kind.

The amount now recommended is the same as then recommended, for the same period of service in 1791 and 1792, and has been calculated by direction of the Paymaster-General of the Army in the manner recommended by those old committees. The only change now recommended is the payment to the surviving daughter, Rachael Wilson, instead of scattering the money among several hundred descendants of this Revolutionary character.

[House Report No. 163, Thirty-fourth Congress, third session.]

The memorial of the children and other heirs of Col. Benjamin Wilson, late of Harrison County, in the State of Virginia, deceased, represent: That their said ancestor entered the military service of that State (then a colony) as early as the year 1774, when he served as lieutenant, under Governor Dunmore, against the hostile Indians, and that he continued to hold commissions in the State militia, rising through the successive grades, until the year 1795; that during the period of the Revolution he was frequently in active service, and that after the close of that contest he was, from time to time, in arms against the Indians until the frontier was quieted by the treaty of Greenville in 1795, about which time he resigned the commission he had held since the year 1781 as colonel of Harrison County militia.

In support of these allegations the memorialists refer to the histories of the times, in which Colonel Wilson had obtained such reputation as to be mentioned by name with high commendation, and to certain documents recovered from among the few which at this late day remain of the private papers of the deceased veteran.

The memorialists assimilate the services of their ancestor during the Revolution to those of the officers of the Virginia State and continental lines, and ask an allowance equivalent to the commutation of half pay granted to those officers.

Although the evidence produced proves much of the service alleged, and the committee are satisfied by the historical and other references that all of it was performed, they are not prepared to recommend the extension of the commutation to any other officers than those to whom it was promised by

the resolutions of the Continental Congress, and can not, therefore, report a bill in conformity with the prayer of the memorialists.

With regard, however, to the claim for services rendered subsequently against the Indians the case is different.

It is historically known that from the commencement of the Revolution to the conclusion of the treaty of Greenville the western frontier of Virginia was harassed incessantly by threatened or actual Indian hostilities; and Colonel Wilson was undoubtedly, from his military rank, experience, and standing in the community, one of the foremost in the defense of the settlements. Indeed, it is stated, from a source of unquestionable authority, that his residence was the refuge of the surrounding settlers in time of danger, and was then and long thereafter known as "Wilson's fort."

It is only, however, during a portion of this period that the services of Colonel Wilson were of such a nature, and are established by such evidence, as to afford ground for such claim as can be recognized by this Government according to the existing practice.

It appears, from original instructions now produced, signed by Gen. Henry Knox, Secretary of War, and issued on the 13th of April, 1790, that at that date the General Government determined to take more efficient measures for the relief of the Western frontier, and in this paper directions are given for calling into service portions of the militia of the county, for stating the accounts of the men engaged, and for proving their service in such form as to obtain payment from General Harman, or the commander of the United States troops on the Ohio, under whose direction such service was to be rendered. It was expressly stated that the arrangement was but an experiment, and could not be continued unless great care and economy should be observed by the militia officers in the use of this discretionary power.

These instructions were received by Colonel Wilson, as proved by an indorsement thereon in his own hand, on the 10th of August, 1790; and it further appears, by original returns made by him and a report signed by him as colonel of Harrison County militia, that scouts or rangers were detailed for duty, under these instructions, at various periods from that date to the 2d of December, 1792; that the General Government assumed payment of those who were in service when the instructions were received, retrospectively, from the 1st of May, 1790, a date subsequent to that of the instructions, but several months prior to their receipt by Colonel Wilson, and that the last payment made by him was on the 17th of March, 1794.

The precise nature of the services performed by Colonel Wilson in reference to these details is not established fully by the original documents produced. In one case only is it distinctly stated that he himself ordered out the men; but there can be no doubt, from the manner in which the returns were made by him, and from the fact that he stated the accounts and paid off the men, that he acted under the instructions above mentioned and discharged all the duties thereby imposed. The services thus rendered appear in every respect similar to those performed by militia officers in certain cases during the late war with Mexico, "in organizing volunteers," which have been paid for under the general acts of March 2, 1847 (9 Stat., 206), and June 2, 1848 (9 Stat., 236), and the committee are of opinion that the services of Colonel Wilson should be remunerated on the same principle; they therefore report a bill allowing pay from the date when he received the instructions from the Secretary of War to the date of the discharge of the last detachment of militia called out in pursuance thereof.

This period is little more than half that which would be arrived at by taking for its commencement the date when the United States assumed payment of the militia, and for its termination the date of the last payment made by Colonel Wilson to the said troops. Though these dates perhaps mark strictly the beginning and end of Colonel Wilson's service as proven, under the authority of the United States, yet his service is not shown to have been continuous, and, under the circumstances, can not be supposed to have been so. Payment for the shorter period, therefore, is all that the claimants are entitled to expect.

[House Report No. 279, Thirty-fifth Congress, first session.]

The memorial of the children and other heirs of Col. Benjamin Wilson, late of Harrison County, in the State of Virginia, deceased, represent: That their said ancestor entered the military service of that State (then a colony) as early as the year 1774, when he served as lieutenant under Governor Dunmore, against the hostile Indians, and that he continued to hold commissions in the State militia, rising through the successive grades until the year 1795; that during the period of the Revolution he was frequently in active service, and that after the close of that contest he was, from time to time, in arms against the Indians, until the frontier was quieted by the treaty of Greenville, in 1795, about which time he resigned the commission he had held since the year 1781 as colonel of Harrison County militia.

In support of these allegations, the memorialists refer to the histories of the times, in which Colonel Wilson had obtained such reputation as to be mentioned by name with high commendation, and to certain documents recovered from among the few which at this late day remain of the private papers of the deceased veteran.

The memorialists assimilate the services of their ancestor during the Revolution to those of the officers of the Virginia State and Continental lines, and ask an allowance equivalent to the commutation of half pay granted to those officers.

Although the evidence produced proves much of the service alleged, and the committee are satisfied by the historical and other references that all of it was performed, they are not prepared to recommend the extension of the commutation to any other officers than those to whom it was promised by the resolutions of the Continental Congress, and can not, therefore, report a bill in conformity with the prayer of the memorialists.

With regard, however, to the claim for services rendered subsequently against the Indians, the case is different.

It is historically known that from the commencement of the revolution to the conclusion of the treaty of Greenville, the western frontier of Virginia was harassed incessantly by threatened or actual Indian hostilities; and Colonel Wilson was undoubtedly, from his military rank, experience, and standing in the community, one of the foremost in the defense of the settlements. Indeed, it is stated, from a source of unquestionable authority, that his residence was the refuge of the surrounding settlers in time of danger, and was then and long thereafter known as "Wilson's fort."

It is only, however, during a portion of this period that the services of Colonel Wilson were of such a nature, and are established by such evidence, as to afford ground of such claim as can be recognized by this Government according to existing practice.

It appears from original instructions now produced, signed by Gen. Henry Knox, Secretary of War, and issued on the 13th of April, 1790, that at that date the General Government determined to take more efficient measures for the relief of the Western frontier, and in this paper directions are given for calling into service portions of the militia of the county, for stating the accounts of the men engaged, and for proving their service in such form as to obtain payment from General Harman, or the commander of the United States troops on the Ohio, under whose direction such service was to be rendered. These instructions were received by Colonel Wilson, as proved by an indorsement thereon in his own hand, on the 10th of August, 1790; and it further appears by original returns made by him, and a report signed by him as colonel of Harrison County militia, that scouts or rangers were detailed for duty, under these instructions, at various periods from that date to December 2, 1792; that the General Government assumed payment of those who were in service when the instructions were received, respectively, from the 1st of May, 1790, a date subsequent to that of the instructions, but several months prior to their receipt by Colonel Wilson, and that the last payment made by him was on the 17th of March, 1794.

The precise nature of the services performed by Colonel Wilson in reference to these details is not established fully by the original documents produced, but there can be no doubt, from the manner in which the returns were made by him, and from the fact that he stated the accounts and paid off the men, that he acted under the instructions above mentioned and discharged all the duties thereby imposed.

The services thus rendered appear, in every respect, similar to those performed by militia officers in certain cases during the late war with Mexico, "in organizing volunteers," which have been paid for under the general acts of March 3, 1847 (9 Stat., 206), and June 2, 1848 (9 Stat., 236), and the committee are of opinion that the services of Colonel Wilson should be remunerated on the same principle. They therefore report a bill allowing pay from the date when he received the instructions from the Secretary of War to the date of the discharge of the last detachment of militia called out in pursuance thereof.

This period is little more than half that which would be arrived at by taking for its commencement the date when the United States assumed payment of the militia, and for its termination the date of the last payment made by Colonel Wilson to the said troops.

Though these dates, perhaps, mark strictly the beginning and the end of Colonel Wilson's services, as proven under the authority of the United States, yet his service is not shown to have been continuous, and under the circumstances can not be supposed to have been so. Payment for the shorter period, therefore, is all that the claimants are entitled to expect.

[House Report No. 78, Thirty-sixth Congress, first session.]

The memorial of the children and other heirs of Col. Benjamin Wilson, late of Harrison County, in the State of Virginia, deceased, represent: That their said ancestor entered the military service of the State (then a colony) as early as the year 1774, when he served as lieutenant under Governor Dunmore against the hostile Indians, and that he continued to hold commissions in the State militia, rising through the successive grades, until the year 1795; that during the period of the Revolution he was repeatedly in active service, and that after the close of that contest he was, from time to time, in arms against the Indians until the frontier was quieted by the treaty of Greenville in 1795, about which time he resigned the commission he had held since the year 1781 as colonel of Harrison County militia.

In support of these allegations the memorialists refer to the histories of the times, in which Colonel Wilson had obtained such reputation as to be mentioned by name with high commendation, and to certain documents recovered from among the few which at this late day remain of the private papers of the deceased veteran.

The memorialists assimilate the services of their ancestors during the Revolution to those of the officers of the Virginia State and Continental lines, and ask an allowance equivalent to the commutation of half pay granted to those officers.

Although the evidence produced proves much of the service alleged, and the committee are satisfied by the historical and other references that all of it was performed, they are not prepared to recommend the extension of the commutation to any other officer than those to whom it was promised by the resolutions of the Continental Congress, and can not, therefore, report a bill in conformity with the prayer of the memorialists.

With regard, however, to the claim for the services rendered subsequently against the Indians the case is different.

It is historically known that, from the commencement of the Revolution to the conclusion of the treaty at Greenville in 1795, the western frontier of Virginia was harassed incessantly by threatened or actual Indian hostilities; and Colonel Wilson was undoubtedly, from his military rank, experience, and standing, one of the foremost in the defense of the frontier settlements. Indeed, it is stated from a source of unquestionable authority that his residence was the refuge of the surrounding settlers in time of danger, and was then and long thereafter known as "Wilson's fort."

It is, however, during a portion only of this period that the services of Colonel Wilson were of such a nature, and are established by such evidence, as to afford ground of such a claim as can be recognized by this Government according to existing practice.

It appears from original instructions now produced, signed by Gen. Henry Knox, Secretary of War, and issued on the 13th of April, 1790, that at that date the General Government determined to take more efficient measures for the relief of the western frontier, and in those instructions authority was given for calling into service portions of the militia of the frontier, for stating the accounts of the men engaged, and for proving their service in such form as to obtain payment from General Harman, or the commander of the United States troops on the Ohio, under whose direction such service was to be rendered.

These instructions were received by Colonel Wilson, as proved by an indorsement thereon in his own hand, on the 10th of August, 1790; and it further appears by original returns made by him, and a report signed by him as colonel of Harrison County militia, that scouts or rangers were detailed for duty under these instructions at various periods from that date; that the General Government assumed payment of those who were in service when the instructions were received, retrospectively, from the 1st of May, 1790, a date subsequent to that of the instructions, but several months prior to their receipt by Colonel Wilson, and that the last payment made by him was on the 17th of March, 1794.

The precise nature of the services performed by Colonel Wilson in reference to these details is not established fully by the original documents produced. But there can be no doubt, from the manner in which the returns were made by him, and from the fact that he stated the accounts and paid off the men, that he acted under the instructions above mentioned and discharged all the duties thereby imposed.

The services thus rendered appear in every respect similar to those performed by militia officers in certain cases during the late war with Mexico, "in organizing volunteers," which have been paid for under the general acts of March 3, 1847 (9 Stat., 206), and June 2, 1848 (9 Stat., 236), and the committee are of opinion that the services of Colonel Wilson should be remunerated on the same principle; they therefore report a bill allowing pay from the date when he received the instructions from the Secretary of War to the date of the discharge of the last detachment of militia called out in pursuance thereof.

This period is little more than half that which would be arrived at by taking for its commencement the date when the United States assumed payment of the militia and for its termination the date of the last payment made by Colonel Wilson to the said troops.

Though these dates mark strictly the beginning and the end of Colonel

Wilson's services, as proven under the authority of the United States, yet his services are not shown to have been continuous, and under the circumstances payment for the shorter period, therefore, is all that the claimants are entitled to expect.

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

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Rachel Wilson, of Harrison County, W. Va., the sum of $2,998.80, being compensation for services rendered to the United States by her father, Col. Benjamin Wilson, in protecting the frontier from the Indians from August 10, 1790, to December 2, 1792.

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.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PERKINS. I now ask that the consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill be proceeded with.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9711) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial service, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the amendments of the committee may be acted upon as they are reached in the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Fortifications and other works of defense," on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

For the purchase of land on Cushings Island, Portland Harbor, Maine, as described in Senate Document No. 278, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, to be used to erect additional batteries and for buildings for the troops, $250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended until a valid title to all the land and property set forth in said document shall have been acquired by the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 15, to insert:

For the purchase of suitable building sites, and improvements and leases thereon, necessary to properly provide for the garrison at Sullivans Island, Charleston, S. C., $135,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended until valid title to all the land, and improvements and leases thereon, necessary for this purpose, shall have been acquired by the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 13, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

For construction of a sea wall and for necessary filling in at the reservation at Fort Caswell, N. C., $150,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Armament of fortifications," on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

For completing the equipment of field and siege batteries now in service, and for fully equipping four additional siege batteries according to the requirements of general orders of the War Department under date of February 24, 1900, $115,140, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Board of Ordnance and Fortification," on page 9, line 3, after the word "dollars," to insert "the expenditure of which shall be made by the several bureaus of the War Department heretofore having jurisdiction of the same, or by the board itself, as may be approved by the Secretary of War;" so as to make the clause read:

BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

To enable the board to make all needful and proper purchases, experiments, and tests to ascertain, with a view to their utilization by the Government, the most effective guns, small arms, cartridges, projectiles, fuses, explosives, torpedoes, armor plates, and other implements and engines of war, and to purchase or cause to be manufactured, under authority of the Secretary of War, such guns, carriages, armor plates, and other war material as may, in the judgment of the board, be necessary in the proper discharge of the duty devolved upon it by the act approved September 22, 1888; to pay the salary of the civilian member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification provided by the act of February 24, 1891, and for the necessary traveling expenses of said member when traveling on duty as contemplated in said act; for the payment of the necessary expenses of the board, including a per diem allowance to each officer detailed to serve thereon, when employed on duty away from his permanent station, of $2.50 a day; and for the test of experimental guns, carriages, and other devices procured in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, $100,000, the expenditure of which shall be made by the several bureaus of the War Department heretofore having jurisdiction of the same, or by the board itself, as may be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That before any money shall be expended in the construction or test of any gun, gun carriage, ammunition, or implements under the supervision of the said board, the board shall be satisfied, after due inquiry, that the Government of the United States has a lawful right to use the inventions involved in the construction of such gun, gun carriage, ammunition, or implements, or that the construction or test is made at the request of a person either having such lawful right or authorized to convey the same to the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 21, to insert:

EMERY CARRIAGE.

To enable A. H. Emery to complete and erect the 12-inch elevating carriage he is building for the Government, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to increase the contract price of this carriage and its foundations from $110,000 to $130,000; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to increase the price of the work to be done under the supplementary contract pertaining to this carriage from $10,000 to $30,000; and to enable the Secretary of War to make these two respective increases of $20,000 and $20,000 in the payments for this work; the sum of $40,000 is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That in the act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, approved June 6, 1896, the paragraphs providing for the payment for this carriage and its testing and for the supplementary contract pertaining thereto, beginning with the words "of the $110,000 to be paid for this carriage and its foundations" and ending with the words "to make which payment the sum of $10,000 is hereby appropriated," be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Of the $130,000 to be paid for the carriage and its foundations, 90 per cent shall be paid in partial payments as the work progresses, in accordance with the proposals submitted by A. H. Emery to the board in his letter of January 21, 1893, and $5,000 shall be due and paid the said Emery when he gives notice to the Secretary of War that he is ready to begin the construction of the foundations for this carriage, and five thousand more shall be due and paid him when the foundations are ready for the erection of the carriage; and no bonds shall be required for the return of this money or any part thereof if the carriage is not accepted, nor shall the said Emery be required to return the money paid; and the carriage shall belong to the United States when the tests are completed. The balance of the $130,000 shall be paid for the carriage and its foundations as soon as the carriage is erected and its test completed and the work found to be done according to contract. Of the $20,000 to be paid for the testing of the carriage, three-eights shall be paid the contractor when the preliminary tests are completed, and the other five-eighths shall be paid to him proportionally as the 50 rounds for proof are furnished.

"And the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a supplemental contract with the contractor for this carriage for the supply by him of a loading apparatus, to go with and belong to the carriage, and to be furnished therewith as a part thereof; and the carriage shall be so constructed that a part of the work of recoil can be used for the horizontal traverse of the carriage and the working of the loading apparatus; and the payment for the work so furnished under this supplementary contract shall be $30,000, one half of which sum shall be due and payable July 1, 1900, and the other half when the carriage and loading apparatus are completed and erected, to make which payments the sum of $20,000 is hereby appropriated. After this carriage is completed and tested and all moneys due the contractor thereon have been paid, the Government shall have the right to build any and all such other disappearing carriages as it may choose under any or all United States patents obtained at any time by the said Emery on his inventions embodied in this carriage. The royalty to be due and paid him or his legal representatives on all carriages built by or for the Government or carriages which they build, excepting the type carriage now under construction, embodying any of the said specified inventions, shall not exceed 6 per cent of the cost of the erected carriage in which such inventions are used; payment of the royalty on any such carriage to be due when such carriage is completed. And the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to extend the contract for the construction, erecting, and testing of this carriage two years from the date of the approval of this act, and said carriage shall be completed, tested, and turned over to the United States within said period."

Mr. TELLER. I move to amend the amendment, in line 2 on page 13, after the word "period," by inserting "if it shall be practicable to do so." I have the consent of the subcommittee who considered the bill to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment, on page 13, line 2, after the word "period," by inserting "if it shall be practicable to do so."

Mr. PERKINS. There is no objection to that.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 13, after line 2, to insert:

ISHAM SHELL AND TUTTLE "THORITE."

To enable the Secretary of War to purchase the United States Letters Patent No. 622479, issued April 4, 1899, covering the Isham high-explosive shell, designed for firing high explosives and carrying the same through armor plate, invented and now owned and controlled by Willard S. Isham, and also to purchase the entire and exclusive right for the United States to manufacture and use the high explosive "thorite," invented and now owned and controlled by Dr. Hiram P. Tuttle, $100,000: *Provided*, That all formulæ, data, and facts related to said process and necessary to the successful manufacture of said "thorite" shall be placed in the possession of the Secretary of War, and to his satisfaction, before any payment for the same shall be made.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to come in as an additional section to the bill. I think the committee will accept it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill the following as an additional section:

SEC. —. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to make partial payments under the contracts now existing with the War Department for the purchase and erection of pneumatic dynamite guns, carriages, etc., and ammunition for same, the said payments to be proportioned to the amount of work done and material furnished to date under said contracts: *Provided*, That the contractors furnish a satisfactory bond, equal to the amount of all payments to be made, indemnifying the Government against

loss in case the said dynamite guns, fittings, etc., shall not fulfill the contract requirements: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of partial payments made under the contract shall not exceed 80 per cent of the work done and material furnished to date of payment.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no objection to the amendment, Mr. President.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I inquire if the amendment in relation to the Isham shell has been adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been adopted.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] who stepped out a moment ago desires, I think, to offer an amendment to that amendment, but he can do that when the bill is reported to the Senate, I suppose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can be done when the bill is reported to the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I shall send for the Senator.

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

Mr. TELLER. Is it too late now to offer an amendment to an amendment which has been adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it is open to amendment in the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I have sent for the Senator from Vermont, and I suppose he will be here in a moment. If he does not come in, I will myself move an amendment.

Mr. PROCTOR subsequently entered the Chamber.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask now that the consideration of the fortifications bill may be resumed.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9711) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

Mr. PERKINS. I understand there are no further amendments.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

COLORADO COOPERATIVE COLONY.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill while we are waiting for the Senator from Vermont. I think it will only consume the time necessary to read it. It is House bill 6250, reported by the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which will be read in full for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 6250) extending the time for proof and payment on lands claimed under the desert-land law of the United States by the members of the Colorado Cooperative Colony in southwestern Colorado; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Lands was to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 2. That any person who, prior to the passage of this act, having made a homestead entry, but for any cause lost or forfeited the same, or for any reason failed to perfect or secure title in fee simple to the land embraced therein, or who, having perfected or secured such title, did so by what is known as the commutation of his homestead entry under section 2301, United States Revised Statutes, may make a homestead entry of not exceeding one quarter section of any of the public lands in any State or Territory subject to such entry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 3. That any person desiring to make another entry under this act will be required to make affidavit, to be transmitted with the other filing papers now required by law, giving the description of the tract formerly entered, date and number of entry, and name of the land office where made, or other sufficient data to admit of readily identifying it on the official records.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 4. That on the proper showing being made by any qualified applicant under this act, to the satisfaction of the register and receiver, that his former entry has been lost or forfeited for any cause, and that he has not perfected or secured title thereto under the homestead law, or who, having perfected title thereto, did so under section 2301 of the United States Revised Statutes, and having all other proper qualifications of a homestead entryman, the register and receiver will, without further showing, on payment of the usual fees and commissions, allow his said application and make his entry of record: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall apply to and include those persons who purchased land under and in accordance with the terms of an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of lands patented to certain members of the Flathead band of Indians in the Territory of Montana, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill extending the time for proof and payment on lands claimed under the desert-land law of the United States by the members of the Colorado Cooperative Colony in southwestern Colorado, and for other purposes."

CORINNE STRICKLAND.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3473) for the relief of Corinne Strickland.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to Corinne Strickland, widow of the late Jesse H. Strickland, $2,965.81, as pay and allowances for the services of Jesse H. Strickland as colonel of the Eighth Tennessee Cavalry from January 30, A. D. 1833, to April 1, A. D. 1864.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT JOPLIN, MO.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 3660) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a public building at Joplin, Mo. It is only fifteen lines long, and is reported favorably from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a building for the accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices in the city of Joplin, Mo., to $105,000.

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

JOHN E. WELCH.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 876) for the relief of John E. Welch.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,194, being the amount of pension due Mary Welch under certificate No. 119743 at date of her death, and that the said amount be duly paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the said John E. Welch or his legal personal representative, the same being in full for all claims and demands which said John E. Welch has or may have for supporting and taking care of said pensioner during the period her pension was wrongfully withheld.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not object, but is there any report? I should like to have it read, if there is, or an explanation made.

Mr. FORAKER. There is a report in the case. I can make an explanation, however. I should be glad to have the report read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. KEAN April 18, 1900, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 876) for the relief of John E. Welch, submit the following report:

The examination of the claim by the committee leads them to the same conclusions as those reached by the Committee on Claims of the Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, Report No. 1305. It is therefore deemed unnecessary to recapitulate the facts set forth in that report, a true copy of which is hereto attached for information.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

[Senate Report No. 1305, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 700) for the relief of John E. Welch, have considered the same and report as follows:

Under pension certificate No. 119743 Mary Welch was granted a pension of $8 per month as dependent mother of James I. Welch, Company I, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, who was killed in battle May 3, 1864.

The pensioner drew pension to June 4, 1876, when she learned that her right to such pension had been questioned, whereupon, by letter, she requested the Commissioner of Pensions to advise her as to her rights in the premises, and stated that inasmuch as she had a son, John E. Welch, upon whom she and her invalid husband depended for support, it was possible she was not legally entitled to a pension.

The pension authorities directed her to furnish a statement under oath as to the amount of her income from all sources, and promised upon receipt of same to inform her as to her right to a continuance of the pension.

Notwithstanding this information was promptly furnished, and several letters of inquiry were subsequently sent by her, the Pension Bureau failed to advise her as promised.

In response to further inquiry by the pensioner, she was informed that the case was held for special investigation to determine its general merits, and when completed she should be advised.

The special examiner reported June 26, 1879, "pension should be continued;" and a memorandum in the papers, of date October, 1879, reads: "Case

in admitted files, June 27, 1879, pension continued." The office failed to advise her of its conclusion that she was entitled to a continuance of her pension, and as a result she was illegally and wrongfully deprived of her pension, rendering it necessary for her to depend for support upon her son, John E. Welch.

In January, 1894, she again filed a claim for restoration to the rolls, and after furnishing the evidence rendered necessary by the lapse of time, a certificate was issued dated December 14, 1894, restoring her name to the roll with pension at $8 per month from June 4, 1876 (date of wrongful dropping), and $12 from March 19, 1886, date of act increasing such pension from $8 to $12.

The pensioner died on the 5th day of December, 1894, nine days prior to the issuance of the certificate restoring her to the rights of which she had been illegally deprived.

The claimant, John E. Welch, by reason of the wrongful discontinuance of the payment of such pension, continued to support the pensioner to the date of her death, and is therefore clearly and justly entitled to the amount of pension thus due and unpaid.

The committee therefore recommend the passage of said bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio whether this case was submitted to the Pension Bureau, and whether or not the Commissioner of Pensions gave any information touching it?

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know what the Committee on Claims did in that respect, but as the report shows, this pensioner was wrongfully dropped from the rolls and deprived of her pension for a period of about eighteen years, during all of which time she was making claim to it and asking for its allowance and continuance. Finally, after that long lapse of time, the Pension Bureau decided in her favor and restored her to the rolls, and informed her, or wrote a letter to the effect, that she had been so restored and there was due her this precise amount of money, but she had died some nine days, I believe, prior to that action being taken.

In the meanwhile, during those eighteen years, she was supported entirely by John E. Welch, her son, upon whom she was dependent, as the Pension Bureau is informed, and he is the claimant of that sum.

Mr. GALLINGER. The case strikes me as being a very extraordinary one. It is just possible that we can enact this bill into law without getting into any trouble in cases involving arrears of pension that are being claimed by a great many soldiers and their widows, but I do not think Congress ought to review the action of the Pension Bureau without being extremely careful. However, as the Bureau seems to have granted this pension the second time, and I presume it would run back to the time when she was dropped from the rolls——

Mr. FORAKER. That is the point.

Mr. GALLINGER. Carrying this amount of money, I shall not interpose an objection, but, on the other hand, think the bill ought to pass.

Mr. FORAKER. As to this amount, it was the finding of the Pension Bureau that she was entitled to it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I understand a certificate was actually issued.

Mr. FORAKER. It was actually issued, as shown by the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

GUARANTY COMPANIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. KENNEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9143) to authorize the formation of guaranty companies in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALE. There will be objection to the bill, as I learn from Senators about me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill goes to the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. Therefore I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. STEWART. Will not the Senator give way to me that I may make a statement for five minutes?

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator yield to me that I may present certain amendments to appropriation bills? I have to leave tomorrow.

Mr. HALE. I withhold the motion.

[The amendments submitted by Mr. BUTLER appear elsewhere under the heading "Amendments to appropriation bills."]

Mr. MASON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine withdraw his motion?

Mr. MASON. I hope the Senator will withhold it until I can have a short bill considered, to which there will be no objection. I have been waiting several hours to obtain unanimous consent.

Mr. HALE. I am appealed to in so many ways and by so many forms of importunity—one Senator says he has a very short bill and another says he has a very long bill—that I do not feel, under the circumstances——

Mr. STEWART. I want five minutes.

Mr. HALE. The Senator wants five minutes for a speech?

Mr. STEWART. To make an explanation.

Mr. HALE. For a speech?

Mr. STEWART. For a speech, to explain a bill.

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

JOHN L. SMITHMEYER AND PAUL J. PELZ.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on two occasions I have asked unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 186) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz, and twice it has been objected to, under misapprehension, no doubt. I wish to have the bill, which is short, and the report printed in the RECORD, and I wish to make a single remark in reference to it.

Mr. HALE. The Senator does not propose now to impose that old settler on the Senate for the purpose of passing it to-day.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, no.

Mr. HALE. Nor on any day.

Mr. STEWART. After you are convinced, I will pass it; and I can convince you if you will listen to me.

Mr. HALE. I agree that the matter shall be left in that way.

Mr. STEWART. I know you are a square man and you will be convinced. There is no doubt that Smithmeyer & Pelz were the architects of the Library building.

Mr. CHANDLER. It seems to me the Senator had better get the bill up. Then he will speak to the bill.

Mr. STEWART. I have the floor. This was let after competition. They labored for some thirteen years to produce the plan of this building, in competition with others. They produced the plan that eventuated in a building which is the admiration of the world. It was awarded to them in competition. They were entitled to compensation. Some six months after this award had been made to them they were employed for a short time on the building—a different contract, entirely disconnected with it. The court says it is entirely disconnected, and the judge who rendered the opinion said that if he could have his way he would decide in favor of Smithmeyer & Pelz:

> Speaking for myself alone, I am of the opinion that compensation should be measured by the general rule and usage which govern the compensation of the profession.

But he goes on, after explaining it, that the balance of them say it should be gauged by the subsequent amount that was paid to them, Smithmeyer receiving $5,000 a year and Pelz at the rate of three thousand during the short period of six months they were employed on the building. Then Smithmeyer got into trouble with some contractors furnishing cement, and he condemned it, and it raised a storm about his head.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Nevada pardon me? The trouble was occasioned solely by his inflexible honesty and fidelity to the Government.

Mr. STEWART. It was his inflexible honesty. The whole trouble was that he would not allow the Government to be imposed upon. Then when he applied for his payment, it was referred to the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims, instead of paying him for his plans according to the ordinary rule, said that he should only have it at the rate, when he worked, that his services were paid for while in the service of the Government, disconnected entirely. The committee has investigated this thoroughly, and I have not come across a greater outrage than this is.

The bill proposes that the matter shall be referred again to the Court of Claims and that they shall determine what is due for these plans, what he received to be deducted. It has provided, after great labor, a rule for the court to act upon in determining this question:

> *Provided, however*, That the measure of compensation shall be awarded upon a quantum meruit basis for all services rendered until such plans were accepted by the United States; and in the absence of express contract the rate of compensation subsequently paid to the claimants for services in the construction of the Library building shall not be evidence of the value of the services of claimants in preparing such plans: *And provided further*, That the measure of compensation shall not exceed the rates and rules established by the custom and usage of the profession of architects for such services; and the evidence heretofore taken and used by either party in the Court of Claims shall be competent in this suit and considered with such other evidence as either party may introduce.

Now, it is ridiculous to say that because he was subsequently employed for a little while, he shall be deprived of the results of thirteen years' labor in producing the plans for the edifice which the world admires. The whole account is stated in the report. I want to have it printed in the RECORD, so that it will be accessible to all. I want the bill and the report to be printed. The committee examined it very carefully, and I know of no greater outrage; and the whole of it results, as the Senator from Massachusetts says, because of his honesty in refusing to have poor material used in the construction of that building.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. All the Senator wants to do is to have the report printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STEWART. The report and the bill printed in the RECORD. That is all I ask. I give notice that I will ask unanimous consent once more for the consideration of the bill; and if I can not have it, then I am going to insist upon its being taken up. I will have

the yeas and nays on it. I have tried for two sessions to have a hearing on the matter, and I am going to have one before I quit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill and report are as follows:

A bill (S. 186) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz.

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Court of Claims be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to rehear and render judgment in the claim of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz for compensation for their services in preparing the plans for the building for the Library of Congress, and no prior settlement or adjudication thereunder of their claim for compensation for said services shall be a bar: *Provided, however*, That the measure of compensation shall be awarded upon a quantum meruit basis for all services rendered until such plans were accepted by the United States; and in the absence of express contract the rate of compensation subsequently paid to the claimants for services in the construction of the Library building shall not be evidence of the value of the services of claimants in preparing such plans: *And provided further*, That the measure of compensation shall not exceed the rates and rules established by the custom and usage of the profession of architects for such services; and the evidence heretofore taken and used by either party in the Court of Claims shall be competent in this suit and considered with such other evidence as either party may introduce.

JOHN L. SMITHMEYER AND PAUL J. PELZ.

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 186) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz, having considered the same, beg leave to report as follows:

A bill similar to this one was favorably reported to the Senate in the second session Fifty-fifth Congress. The report made by this committee in the last Congress is adopted as a part of this report, and your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

[Senate Report No. 1072, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3901) entitled "A bill for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz," have examined the facts upon which the memorial accompanying the bill is based, all of which facts are contained in the findings of fact of the Court of Claims in the case No. 16432, John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz *vs.* The United States.

First. The claimants, John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz, were in 1873 and afterwards copartners, doing business as architects in the city of Washington.

Second. Under the directions and at the request of the commissions and committees of Congress mentioned in the following acts of Congress, namely, the commission created by the sundry civil appropriation act, March 3, 1873 (17 Stat. L., 510-513); the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, sundry civil act, June 23, 1874 (18 Stat. L., 204. 226), and the legislative appropriation act, August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. L., 143, 168); the Commission on the Enlarged Accommodation for the Library of Congress (act April 3, 1878, 20 Stat., 35); the Joint Select Committee on Additional Accommodation for the Library of Congress, organized under the act June 8, 1880 (21 Stat. L., 165); deficiency act, March 3, 1881 (21 Stat. L., 414, 424), and the act April 15, 1886 (24 Stat. L., 12), the claimants devoted their time as architects from 1873 until 1886 in the making of plans and drawings for a building for the Library of Congress.

During said thirteen years claimants prepared ten different plans, the first one being in competition with 27 other competitors. They were awarded the first prize in this competition. The other plans were of various styles of architecture, for which they were called upon from time to time by the commissions and committees of Congress. The plan finally adopted by act of Congress of April 15, 1886, and readopted in 1889, was for the present building in the Italian renaissance style of architecture. The claimants make no demand for compensation for any of their work except this one plan.

Third. The claimants in 1874 gave up their private business as architects and, until 1886, devoted themselves almost exclusively to their work on these plans for the Library building. In 1882 Mr. Smithmeyer traveled extensively over this country and in Europe, visiting library buildings in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, Liverpool, London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Dresden, Leipsic, and Hanover, at the request of the Joint Select Committee of Congress, for the purpose of obtaining information in respect to the requirements of the great library buildings of the world. The act of 1886, adopting the plans of the claimants, created a commission to carry into execution the construction of the building. Work was commenced on the same in 1886.

Fourth. From the 15th of April, 1886, when the claimants' plans were adopted, until October 16 of that year, a period of six months, the claimants were not employed as architects of the building, but, on the contrary, a portion of the work of construction proceeded under the superintendence of the commission without any superintendence by the claimants or either of them. This clearly establishes the fact that the making of the plans and drawings and their adoption by the Government completed the service for which they had been employed by the Government. Whatever subsequent employment they might have in the superintendence of the construction of the building, if any, was then unknown to both parties. The service being completed and the plans and drawings delivered to the commission created by Congress, it only remained for the Government to pay suitable compensation for the work.

Fifth. Upon the question of compensation the Court of Claims, in its ninth finding, says:

IX.

The usual and customary schedule of charges and the professional practice of architects, as prescribed by the American Institute of Architects (chartered under the laws of the State of New York, and of which both claimants are members), the Western Association of Architects, and other architectural societies, including the District of Columbia, and by the profession generally, fixes the rates of compensation and rules governing the same as follows:

For full professional services (including supervision), 5 per cent upon the cost of the work.

The charge for partial service is as follows:

	Per cent.
Preliminary studies	1
Preliminary studies, general drawings, and specifications	2½
Preliminary studies, general drawings, specifications, and details	3½

For works that cost less than $10,000, or for monumental and decorative work and designs for furniture, a special rate in excess of the above. An additional charge to be made for alterations or additions in contracts or plans, which will be valued in proportion to the additional time and services employed.

Necessary traveling expenses to be paid by the client.

The architect's payments are successively due as his work is completed in the order of the above classifications.

Until an actual estimate is received the charges are based upon the proposed cost of the works, and the payments are received as installments of the entire fee, which is based upon the actual cost.

These are the rates and rules established by the custom and usage of the profession, and are never deviated from by architects in good standing except under exceptional circumstances, and then only by a special and express contract.

The plans under which the building for the Library of Congress is being constructed are designed and intended for a monumental building within the meaning of the paragraph of the foregoing schedule which prescribes additional rates for such plans.

In a number of cases the executive branch of the Government has employed architects at the rates prescribed by the foregoing schedule of the American Institute.

Sixth. The tenth finding of the court applies this schedule to the services rendered by claimants and states the amount which should be deducted for the reason stated:

X.

The plans prepared and submitted by the claimants, and accepted and so used by the Government in the construction of the building, consisted of "preliminary sketches and general drawings," within the meaning of the classification in the schedule of the American Institute of Architects, and were so complete and perfect that any competent architect could take them and construct the contemplated building from them without the assistance or advice of the claimants.

For such preliminary studies and general drawings the rate of remuneration prescribed in the schedule set forth in the preceding finding is, with specifications added, 2½ per cent upon the cost or proposed cost of the work; but inasmuch as the kind of material and style of finish for the Library building had never been fixed upon by Congress, nor by any officer or agent of the Government, no specifications were ever prepared by the claimants.

They consequently were unable to furnish the specifications and were relieved from the duty and labor of preparing them. The court finds $3,300 to be the reasonable value of the service of preparing specifications for this building from which the claimants were so relieved—that is to say, if the claimants are entitled to recover a commission of 2½ per cent on the cost or proposed cost of the building, the sum of $3,300 represents the amount which may be deducted for specifications, which they were ready and willing to furnish, but which they did not in fact furnish to the defendants.

Seventh. As to the amount upon which 2½ per cent would be payable under the rules of the Institute of Architects, the estimated cost would govern until the actual cost was ascertained.

The foregoing facts taken from the findings of the Court of Claims, after a full hearing of the testimony for the Government and for the claimants, would, if the established custom of the Architects' Institute were to govern, establish the right of the claimants to the full compensation of 2½ per cent of the actual cost of the building, less $3,300, which the court found to be the reasonable value of the services of preparing specifications for the buildings, from which the claimants were relieved for the reasons stated.

The actual cost of the building is now ascertained to be a little more than $6,500,000. Two and a half per cent of this sum would be the fee for the plan under the rules of architects, and would amount to $162,500. Deducting from this $3,300 for the specification, not furnished (for reasons stated), and there would remain $159,200 as the measure of this claim under the rules governing the profession. Of this amount, $48,000 has been paid to the claimants under a judgment of the Court of Claims. It is for the remainder ($119,200) that they now memorialize Congress.

On this subject of the amount of the compensation claimed, the claimants have submitted to the committee the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 25, 1898.*

DEAR SIR: In the matter of the claim of Smithmeyer & Pelz for services as architects for the Library of Congress, I beg leave to submit the following statement as to the amount that would come to the claimants in the event that the bill for our relief should become a law and the Court of Claims render a judgment for the maximum amount provided for in the bill, namely, the amount to which we would be entitled under the rates laid down in the rules of the American Institute of Architects:

Cost of building	$6,500,000
(This is somewhat less than the actual cost.)	
2½ per cent of this amount for plans and drawings	162,500
Less amount of specification, not furnished	3,300
	159,200

In our case in the Court of Claims that court says, in its eleventh finding, that it was "shown that the cost of draftsmen, clerks, and office rent is usually about 50 per cent of the gross receipts of an architect's business, and that the cost of plans and specifications in the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury is about 2½ per cent on the cost of the building."

A calculation upon this basis would show that in the progress of their work upon the plans their expenses connected with it were $79,750. We have not the data to supply a detailed statement of those expenses. It should be remembered that this work extended over a period of thirteen years.

Assuming, then, the correctness of the estimate by experts of the usual expenses attending such work, there would remain for our professional services $79,750, which, for the thirteen years, would be $6,135, or a little more than $3,000 a year for each claimant.

We are, very respectfully, your obedient servants,

SMITHMEYER & PELZ.

Hon. HENRY M. TELLER,
Chairman Committee on Claims, United States Senate.

This is not only the usual compensation of architects of good standing in their profession, but it is the rate of compensation which the Government has paid and is still paying for such services. In the case of Tilley *vs.* The County of Cook (103 United States Reports, page 155) the Supreme Court stated that if the architect's plan had been used evidence to show the usage would have been admissible, and intimated that it would have been binding upon the county. In The District *vs.* Cluss (Ibid., 705) the court, Justice Field delivering the opinion, said:

"In 1870 the board of trustees of colored schools for the District of Columbia employed the plaintiff, who is an architect by profession, to prepare the plans and specifications for a schoolhouse in Washington and to superintend its construction, agreeing to give him for his services 5 per cent on the cost of the building. This was the ordinary rate of charge of compensation for similar services in the District."

Referring to these decisions, and also giving his own opinion, Judge Nott, of the Court of Claims, in delivering the opinion of the court, used the following language:

"Speaking for myself alone, I am of the opinion that compensation should be measured by the general rule and usage which govern the compensation

of the profession. I think that in legal effect the claimants proffered their plans to Congress, through the intervention of the joint select committee, for inspection, coupled, nevertheless, with the implied condition that if they were used their services should be paid for as like services are paid for by other persons; that when Congress adopted the design by the act of 1886 the case reached the condition of Tilley *vs.* County of Cook (supra), and that when the defendants proceeded to give effect to the statute by actually using the plans in the erection of a building after their design the case entered the third stage, in which, as the Supreme Court intimates, the legal liability of the employer at last becomes fixed and the obligations to pay for the service becomes legally binding.

"I think, too, that the decisions of the Supreme Court holding that the usage of architects extends to and is binding upon a body politic erecting a public building (Tilley *vs.* County of Cook, supra), and that it has a recognized and established existence in the District of Columbia (District of Columbia *vs.* Cluss, 103 U. S. R., 705), are authority for holding the usage obligatory upon the Government for a building erected in the city of Washington. The sum which would be recovered is large ($136,355), but the services embodied in these plans extended through the best part of these men's professional lives, and the risk which they ran was immense. From October, 1874, when they began to give their time to the Congressional committees and commissions, until October, 1886, when the work of construction actually began, no liability had fallen upon the defendants and no remuneration had been given to the claimants, who had fought through these twelve years against the professional competition of the whole world."

The amount named by Judge Nott was based on the estimated cost, and not on the actual cost, which was not then known.

Judge Nott wrote no dissenting opinion, but the foregoing extract was a dissent from the decision of the court.

Speaking for the majority of the court, he said:

"But the majority of the judges are of the opinion that the acts of the parties indicate that the services should be estimated according to the rule of quantum meruit, and not according to the schedule of charges of the Institute of Architects. According to that schedule the claimants would be entitled to 2½ per cent up to the point where the suit brings their service, and to another 2½ per cent if that service should continue until the completion of the building.

"Instead of the latter the defendants elected to give, and the claimants consented to take, two annual salaries, amounting to $8,000 a year, as an equivalent for the percentage they would be entitled to according to the schedule. The claimants having thus 'departed from the general rule of architects of measuring their compensation by the customary fees of their profession,' as is insisted by the counsel for the Government, and having done this with no express agreement or reservation as to the preceding part of their service, the court is of opinion that that part should be estimated according to the same rule which the parties themselves have adopted."

It is admitted that the claimants were the successful competitors out of twenty-eight; that their plans were adopted by an act of Congress; that these plans were adhered to in the construction of the building, excepting as to the omissions for economic reasons of certain portions of the interior only; that the established rate of compensation for such services is 2½ per cent on the cost of the building, and that all architects are entitled to 2½ per cent for plans and drawings and 2½ per cent for the superintendence of the building, when so employed. These things are all agreed upon by all the members of the Court of Claims. The only reason assigned in the opinion of the court for making a reduction in the rate of compensation for the plans and drawings in this case is that the architects accepted employment six months later for the superintendence of the construction of the building at aggregate salaries of $8,000 per annum, and that, by this act, they waived their right to the customary and established charges of the institute for the former completed work of making the plans.

But when the architects were employed to superintend the work, it was six months after they had completed the plans, delivered them to the Government, and wholly ceased their connection with the Library Building.

The court says that according to the architect's schedule the claimants would be entitled to 2½ per cent up to the point where the suit brings their service, and to another 2½ per cent if that service should continue until the completion of the building. But that service did not continue. It wholly ceased after the six months referred to. The superintendence of the Library building was as distinct and separate from the plans and drawings as would have been the superintendence of another building in another locality.

This fact is clearly established by these words, contained in the additional findings of fact of the Court of Claims:

"From the passage of the act of April 15, 1886, until October 1, 1886, neither of the claimants were in any way in the employ of the defendants."

It nowhere appears in any of the rules of the Institute of Architects, nor in any of the testimony in the case, that the making of the plans and the superintending of the building are necessarily a single connected work. The Government at that time and long afterwards usually made its own plans for public buildings, and employed private architects to superintend their construction. In cases where it employed private architects to make plans it paid for the plans according to the rules of the institute, while for the construction it was the practice of the Government to pay a per diem and not a percentage. The testimony is clear on the point that under the rules of the Architects' Institute, special contracts are admissible, either for plans and drawings or for the superintendence of construction, and that fees will govern in each case where there is no special contract to the contrary.

It is not contended in this case that there ever was any agreement that the compensation for the plans should be less than the usual 2½ per cent. Nor was any effort ever made to obtain any such special contract.

Congress decided in October, 1888, to abolish the Library Commission and to place the superintendence of the building in charge of the Chief Engineer of the Army. Mr. Smithmeyer's services were dispensed with at once, and those of Mr. Pelz later on. No claim has been made for anything connected with the superintendence of construction.

Under the decision of the courts the acceptance by the claimants of a salary for superintendence of the building constituted in law an implied waiver of their right to the usual and established percentage rate of the American Institute of Architects for plans and drawings. It is obvious that the claimants were totally unaware that they had, by any act or omission of theirs, made such a waiver. They unwittingly made themselves the victims of a legal technicality. No such waiver had ever been hinted at or requested by or on behalf of their employer, the Government. To have volunteered it would have seemed an insane act. The courts could only deal with the claim in its strictly legal aspect, whatever the hardship this would work to the claimants.

The Library building is admired by all who look upon it. It is admitted that the claimants abandoned all other business and devoted thirteen years of professional skill to its creation. Without their knowledge or intention, and without any motive for doing so, they entangled themselves in a mere technicality of law, which operated to deprive them of the greater portion of the compensation to which the courts say they would otherwise have been entitled. We do not believe any honorable man would consent to enjoy the benefit of such an accident, and we therefore believe that the Government should be unwilling to retain in its Treasury the money which only an accident enitles it to and which in good faith and in fairness and equity belongs to the claimants.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill, with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that when the Senate adjourn today it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

LIGHTS ON WARROAD AND RAINY RIVERS, MINNESOTA.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4541) for the establishment of lights at the mouths of Warroad and Rainy rivers, Lake of the Woods, Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DURHAM, N. C.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1286) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Durham, in the State of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to its consideration as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred and twenty-five" and insert "eighty;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site, and to cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices in the city of Durham and State of North Carolina, the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of $80,000.

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 L. ORR.

Mr. MASON. I ask leave to call up the bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of William L. Orr.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay sufficient to satisfy the claim of William L. Orr for services rendered the Government as second assistant engineer in the United States Navy from September, 1863, until March, 1865.

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

ARTHUR R. HENDERSON.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2813) for the relief of Arthur R. Henderson.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury, in settling the accounts of Arthur R. Henderson while acting postmaster of Boston, Mass., to allow him to retain the sum of $1,750 over and above his regular salary of assistant postmaster, for his services as acting postmaster for the term of seven months from June 1, 1899, to December 31, 1899, inclusive.

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

INVESTIGATIONS AND TESTS OF AMERICAN TIMBER.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 364) to appropriate funds for investigations and tests of American timber.

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

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator rise to this bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, sir. From what committee does the bill come?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Chair is informed.

Mr. TILLMAN. What is the amount appropriated in it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty thousand dollars.

Mr. TILLMAN. Where is this laboratory for these timber tests to be located?

Mr. FOSTER. At the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is there a report with the bill?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have here a copy of the report.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let us have the report read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. FOSTER on the 2d instant, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, having had under consideration the bill (S. 364) to appropriate funds for investigations and tests of American timber, makes the following report:

The necessity exists for the speedy publication of authentic information regarding the relative strength and durability of American timber. While it is true that numerous tests have been made, and at various times and places, satisfactory information, suitably arranged in tables and in a comprehensive style, and covering the subject thoroughly and impartially, can not be collected and published by the Government because of a lack of appropriations for this commendable purpose.

Authentic information of the nature contemplated by the bill is most desirable, and the same will prove of incalculable value to the public at large. Great loss and much inconvenience result from a lack of reliable information on this subject, and in view of the enormous sums annually expended in harvesting the products of the American forests and in the purchase of lumber throughout the country, the data to be published should not only be complete, authentic, impartial, and comprehensive, but should be speedily compiled, as contemplated in this bill. Above all, the information desired by consumers and purchasers of lumber is something reliable, authentic, and authoritative; in a word, something complete and impartial that would be accepted as a standard reference.

The results desired would be of the greatest value to engineers, as well as the public generally. In fact, of such great value are these tests to engineers and those directly interested in possessing authentic data that several investigations have been conducted by private parties, particularly in recent years, as regards Douglas fir, or what is commonly termed "fir." The tests have been conducted mostly by railroad companies, for the purpose of availing themselves of such facts as would guide them in purchasing bridge and car building lumber with the best possible results.

At present at the Northern Pacific Railroad shops at South Tacoma, Wash., 900 cars are being built entirely of Washington fir, that timber being utilized in preference to oak. While the railroad companies have investigated the strength and durability of fir, the people of the country generally are not aware of the results attained and are unable to secure authentic data on the subject.

With reference to that portion of the bill providing that 30 per cent of the amount appropriated be used in conducting investigations on the Pacific coast, it may be proper to direct attention to the fact that the State of Washington has an annual lumber cut aggregating approximately 700,000,000 feet, and the annual shipments by rail to the East, notwithstanding the long rail haul, amounts to nearly 300,000,000 feet. A considerable portion of these rail shipments is the direct result of the tests referred to, imparting, as they did, a more thorough knowledge possessed by railroad companies of the strength and durability of fir timber. This knowledge is, as a rule, not possessed by the public generally. Some idea, however, of the surprising results attained may be indicated by a comparison of the strength developed, under breaking tests, by white pine, Eastern oak, and Douglas fir:

	Pounds.
Eastern white pine	1,610
Eastern oak	2,439
Douglas fir	4,320

Quite as interesting and surprising to the average citizen are the details of oak and fir tests, one of which is here given:

SOUTH TACOMA, WASH., *January 24, 1896.*

The following breaking tests were made by O. D. Colvin at the South Tacoma car shops of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company between eastern white oak and Washington fir:

A dressed piece 2 inches square was given an 18-inch span, and lift made by a hydraulic jack with the following results:

First. Two pieces were selected, which had not been seasoned, of both oak and fir. A lift was made until pieces broke. The result was as follows:

Fir, green.	Oak, green.
Pounds.	*Pounds.*
2,950	3,250
3,100	2,100
3,050	2,600
3,000	3,000
2,750	3,000
2,825	2,800
2,325	3,600
2,800	2,200
2,450	3,000
3,200	1,800
28,450	27,350
Average, 2,845	Average, 2,735

110 pounds in favor of fir.

Second. Ten pieces were selected, both oak and fir, well seasoned, and no attention given whatever to the bearing in regard to the grain. The lift was made until the piece broke. The result was as follows:

Fir, seasoned.		Oak, seasoned.	
Deflection.	Strain.	Deflection.	Strain.
Inch.	*Pounds.*	*Inch.*	*Pounds.*
5/16	3,500	1/2	4,250
5/16	3,400	1/2	3,300
7/16	4,000	3/8	2,300
3/16	3,700	5/8	3,900
1/2	5,000	7/16	2,300
7/16	3,900	11/16	3,100
7/16	4,100	5/8	3,100
1/2	4,700	11/16	4,200
5/16	3,200	3/4	3,000
5/16	3,500	11/16	2,700
8 8/16	39,000	9 4/16	32,150
Average, 5/16	3,900	Average, 9 5/16	3,215

685 pounds per stick in favor of fir.

Third. Six pieces of fir were selected which had been under cover one year, with the following results:

Fir.	
Deflection.	Strain.
Inch.	*Pounds.*
5/16	4,300
1/2	3,900
7/16	4,400
7/16	4,100
1/2	4,400
1/2	4,300
	25,400
Average	4,233

The conditions were the same in each test, and care was taken to select the best quality of both oak and fir.

This is to certify that I was present when the comparative test was made between oak and fir at the South Tacoma shops January 24, 1896, and know of my own personal knowledge that they are correct, as shown by the attached statement.

Witness:

H. W. TOPPING,
Of Parker & Topping.
G. H. GILMAN,
General Car Foreman Northern Pacific Shops.
J. T. HOWSON,
Manager American Foundry Company, South Tacoma.

A number of tests of yellow pine have been made at the Washington University, at St. Louis, Mo., and by various railroad companies and individuals, but for obvious reasons there is a lack of uniformity, completeness, and authenticity in available timber-test data. There is no accepted fountain head or authoritative source where accepted and reliable reports can be had, such as are generally accepted as a standard.

For the above reasons it is deemed eminently proper and very desirable that impartial and absolutely accurate timber-test data, covering all of the various woods of the country, be compiled as speedily as possible and published in compact and convenient form, in order that the same may become a standard reference on this important subject.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, it is late, and evidently this bill is going to give rise to discussion and objection. I must insist on my motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine moves 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 eighteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 7, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4, 1900:

CLAIMS COMMISSIONERS.

William Glover Gage, of Michigan, to be the commissioner on the part of the United States under the conventions for a claims commission concluded between the United States and Chile August 7, 1892, and May 24, 1897.

William H. Hunt, of Montana, to be the agent on the part of the United States under the conventions for a claims commission concluded between the United States and Chile August 7, 1892, and May 24, 1897.

SUPERVISOR OF CENSUS.

William T. Bedford, of La Salle, Ill., to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Illinois, vice William E. Birkenbeuel, deceased.

POSTMASTER.

Perry C. Hill, to be postmaster at Virden, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois, in the place of E. P. Kimball, whose commission expired March 9, 1900.

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Forty-eighth Infantry.

First Lieut. Hugh Thomason, battalion adjutant, Forty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be captain, May 1, 1900, vice Clayton, regimental quartermaster, resigned.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Samuel C. Lemly, of the United States Navy, a citizen of the State of North Carolina, to be Judge-Advocate-General of the Navy, with the rank of captain in the Navy, for the term of four years, from the 4th day of June, 1900.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

E. C. Bellows, of Washington, to be consul-general of the United States at Yokohama, Japan, vice John F. Gowey, deceased.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. William C. De Hart, of New Jersey, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in place of Calvin L. Hooper, deceased.

Second Lieut. Andrew J. Henderson, of the District of Columbia,

to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William C. De Hart, promoted.

Third Lieut. Charles W. Cairnes, of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Andrew J. Henderson, promoted.

GOVERNOR OF HAWAII.

Sanford B. Dole, of Hawaii, to be governor of the Territory of Hawaii, an original appointment under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900.

SECRETARY OF HAWAII.

Henry E. Cooper, of Hawaii, to be secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, an original appointment under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4, 1900.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Sidney B. Everett, of Massachusetts, now consul at Batavia, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Guatemala City, Guatemala.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Infantry arm.

Second Lieut. Frederick S. L. Price, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, March 11, 1900.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Eleventh Cavalry.

First Sergt. George Sutherland, Troop M, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, April 27, 1900.

First Sergt. Edward S. Luthi, Troop C, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, April 27, 1900

Thirty-seventh Infantry.

First Sergt. Thomas W. Gunn, Company K, Thirty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, April 27, 1900.

Thirty-ninth Infantry.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Henry R. Casey, Thirty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, April 27, 1900.

Sergt. Maj. Archer W. Davis, Thirty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, April 27, 1900.

PROMOTION IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Thirty-third Infantry.

Second Lieut. Arthur N. Pickel, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, April 10, 1900.

POSTMASTERS.

Caroline B. Andrews, to be postmaster at Presidio, in the county of San Francisco and State of California.

Leander N. Turner, to be postmaster at Wall Lake, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa.

Ralph M. Potter, to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Floyd and State of Iowa.

David James, to be postmaster at Loveland, in the county of Larimer and State of Colorado.

Edward A. Cowles, to be postmaster at Patchogue, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

Clarence M. Alvord, to be postmaster at Livonia, in the county of Livingston and State of New York.

Henry Wood, to be postmaster at Loogootee, in the county of Martin and State of Indiana.

Anna V. T. Smith, to be postmaster at Bronxville, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

James S. Merritt, to be postmaster at Port Chester, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

John H. McGrath, to be postmaster at New Lebanon, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

Thomas G. Moore, to be postmaster at Barnesville, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio.

Peter Housel, to be postmaster at Shreve, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio.

Francis Worden, to be postmaster at Coxsackie, in the county of Greene and State of New York.

Harry C. Budge, to be postmaster at Miami, in the county of Dade and State of Florida.

Joseph Kubler, to be postmaster at Custer, in the county of Custer and State of South Dakota.

Fred Schanzle, jr., to be postmaster at Elmwood Place, in the county of Hamilton and State of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May 4, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

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

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message of the President of the United States; which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I herewith return without approval H. R. 4001, entitled "An act authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Territory of Arizona." My objections to the bill are embodied in the following statement:

This tribe has a population of about 20,500 souls, of whom 1,000 dress in the manner of white men, 250 can read, and 500 use enough English for ordinary conversation. Last year they cultivated 8,000 acres, and possessed, approximately, 1,000,000 sheep, 250,000 goats, 100,500 cattle, 1,200 swine, and very considerable herds of horses and ponies.

Prior to January last the reservation, which is in the extreme northeastern portion of the Territory of Arizona, consisted of lands set apart for the use of these Indians under the treaty of June 1, 1868 (15 Stat., 667), and subsequent Executive orders. On account of the conditions naturally prevailing in that section the reservation as then constituted was altogether inadequate for the purposes for which it was set apart. There was not a sufficient supply of grass or water within its borders for the flocks and herds of the tribe, and in consequence more than one-third of the Indians were habitually off the reservation with their flocks and herds, and were in frequent contention and strife with whites over pasturage and water.

After most careful inquiry and inspection of the reservation as it then existed, and of adjacent lands, by efficient officers in the Indian service, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, recommended that the limits of the reservation be extended westward so as to embrace the lands lying between the Navajo and Moqui Indian reservations on the east and the Colorado and Little Colorado rivers and the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve on the west. This recommendation was supported by a very numerously signed petition from the white residents of that section, and also by a letter fron the governor of the Territory of Arizona, in which it was said:

"I understand that a petition has been forwarded asking that the western limit be fixed at the Little Colorado River, as being better for all concerned and less liable to cause friction between the Indians and the whites. I earnestly hope that the prayer of the petitioners be granted, for the reason that the Little Colorado could be made a natural dividing line, distinct and well defined, and would extend the grazing territory of the Navajoes to a very considerable extent without seriously encroaching upon the interests of white settlers who have their property in that neighborhood.

"I think great care should be exercised in questions of this nature, because of possible serious friction which may occur if the interests of all concerned are not carefully protected."

The investigation which preceded this recommendation, and upon which it was in part based, showed that with the boundaries of the reservation thus extended the Indians would be able to obtain within the limits of the reservation sufficient grass and water for their flocks and herds, and the Government would therefore be justified in confining them to the reservation, thus avoiding the prior contention and friction between them and the whites.

It appearing that but little aid had been extended to these Indians by the Government for many years, that they had taken on habits of industry and husbandry which entitled them to encouragement, and that it was neither just nor possible to confine them to the limits of a reservation which would not sustain their flocks and herds, an order was issued by me January 8 last extending the reservation boundaries as recommended. The Indians have accepted this as an evidence of the good faith of the Government toward them, and it is now the belief of those charged with the administration of Indian affairs that further contention and friction between the Indians and whites will be avoided if this arrangement is not disturbed.

The present bill proposes to open to miners and prospectors and to the operation of the mining laws a substantial portion of this reservation, including a part of the lands covered by the recent order. There has been no effort to obtain from the Indians a concession of this character, nor has any reason been presented why, if these lands are to be taken from them—for that will practically result from this bill if it becomes a law, even though not so intended—it should not be done in pursuance of negotiations had with the Indians as in other instances.

The Indians could not understand how lands given to them in January as necessary for their use should be taken away without previous notice in May of the same year. While the Indians are the wards of the Government, and must submit to that which is deemed for their best interests by the sovereign guardian, they should, nevertheless, be dealt with in a manner calculated to give them confidence in the Government and to assist them in passing through the inevitable transition to a state of civilization and full citizenship. Believing that due consideration has not been given to the status and interests of the Indians, I withhold my approval from the bill.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May 3, 1900.*

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill by its title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4001) authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Territory of Arizona.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President and the bill be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

REPRINT OF BILL.

By unanimous consent, a reprint was ordered of the bill (S. 1477) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890, and the accompanying report.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve

itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 11212, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. GRAFF. Pending that, I desire, Mr. Speaker, to submit the following proposition to the House.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF] submits the following request, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that on the legislative day immediately following that on which the sundry civil appropriation bill shall pass the House it shall be in order to go into Committee of the Whole House to consider business reported by the Committee on Claims; provided that nothing in this order shall interfere with the priority of motions to suspend the rules on Monday, May 7, 1900; and provided further, that on the next Friday devoted to private business, business reported from the Committee on War Claims shall have priority over business reported from the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken and the motion was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11212, and the Clerk will read?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the paragraph read last night I asked the gentleman some questions, and I desire to ask some further questions. The additional amount appropriated was $187,900 in that paragraph, and after reading the paragraph carefully I observe it is for "salaries and employees." Now, is this for additional salaries, additional employees, additional clerks, or an increase of salaries of those already employed?

Mr. CANNON. Which paragraph does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. LLOYD. To page 27—increase in engraving and printing.

Mr. CANNON. It is not for an increase of salary, but a mere increase of service.

Mr. LLOYD. "Increase of service." Well, then, there will be a greater number of employees?

Mr. CANNON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LLOYD. And they will receive the same salary as those employed?

Mr. CANNON. Nearly all the work, I believe, if I am correct, in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is piecework.

Mr. LLOYD. That is provided for in the next paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct; I was mistaken—

For necessary clerks and employees other than plate printers.

And so on.

Mr. LLOYD. Now, how many additional employees, and of what character?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know. An estimate was made for increase of work for the coming year over the work of past years; and it is not a great increase, because it was only $32,000. There have been several deficiency items passed and $155,000 on account of the great increase of work this year.

Mr. LLOYD. There is no increase of salary to any individual now employed?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all.

Mr. LLOYD. And there is no estimate showing how many additional employees there may be?

Mr. CANNON. I think not; it is based on the number of prints. What governs it is the amount of printing.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph beginning on page 21 and ending on page 22 was passed over yesterday. I ask that we return to it and now dispose of the question there pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying yesterday, the act of 1892 pays these surfmen at the uniform rate of $65 a month, which proves entirely satisfactory to the service. In 1894 there was an extension of the period of service in certain stations from eight to ten months, and the proviso was contained in that act that where the service exceeded eight months the pay should only be at the rate of $60 per month in those particular stations. That was subsequently amended by another act, so that where the period of service did not exceed eight and one-half months the pay should be $65 per month, and where it exceeded eight and a half months, or was in continuation of service under enlistment exceeding eight and a half months, it should be but $60. That is the law, as I understand it, as it exists to-day. It introduced great confusion and dissatisfaction; it made discrimination in about 157 life-saving stations. Part of the crew received at the rate of $65 per month and a part of the crew received at the rate of $60 per month.

Now, to insist upon this point of order and to return to that condition of discrimination and dissatisfaction, I conceive, would not be to the interest and welfare of the Life-Saving Service. Neither is it to the interest of the Life-Saving Service that the pay should fall this year to a uniform rate of $60 per month in all the stations, because the best men are resigning. The Life-Saving Service reports a terrible condition as prevailing upon the lakes and upon the Pacific coast, as well as upon the Gulf coast, and some time ago it was submitted by that Department that there be a uniform rate of $65 per month.

While I would favor House bill 10103, which I had the honor of reporting, I believe it is sufficient for the present purposes to make a uniform rate of $65 per month. If adopted, I am willing to withdraw the point of order, and I move the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his point of order and submits the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting the word "uniform" at the end of line 23, and the word "five" between the word "sixty" and the word "dollars," in line 24.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, for the reason so well stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the amendment is acceptable to the committee, and I hope it will be agreed to.

[Mr. SCUDDER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will pass. While I do not represent a coast district, I am very much interested in this matter; and though I have no intention of making a lengthy speech, I desire to submit some remarks because of my intense interest in the Life-Saving Service.

If there are any men in any department of the Government who deserve an increase of pay, certainly the surfmen of the Life-Saving Service are entitled to consideration. This service is not only most humane, but most valuable to the citizens of the Government. The expense of its maintenance is small as compared with the dividends it pays and the results it accomplishes in saving property and human life.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Acting General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service in response to an inquiry which I addressed to General Superintendent Kimball, from which it appears, estimating all the disasters which have occurred to shipping on our ocean and lake coasts, 10,000 miles in their extent, that the Life-Saving Service has rescued and saved more than 80 out of 100 per cent of property in jeopardy, and that where this service is in existence less than 1 per cent of human lives in peril have been lost. I submit this letter, Mr. Chairman, as a part of my remarks:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE GENERAL SUPERINTEDENT, LIFE-SAVING SERVICE,
Washington, April 28, 1900.

Hon. CHAS. R. THOMAS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th instant, requesting that there be mailed to you, if we have the figures in tabulated form, a statement showing, as nearly as possible, what per cent of lives and what per cent of property in jeopardy in the past history of the Life-Saving Service have been rescued and saved by the crews of said Life-Saving Service.

I regret to say that there is no tabulated statement reduced to percentages, but I send you by to-day's mail the last printed annual report of the service, which contains on page 19 a summary of the disasters which have occurred within the scope of the service from 1871, when the present system was introduced, to the 30th of June, 1898.

This summary gives total of lives and property involved, etc., but as to the lives lost the footnote should be considered. Ninety-nine, as you will notice, of the total 845 were lost under circumstances for which the service was in no wise responsible, and where stations, which had been persistently urged by the General Superintendent, had not been at that time authorized. Including these, the percentage lost would be 1.04, but excluding them it would be 0.91. The amount of property saved, as shown by that summary, is 78 per cent, almost exactly, and that lost 22 per cent. These figures, you will notice, go back to the beginning of the present system.

An examination which I have caused to be made covering the last twenty years shows the percentage of property saved to be more than 80 per cent of the amount imperiled, and of course the amount lost to be less than 20 per cent, while the loss of life during the same period has been but 1 person out of every 118 imperiled.

In some of the later years the loss of property has been as low as 14 per cent and even less, and the loss of life less than one-half the general average percentage indicated above. Page 19, annual report for 1895, which I also send, contains interesting figures in this regard.

Probably no more satisfactory statement covering the points you mention could be found than that embraced between the second paragraph on page 28 and the second paragraph on page 32 of "Organization and methods," a paper read by Mr. Kimball before the late International Marine Conference held in this city, a copy of which is also sent you.

Respectfully,
HORACE L. PIPER,
Acting General Superintendent.

The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

WANGER] proposes to fix the pay of all surfmen employed in the Life-Saving Service of the United States at the rate of $65 per month. The present compensation is at the rate of $65 per month for service upon the lakes only, while other surfmen receive but $60 per month. The additional amount of appropriation for the next fiscal year required under the uniform rate of $65, according to the statement of the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service, would be, in the aggregate, $88,330. The value of the service to the Government and its citizens far exceeds this slight increase in the pay of surfmen and in the annual appropriation. There is no service of the Government more valuable, more humane, or which does a nobler and grander work. These men are worthy of the increase in compensation, the service is worthy of it, and it is rendered necessary by the fact that by reason of employment in other vocations in which better pay can be had the service is becoming rapidly decimated and losing some of its best men.

This service had its origin and inception as early as 1789, when, on the bleak coast and treacherous shores of New England, the "Massachusetts Humane Society" was organized for the purpose of saving mariners and property from the perils of the sea. This society in 1807 "established the first lifeboat station at Cohasset," being the modern life-saving station in its crudest and most original form. Since that time the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and the lakes of the United States have been dotted with 260 life-saving stations, 190 of which are on the shores of the Atlantic, 14 on the Pacific, and 55 on the Great Lakes. There is besides a station at the Falls of the Ohio River, at Louisville, Ky.

Prior to 1871, the date of the organization of the present life-saving system, the operations of the service were confined to the coasts of Long Island and New Jersey, and the appropriations of Congress had been meager and insufficient. In 1871 there were a number of fatal disasters along the coast, and the system of stations was reorganized under the supervision of the present efficient Superintendent, Mr. Kimball, and the Government began to give its earnest and continuous support to an institution which has been of so much benefit not only in saving human life but to the commercial interests of the country. No better appropriation of public money can be made, in my opinion.

I call the attention of gentlemen to the general summary showing the benefit to our shipping interests rendered by this service, which I take from the last printed annual report of the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service, being the report for the year 1898, referred to in the letter of the acting superintendent which I have just read. This summary is as follows:

*General summary of disasters which have occurred within the scope of life-saving operations from November 1, 1871 (date of introduction of present system), to close of fiscal year ending June 30, 1898.**

Total number of disasters	10,448
Total value of vessels	$113,346,275
Total value of cargoes	$47,839,149
Total value of property involved	$161,185,424
Total value of property saved	$125,630,262
Total value of property lost	$35,555,162
Total number of persons involved	†81,245
Total number of lives lost	‡845
Total number of persons succored	§13,876
Total number of days' succor afforded	35,199

I also submit in this connection a statement from the able address of General Superintendent Kimball before the International Marine Conference in November, 1889, in which he makes a very interesting comparison between the cost of maintenance of the service and the results of the service in saving human life and the property of shipowners by taking the aggregates during seven years, from 1883 to 1889, both inclusive. I quote from his address as follows:

We would probably obtain a better idea of the relation between the cost of maintenance and the results by taking the aggregate during the seven years since the adoption of the present rate of wages, commencing July 1, 1883, and afterwards giving the average per station. In 1883 there were 194 stations; 1884, 201; 1885, 203; 1886, 211; 1887, 218; 1888, 222; 1889, 225; making a total of 1,474 stations. The general cost and results may be summed up as follows:

Cost during seven years	$5,791,184.05
Number of disasters	3,232
Value of property involved (vessels and cargoes)	$52,441,120.00
Value of property saved	$42,286,800.00
Value of property lost	$10,154,320.00
Number of persons on board	27,766
Number of persons lost	196
Number of shipwrecked persons succored at the stations	4,831
Number of days' succor afforded	12,402
Number of disasters resulting in total loss of vessels	482

The average number of stations was 210, and the average annual cost of maintenance per station was therefore $3,928.89.

These tables accord with the statements of the acting superintendent's letter and show clearly and conclusively that the cost of maintaining this service is inconsiderable as compared with the great benefits which accrue from its support by the Government.

I have been informed by the General Superintendent that by reason of the present rate of pay ($60 per month for all surfmen except those upon the lake coast, the men having to pay their living expenses as well as the expenses of their families from this small compensation) the service is being rapidly decimated.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House has reported favorably a bill similar to this proposed amendment, and the increase of pay is deemed necessary by that committee, as well as by the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service, in order to maintain the present standard of efficiency of the service.

For business and commercial reasons this service should not be allowed to retrograde. But, Mr. Chairman, there are stronger and better and humanitarian reasons why the efficiency of the service should be maintained. Not only is more than 80 per cent of property in jeopardy belonging to our shipowners saved wherever this service exists along our coasts, but who can estimate the value of human life?

In the language of the Hon. Samuel S. Cox, in his great speech on the reorganization of the Life-Saving Service, made in the House of Representatives on June 4, 1878, at the second session of the Forty-fifth Congress:

No reward can adequately reimburse for saving precious human life. The statute which preserves human life is not merely a sentimental humanity, but a real benefaction. Life saving is a friend of the human race. Nor is the question of life saving local in its character. It concerns commerce in its largest sense, and human life everywhere in all its sanctity.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen and know personally the value of the Life-Saving Service and the loss which occurs by reason of the nonexistence of life-saving stations on our coasts. The great wrecks of the *Huron* and *Metropolis* occurred upon the coast of my State. In the winter of 1886, in a county which I had the honor formerly to represent in the legislature of my State, I stood upon the shores of the Atlantic and saw, at the wreck of the schooner *Crissie Wright*, six seamen brought to the shore frozen to death in the wreck of that ill-fated vessel. Had there been a life-saving station upon our coast at the point where this wreck occurred, every one of these precious human lives would have been saved.

Mr. Chairman, the men of the Life-Saving Service are warriors as true and tried as those who upon the battlefield face the enemies of our country. In time of war the soldier follows some dashing leader, marching even to the cannon's deadly mouth under the influence of the strains of martial music. But the men of the Life-Saving Service often face death along the bleak and stormy coasts of our country without such inspiration, exposed to all sorts of perils and dangers.

In the silent watches of the night they brave all the hardships of the wintry coasts, and when the cry for human help comes surging over the sea and the storm-tossed ship is in the grasp of the cruel breakers, these surfmen, for whom I plead to-day, have and need no dashing leader to follow, but faithful to the call of duty in the midst of the storm and tempest they cheer and succor and relieve and save. Theirs is a work requiring as much genuine courage and bravery and skill in many instances as that of the soldier upon the field of battle or the sailors of our Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be adopted. Let us preserve and maintain the efficiency of this service by this slight increase. Let us do justice to these men who imperil their lives for the safety of others, and let us do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. Leave has already been granted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the total should be amended by inserting $1,396,310 instead of the figures in the bill, to make the amount correspond.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the survey of the coasts of the United States and of coasts under the jurisdiction of the United States, including the survey of rivers to the head of tide water or ship navigation; deep-sea soundings, temperature and current observations along the coast and throughout the Gulf Stream and Japan Stream flowing off the said coasts; tidal observations; the necessary resurveys; the preparation of the

* It should be observed that the operations of the service during this period have been limited as follows: Season of 1871-72, to the coasts of Long Island and New Jersey; seasons of 1872-1874, to the coasts of Cape Cod, Long Island, and New Jersey; season of 1874-75, to the coasts of New England, Long Island, New Jersey, and the coast from Cape Henry to Cape Hatteras; season of 1875-76, to the coasts of New England, Long Island, New Jersey, the coast from Henlopen to Cape Charles, and the coast from Cape Henry to Cape Hatteras; season of 1876-77 and since, all the foregoing, with the addition of the eastern coast of Florida and portions of the lake coasts; and since 1880, the coast of Texas.

† Including persons rescued not on board vessels.

‡ Eighty-five of these were lost at the disaster to the steamer *Metropolis* in 1877-78, when service was impeded by distance, and 14 others in the same year, owing to similar causes.

§ Including castaways not on board vessels embraced in table of casualties.

Coast Pilot; continuing researches and other work relating to physical hydrography, and terrestrial magnetism and the magnetic maps of the United States and adjacent waters, and the tables of magnetic declination, dip, and intensity usually accompanying them, astronomical and gravity observations; and including compensation not otherwise appropriated for of persons employed in the field work, in conformity with the regulations for the government of the Coast and Geodetic Survey adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury: for special examinations that may be required by the Light-House Board or other proper authority, and including traveling expenses of officers and men of the Navy on duty; for commutation to officers of the field force while on field duty, at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not exceeding $2.50 per day each; outfit, equipment, and care of vessels used in the Survey, and also the repairs and maintenance of the complement of vessels; to be expended in accordance with the regulations relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and under the following heads: *Provided*, That no advance of money to chiefs of field parties under this appropriation shall be made unless to a commissioned officer or to a civilian officer who shall give bond in such sum as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 21, page 25, after the words "United States," strike out the words "and all coasts under the jurisdiction of the United States."

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of the House. Inasmuch as the consideration of this question involves a matter of difference between the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations touching the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the hydrographic work, I would like to have some understanding as to the debate that we can have on the question.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know what the gentleman's line of attack may be upon this appropriation for the coast survey, so I do not know what will be necessary. If he will point out what he wants to antagonize; I would suggest that we let all the items be read through, and then, after they are read through, he can pick out such items as he desires to antagonize.

Mr. DAYTON. That would be entirely unsatisfactory, because some of these items are, in my judgment, distinctly subject to a point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Then I think we had better have the point made. I will say to the gentleman that I am quite willing to ask the House to agree that the items be read through, and that when we come to any item on which the gentleman desires to make a point of order he make it and let it be determined; and then let the gentlemen, after the point of order has been determined, offer amendments in regard to the coast survey from the beginning of the provisions to the end, until he is satisfied about the matter.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. That is not satisfactory.

Mr. DAYTON. I understand from my colleague on the committee [Mr. WHEELER] that that arrangement would not be satisfactory. It is at any rate an unusual method of procedure; and I think we ought to proceed in an orderly way.

Mr. CANNON. I am quite willing that the gentleman should make any motion about this first paragraph that he wants to. It was only to expedite the consideration of the bill and, as I thought, to get at the very core of what the gentleman desired, that I proposed to keep all these paragraphs open for amendment, letting the point of order, if there be a point of order, be determined first. But I am quite willing to pursue the ordinary course, if the gentleman prefers it.

Mr. DAYTON. The marrow of the matter is involved in this amendment which I have offered.

Mr. CANNON. Does the amendment apply to something that has just been read?

Mr. DAYTON. Yes, sir; to the first section.

Mr. CANNON. Very well, then, let the gentleman offer his amendment.

Mr. DAYTON. I have offered it.

Mr. CANNON. I have not heard it read.

Mr. DAYTON. It was read from the desk.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that it may be read again, as the reading escaped my attention.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. DAYTON. That amendment involves the main point. What agreement can we reach in regard to the debate upon it? There are two or three members of the Committee on Naval Affairs who desire to be heard, and I wish to say a few words myself.

Mr. CANNON. I am quite content to agree to any reasonable arrangement that the gentleman may suggest. I want, of course, to get on with the bill. But how much time does my friend desire?

Mr. DAYTON. I do not desire to consume a particle more than is necessary; but I do not wish to limit those who are associated with me. Can the gentleman spare an hour for us?

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman's motion is in order; it seems to me so. But can not our friends get along with a half hour on each side? I would be glad if they could. I think the House may already have some knowledge about this question; and it seems to me that general debate for half an hour on each side, together with such debate as there may be under the five-minute rule, should suffice.

Mr. DAYTON. I can only say in regard to that suggestion that I do not desire to consume one moment longer than may be necessary. This is a matter which is not generally understood; and in the present condition of this unfortunate contest we are very likely to go astray unless we understand the situation.

Mr. CANNON. I think that with the five-minute debate, general debate for an hour, one-half hour on each side, would be reasonable.

Mr. DAYTON. I simply want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that we will not consume any more time than may be absolutely necessary; but if there is to be inquiry and investigation into this matter, there being more or less a contest between two of the great Departments of this Government, which Congress has to determine, we ought to have an opportunity to do it. I have therefore suggested an hour's debate, inasmuch as the gentleman himself asked that much time before.

Mr. CANNON. Well, there is nothing mean about me. [Laughter.] I will split the difference with the gentleman and make it three-quarters of an hour on a side.

Mr. DAYTON. It is immediately split. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that there may be three-quarters of an hour's general debate on each side upon this amendment, if desired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that bebate may be extended on the pending amendment for one hour and a half, three-quarters of an hour to be controlled by himself and three-quarters by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON]. Is there any objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAYTON. I desire to say in the beginning of my remarks that I wish to occupy fifteen minutes and reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Before the gentleman proceeds I would like to interrupt him for an inquiry.

Mr. DAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill—the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—if this is not the same question that was elaborately discussed and decided on the floor of the House during the passage of the naval appropriation bill a short time ago?

Mr. CANNON. I will state to the gentleman from Ohio that in principle it is possibly the same, although there are provisions here which make it different, this being in pursuance of existing law.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. But the gentleman should also state if this involves other questions.

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is a matter of opinion. I answer in accordance with my best information upon the subject.

Mr. DAYTON. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will allow me to explain the matter to him——

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am hoping to take great interest in hearing the speech of the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. DAYTON. I do not wish it, Mr. Chairman, to be understood as the same proposition to which the gentleman refers, and which, as he states, was discussed a few days ago. It is an entirely different question, as I shall hope to show to the committee.

Some reference was made to the question involved here during the consideration of the naval bill a few days since and which developed a controversy regarding certain rights or privileges between two legally organized bureaus of the Treasury and Navy Departments, and I will state now the history of this matter.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has been in existence by statutes since 1807. The Hydrographic Office in the Navy Department has been in existence by statute since 1866. The Coast and Geodetic Survey, by the statute creating it, was organized to survey, make charts and maps, and report upon the coast lines of the United States, and it was limited by the terms of the law creating it to the coasts of the United States and to 20 leagues of sea. This Coast and Geodetic Survey was made by the law wholly and solely dependent upon the Navy and Army Departments for the ships and the men to operate it. That survey, as I have just said, has been going on since 1807, and is not yet completed. Added to the work of that Bureau in late years has been the survey of the Alaskan Territory. The survey of that Territory has scarcely been commenced.

Ninety-three years, therefore, have been spent in the survey of the coasts of the Atlantic and Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, and a very small part of the Alaskan coast. The Hydrographic Office in the naval establishment was organized for the purpose of providing mariners with charts and surveys of the waters in which their vessels were to navigate, and the Navy Department was not

only authorized to make surveys, but in addition to that the duty was imposed on them to make maps and to make charts, to correct inaccurate charts, and they were authorized to sell these charts to the seamen and mariners who desired to use them.

Until last year the operations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey never extended beyond the coasts of the United States and of Alaska, and no pretense of authority was claimed to do so. In the sundry civil bill of last year were embodied these words, which I have moved to strike out of this bill:

And of coasts under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Upon those words alone is based the authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for going out into the deep ocean waters and surveying, especially in the Philippines, in Porto Rico, and in Cuba. This provision has widened out their work, until it is impossible for them in an economical limit of time or with an economical amount of expense to furnish to the Navy and to the maritime establishments of this country proper and suitable charts for them to use in the navigation of their vessels. There has always been——

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman, for convenience of reference, if he will kindly include in his remarks the two statutes?

Mr. DAYTON. I will take great pleasure in doing so. I want to ask leave at the end of my remarks to incorporate a great deal of material in reference to this matter, because it is coming up constantly and continuously and it must be settled and determined.

Last year Congress appropriated $100,000 in the Navy appropriation bill without a word to carry on the necessary surveying under direction of the Bureau of Equipment of the Navy Department of the waters of the Philippines, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the other islands that we are now interested in. These charts had become an absolute necessity. This year the same appropriation was provided for by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and at the instance of my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it was reduced to $10,000.

I want to say that the bill as reported by the Senate committee to the Senate, after a thorough and exhaustive examination of the matter, restores that $100,000, and the committee over there are a unit in so restoring it.

Now, the question is simply and solely this: Shall we, representing our views—to a certain extent champions and partisans of this work being done by the Navy Department on the one hand or by the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the other—shall we, I say, provide for the duplication of this work? I want to say to you that there never has been, there was not last year, and there never has been during the existence of these bureaus, any duplication of the surveys. Not a single body of water has been surveyed by both. There has been a duplication in the charts that have been issued, but that duplication has been solely caused by the Coast and Geodetic Survey assuming the functions of the Hydrographic Office, and publishing some charts that had been several years prior prepared and published by the Hydrographic Office.

And those charts have been made and published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey without any authority. The Hydrographic Office was authorized to take the charts that had been made by the army engineers, that had been made by foreign countries, to purchase them, review them, correct them, and sell them to the mariners of the country. The Coast and Geodetic Survey never was authorized to make those duplicate publications; but all the charts that have been duplicated have been duplicated simply in the publication; not in the surveys of those bodies of water, but in the duplicate publication of charts that have been used and published by the Hydrographic Office three and four years before the Coast and Geodetic Survey published them.

Now, this amendment of mine proposes simply to go back to where the Coast and Geodetic Survey was prior to last year, to place them in charge of the waters of the United States coasts and Alaska. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this Coast and Geodetic Survey by this bill are asking, in addition, to do this work abroad, and so anxious have they been to do it that, without any authority, as I am informed, they have gone to work and established a branch office at Manila and are paying a man over there a salary of from twenty-two hundred to twenty-five hundred dollars a year without any authority at all.

I want to say to the House further, that in order to carry on this work the Coast and Geodetic Survey are asking, in addition to their regular appropriations of last year, an increase of $324,652 in this bill; and what I said in my remarks on the naval appropriation bill has come true, and $182,745 of an appropriation is now asked for the employment of sailors and surgeons, and the establishment of a navy personnel in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in direct violation of the law which provides that the President of the United States shall call upon the Navy for that.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend yield to me for what seems to be a necessary correction of his view?

Mr. DAYTON. Certainly, I will.

Mr. CANNON. My friend is aware that he or the chairman of his committee notified me, and the Secretary of the Navy has also stated, that there would be no appropriation for seamen or officers of the Navy for coast survey work, and that this item of $182,000 is to provide the necessary people——

Mr. DAYTON. I do not want the gentleman to take too much of my time.

Mr. CANNON. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is to provide the necessary people to do the coast survey work in lieu of seamen paid from the appropriations for pay of the Navy and officers in part paid from that appropriation, and that there is no other way to do it, and it is done in this way just as it was during the civil war and the war with Spain.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to say, in reply to that, that the Secretary of the Navy and the bureau head has no authority to make any such provision, and that the amount of the appropriation for the pay of the Navy in that paragraph that the gentleman refers to is the same this year that it was last year, dollar for dollar and cent for cent. Now, then, gentlemen, I say that this $324,000 is made up, first, $182,000 for seamen, surgeons, captains, petty officers of the new Navy, to be established in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and, second, that $80,000 more of it is made up in the purchase of a new vessel, without any authority of law, and the remodeling or the substantial rebuilding of another.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me.

Mr. DAYTON. You have three-quarters of an hour to answer.

Mr. CANNON. But my friend does not want to mislead the House?

Mr. DAYTON. Certainly not.

Mr. CANNON. The bill that has passed the House specifies the pay of the Coast Survey for seamen, and we were advised by a letter which we have on file, from the chairman of his committee, that it was struck out. So that the bill as it passed the House and is proposed——

Mr. DAYTON. I can not yield.

Mr. CANNON. It is a question of facts.

Mr. DAYTON. The gentleman is simply taking all of the time in making a speech in my time.

Mr. CANNON. I challenge the correctness of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. DAYTON. Now, my statement is as clear cut as it possibly can be. In the first place, by the very act that inaugurates the Coast and Geodetic Survey the President of the United States has authority, full and complete, to authorize and take the seamen from the Navy and the vessels from the Navy; and I further say that in the auditing of the accounts the language of the provision is changed, but the amount of the appropriation is the same as last year for these seamen. Now, then, I want to show, gentlemen, further, that another strange thing has developed in this matter. On the 19th of this month the commandant of one of the harbors of Porto Rico sent a telegram to the Secretary of the Navy, in which he said:

Serious case of insubordination on part of one of the crew of Coast Survey schooner *Eagre*. Commanding officer has no authority to punish. Have I any authority to order summary court-martial or inflict other punishment?

Thereupon, after examination in the Navy Department, it transpires that, that man not being an officer of the Navy, there is no court in the world to punish him. The officers of the vessel are powerless to maintain discipline; these ships are not Navy vessels, and they are not registered vessels under the navigation laws of this country, and they have no law or authority or right to navigate the high seas. Therefore we propose to establish, first, a navy that will have no law that will enable you to put down a mutiny and maintain discipline; second, they will not be connected with the naval establishment and not registered under the navigation laws of the United States, and under the laws will have no authority to go abroad on the high seas.

Now, then, with this simple statement, that this work proposes to cost this Government $324,000 more money this year; that our naval officers are over there; that the naval vessels can do this in connection with their other duties at one-third of the amount, this Coast and Geodetic Survey proposes to ask Congress to increase its appropriation, cutting down ours from $100,000 to $10,000 and then increasing theirs $324,000, I submit is to build up a new navy in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and on behalf of the naval interests, as well as the people of this country, I earnestly urge that the members of this House will stop and consider before they do this thing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I understand, Mr. Chairman,

that the question before the committee to-day is the same one that was so elaborately discussed and so emphatically decided by the House when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration. It is a controversy that not unnaturally arises out of our present situation. Before the acquisition of our new possessions the situation was this: The Navy had made all the ocean surveys that had been made by the Government of this country. No one proposes to take from them that function, and the naval bill continues the appropriation for the purpose of ocean surveys. On the other hand, the Coast and Geodetic Survey had the duty, under the statute, of surveying, in the words of the statute, "the coasts of the United States."

That had always been interpreted to mean coasts belonging to the United States wherever they might be situated, and accordingly from time to time, as the United States acquired new territory and new coasts, the jurisdiction of the Coast Survey was extended to these new coasts, notably in the case of Alaska. In the meantime there was established a Hydrographic Office, a misnomer, as the Hydrographic Office is a mere office of publication. By the very terms of the statute which creates it it is for the publication and dissemination of charts and sailing directions to navigators, and a reference to the statute creating that office will show clearly that it has no function of survey.

I will read the statute; and I hope if there is any confusion about what the Hydrographic Office is, it may be cleared up by reading the law which creates it:

SEC. 431. There shall be a Hydrographic Office attached to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department for the improvement of the means for navigating safely the vessels of the Navy and of the mercantile marine—

Now, that is limited how? The statute goes on to say—

by providing, under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, accurate and cheap nautical charts, sailing directions, navigators, and manuals of instruction for the use of all vessels of the United States, and for the benefit and use of navigators generally.

Not a word about survey; not a hint about survey. A mere office for the purpose of procuring charts and distributing them to the Navy and to the merchant marine.

Now, we got new territory last year. As always in the past, appropriations were made in the sundry civil bill for the Coast Survey for the purpose of extending their function to the new territory. No one questioned it—no one doubted that it was a proper thing to do. No one saw that at the same time there was an appropriation in the naval bill giving a parallel authority to the Navy, an authority which had never existed in law before.

The question here—and it is a very important one; a question that is likely to meet us all along the line—is, Shall we continue under civilian control the work which has always been under civilian control, or shall we hand it over to the military control of the Navy Department? I believe we ought not to do that. I believe that we ought to keep the civil law in control everywhere where it is in control to-day. I believe we ought not to do it because, as I took occasion to point out to the House some days ago, the work can be more economically done under civilian control, and it can be done better.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. In view of the statement of the gentleman that the work can be done more economically under civilian control, will the gentleman explain how it is that you ask in this bill $424,000 for doing the work which the Navy Department said could be done for $90,000?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not understand that the bill asks for anything of the kind. And that brings me to the question of economy of expenditures. The complaint is made because there are appropriations in the bill for paying the men who are doing the work. When the committee came to consider this, they had before them the letter of the acting chairman of the Naval Committee, directed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in which he says:

I have the honor to advise you that the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, acting in conformity with the recommendation of the Navy Department, have stricken out of the appropriation bill for 1901 the appropriation for item of naval officers assigned to the coast-survey service. The reason given by the Department for the change is that there are no officers now in the Navy that can be spared for that service.

Now, that is what we were told by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] in his formal communication. I presented to the House, at the last time when this same subject was up for consideration, a letter addressed to me personally from the Secretary of the Navy, in which he informed me, and I informed the House, that there were 1,447 new officers of the Navy required to man the ships that we now have and the ships that are in process of construction and repair. Why, in the name of common sense, does the Navy, already short nearly 1,500 officers of its proper quota, want to undertake this new work, except that it is to provide a haven of refuge for the officers who prefer that kind of work?

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman allow me there?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. Simply because these officers are aboard the vessels; they are in the Philippines already and can do this work in connection with their other duties right along.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If there is any question that is settled in the mind of every man who knows anything about this subject, who has given any attention to it, it is that the naval officers are not without further preparation entirely fitted for work of this kind. In England this department is under the control of the Admiralty, but by the very nature of the work itself it has to be made a separate civilian bureau, and the naval officer who goes in to do the work goes in for life, and there is a fleet of vessels entirely separate from the naval vessels for the purpose of that work. It is shown very clearly by the experience of Great Britain that the work must be done by men who devote their whole time to it and by vessels selected for that purpose alone. I quoted before a letter from one of the high officials of our Navy, showing that the ordinary ships are not suitable for that work.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Will the gentleman bear with me one moment?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. It seems to me that this is largely a matter of the construction of statutes. I want to inquire of the gentleman whether he has read to us all the statutory enactments bearing upon the Hydrographic Office?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I believe I have; I intended to do so.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I asked only for information.

Mr. DAYTON. There is one other section following, which I will hand to the gentleman. I think it does not enlarge or alter the provisions which I have read.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have in our Navy the best educated and most efficient officers in the world. I do not make that statement simply for the purpose of saying something that is pleasant and agreeable to those gentlemen, or pleasant and agreeable to our own national pride. I say it because I believe it is the truth; and I believe it is recognized to be the truth the world over. But if there is one criticism which can be made upon our Navy or upon the officers of our Navy it is a criticism made by one of their number to me last summer when I was taking a trip with him upon some civilian service to which he was then attached.

In the course of conversation I said: "Is it not true that our naval officers are the best officers in the world?" He said: "Yes; I think it is true, without any self-assertion upon our part. But," he continued, "there is one respect in which we fall behind the officers of some of the navies of the world, and notably the officers of the English navy; and that is this: We spend too much time away from our proper naval duties. We take a turn of sea service and then we come back to the land; we begin one after another civilian service, and by the time we are called upon to go to sea again we have become rusty in sea duty; while, on the other hand, the English naval officer spends the greater portion of his time in actual naval service."

Mr. DAYTON. Will you name that officer?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will to you.

Now, I know nothing about this particular matter myself. I do not pretend to have the knowledge which would justify me in making any assertion about it. I have simply given the statement of an accomplished naval officer belonging to a family distinguished for more than one generation in the naval service of the United States.

I think we ought not to add to the civil burdens that are already cast upon the back of our Navy. Let us have our Navy engaged in the primary purpose of a navy—navigating our ships of war and preparing to fight them when the time of stress comes. Let us not extend the functions of our naval officers over what is properly the field of civilian activity. Let us keep them where they belong and leave civilians where they belong. It is for the interest and the honor of the Navy that I speak, as well as for those sound public principles which ought to guide us. This question has been decided once; let us not reopen it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DAYTON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this question after all is largely one of dollars and cents. My judgment, I am frank to confess, has been largely, if not entirely, determined by the attitude of the Navy Department; but a cursory investigation of the matters under dispute has only strengthened my judgment that the attitude of the Navy Department is the correct one.

Now, the committee will understand that we are asking for no new departure in assuming the position we occupy, and so far as this immediate controversy is concerned, I desire to say, with the greatest deference and respect, that in my opinion it is largely a fight between two committees of the House.

I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts to explain to the

committee how it was that the Navy Department offered to do for $90,000 a service for which this bill asks us to appropriate $425,000. I am not familiar with the details of the appropriations contained in this bill, nor do I know exactly why the committee made this appropriation. But I know that a service for which an appropriation of only $90,000 is asked for in the naval bill is exactly what you propose to have this other force do and charge the Government $425,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. We appropriate for the pay of the Navy, I think, $181,000 in this bill. There has been paid as Navy pay, taking the average of the past twelve years, $236,000.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. If we adopt the provision of the naval appropriation bill, the Navy pay will still go to these men, and this appropriation will be unnecessary. That is exactly the point I make.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then will you not be obliged to have more officers?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. No, sir.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will there not be needed some officers to take the place of those who are assigned to this particular work?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am coming to that. The officers in control of the gunboats in the Philippines can do all the work required in this line without extra pay.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Including the gunboats?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, sir, the cost of the coal on those gunboats would be more than the total cost of this service as estimated by the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Does the gentleman suppose that those boats are lying idle? Have they not got to be employed? Their duty is not confined to the harbors. One of the duties of the gunboats in the Philippines is to patrol the coast, and while engaged in that very business they are required, under the orders of the Department, to discharge the duties which this appropriation proposes to impose upon them.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. One moment, if the gentleman will permit me.

The Navy Department, let me say, certainly ought to know what is best in this connection. The service has been under their control for a long time. The Secretary of the Navy himself and the heads of the various bureaus recommend the proposition which was made in the naval appropriation bill, and we have adopted it. We did not seek by that bill to destroy the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. For ninety years they have been working at this business, and the average member on the floor of the House will understand that there is every reason to suppose that it will take a long time in the future to complete it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts (interrupting). Does the gentleman think that they ever will complete the work?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I do not think that as the law now stands they will.

A MEMBER. They have just resurveyed a portion of this work for the tenth or twelfth time.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Why, Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen will permit me, here is the record showing that from January 1, 1900, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has made five maps, and according to the best evidence accessible three of the five are declared to be absolutely worthless.

Mr. BUTLER. Just there let me ask the gentleman how many have been made by the Navy Department?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Well, that is a matter in reference to which I can not inform the gentleman.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will say, if the gentleman will allow me, that 35 have been made.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that a number had been made, but as to the exact figures I do not undertake to say; but I have testimony at hand which is important in connection with the matter. I wish to read a portion of the statement which was made before the Committee——

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question in this connection?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Do you think if the work should be assigned to the naval establishment that it will ever be completed?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Not at all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But work is now being done outside of our own coasts.

A MEMBER. Where?

Mr. SHAFROTH. In the Philippines.

Mr. BUTLER. And in Cuba as well.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, this work is being done certainly in the Philippines.

Mr. HILL. Then why is it necessary, if they are doing the work and have a sufficient force to do so now, to make the appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. Well, it makes the work available for the marine interests of the country.

Mr. HILL (continuing). And in the same connection, why do you add a hundred thousand dollars more to the appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. The committee have given the matter careful consideration. The work necessarily involves additional expense, and in the best judgment of the committee this amount is required over the appropriation last year. The work can not be done for less, and I think that all gentlemen recognize its vast importance.

A MEMBER. It has been asserted that there will necessarily be some civilian employees in connection with this work. Now, why is that necessary if these officers are to do it?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if I can be permitted to proceed——

Several MEMBERS. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, and the gentleman from Kentucky is entitled to the floor. Members will resume their seats, and public business will not be transacted until there is order on the floor.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Will the gentleman from Kentucky allow an interruption?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. SOUTHARD. While this matter was under discussion when the naval bill was pending before the House a statement was made of the comparative cost for soundings where made by the Navy and where made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It was said that the cost of soundings when made by the Navy was very much in excess of the cost of soundings when made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Some one said he was going to answer that. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am not able to answer it, but I can very readily understand how such a conclusion might be arrived at by computing the various things attaching to a naval outfit that would not attach to one of these Coast and Geodetic Survey outfits.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I understand about those salary figures, but the difference is so great that there ought to be some explanation made.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Ought not some explanation to be made about the difference in the salaries? I think so. But how does it happen that this bill asks for an appropriation of $5,000 to pay a chief of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, when the Navy proposes to detail a commander, with a salary of $3,900, an officer whom the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] says belongs to the best educated part of our citizenship?

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. You say that the Secretary of the Navy proposes to detail a commander. I have a letter in my possession from the Secretary of the Navy stating that it is utterly impossible to supply the ships that we now have with officers, and regretting his inability to take them from civil life.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. And that his only remedy is by an increase of the cadets. How are you going to put that additional demand upon the Department for officers when the Secretary says that the Department is now short so many officers who are needed to man these ships?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The Chief of the Coast and Geodetic Survey applied for Navy officers, and the Secretary of the Navy declined to give them to him.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. We all understand that so far as the ships authorized to be constructed are concerned we have not officers enough to man them; but if the provisions of the naval bill which we have put through this House are adopted by the Senate, and the Naval Academy course is made four years instead of six, by the time the new Navy is completed gentlemen may possess their souls in peace and we will have officers enough to command the ships.

Mr. HILL. And you do not propose to do this work until the new Navy is completed?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Yes; we propose to do it right now. Does the gentleman know that there are between 700 and 800 officers on shore leave now who ought to be sent out of the Department and put on board ship and sent to sea? While the Navy Department is complaining of not having officers enough, I will tell the gentleman that there are nearly 700 officers who could be sent from these departments and put in command of vessels.

Mr. HILL. Has the gentleman any idea——

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. When so many of these ships were put out of commission, does the gentleman remember a published statement that there were not officers enough to command them?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Because the officers are in the Department, in the various bureaus and navy-yards, instead of being ordered to sea.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think they should all be ordered to sea?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Had they not better be ordered to sea than to have the present condition of affairs? I think so. But the Secretary of the Navy is the man who has charge of that and not the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am dealing with one branch of the matter now and not with the matter of officers. That is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DAYTON. I will yield an additional five minutes to the gentleman to enable him to answer these questions.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Does not the very condition to which you have just alluded point inevitably to the fact that the Navy Department will never attend to this in the business-like way that the Coast and Geodetic Survey would?

Mr. DAYTON. Will my friend from Kentucky allow me to answer that question? There never has been a charge made against the efficiency of the American Navy, while against the Coast and Geodetic Survey there have been charges. There has been scandal after scandal, and your President recommended that it ought to be divided because of its inefficiency and because of the scandal connected with it.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Let me come back to that.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman from Kentucky has just made a statement against the Navy.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to speculate upon what the Navy Department will do hereafter. I take this opportunity to say that my limited connection with the officers of the United States Navy has led me to conclude that they are educated, patriotic men, lovers of their country, and that they will do their duty. That there is some rottenness in some respects may be true; but as I say, taking them as a whole, they are a credit to their class and to their country.

Mr. HILL. If it is a fact that seven or eight hundred of these officers are on shore, is it not in accordance with a well-established regulation of the Navy that after having served a certain length of sea service they are then entitled to shore duty?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I will not admit that they are entitled to it.

Mr. HILL. Has it not become a regulation by custom?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. It may have become a regulation by custom.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, it was said by some gentleman sitting near where I am that there may be an attempt to impose upon members of this House by some statement made before the committee. I would like to ask the gentleman, as he has looked into this subject, how much money would be saved to the country if the proposition as made by the Committee on Naval Affairs should be adopted?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Three hundred and fifteen thousand dollars will be saved.

Mr. HILL. That is very problematical.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. It is not problematical. It is as fully capable of demonstration as that two and two are four.

Mr. CANNON. I wish my friend would demonstrate it, because I will demonstrate exactly the opposite. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am going to demonstrate it to the satisfaction even of my friend from Illinois.

Mr. SIBLEY. The gentleman is between the devil and the deep blue sea. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Which is the devil and which the deep blue sea?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I think the devil is on that side of the aisle. I wish to say in this connection that the provision we have made in the appropriations recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs covered everything asked for by the Navy Department, which was $90,000. That was struck out, but the Senate has put it back again. But that will do the work of this office, and now you come in and ask for $425,000 for doing the very same work which the Navy proposes to do for $90,000.

Mr. CANNON. What are the items that make up that $90,000?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. My friend knows that I can not go over item by item. That will take up all my time.

Mr. CANNON. But if you will do it, you will find out that there is $500,000.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. The gentleman certainly knows that there is nothing so easily susceptible of entanglement as figures.

Mr. HILL. It depends upon who makes them.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Yes; and just wait a while, as I am trying to elucidate the situation. I am far too sagacious to put myself up against the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in a matter of that kind.

Mr. BUTLER. How much less appropriation will be made of the moneys of the United States Government if this appropriation made should be stricken out and the one recommended by the Naval Committee adopted?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Three hundred and fifteen thousand dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I stated at the outset, and I repeat in conclusion, that in view of the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the naval officers of the United States Government are the best educated in the world, I desire to read a few extracts from a statement prepared by the Navy Department upon this question. Now, these are the very men who sail the sea, who fight the guns, and they certainly ought to know what they want.

All maritime nations—

It says—

without exception do their maritime surveying under the navy department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAYTON. I will yield the gentleman a couple more minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I ask the attention of the committee to this statement:

Naval officers are in every respect better qualified than any others to obtain the necessary hydrographic data and determine which is most needed on a chart for maritime use.

I want to answer the gentleman. Here is a statement of another truth.

The naval officers are the best qualified for doing this work.

3. Naval officers for sixty years have done the hydrographic work used by the Coast Survey, the latter doing unnecessary topographical or outside work not needed on charts for the use of mariners.

4. After more than ninety years the Coast Survey has not completed our own coast proper, with more than twice as much coast line added by that of Alaska and the new possessions.

5. With the sum now appropriated for the Coast Survey added to the current ones of the Navy, it may be safely stated that, with the resources in possession of the Navy, the needed charts of the entire world would be at our disposal in ten years from date of consolidation under the Navy Department.

6. It is of vast importance to the naval officers to have good charts; it is to his own interest, as well as that of the country at large, to have them promptly, and hence the incentive to produce quick results so wanting in the Coast Survey after an existence of nearly a century.

7. The experience of all nations having navies, good governmental administration, economy, promptness of work with quick publication, all point to the advisability of placing all maritime Government survey works under the direction of the Navy Department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that statement of the Navy Department for the consideration of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY].

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, dealing with the question of the Hydrographic Office on the legislative bill, I want to call attention of the committee to the following figures: There was appropriated for the Hydrographic Office on that bill last year about $40,000. Notwithstanding their appropriation was limited to $40,000, they succeeded in expending $86,000. They took from the appropriation for purchase of copper plate, etc., $28,000, which they paid for personal services. They took from the pilots' chart appropriation eight thousand more, which they paid for personal service. They took from the naval bill $10,000 and upward, which they paid for personal service in violation of law. There is not a man in the Navy Department, from the Secretary of the Navy down, who will not admit that $10,000 and more was paid in violation of the law for personal service. This fact, however, was not known to the Secretary of the Navy until after the expenditure was made.

Mr. DAYTON. What do you mean by "personal service?"

Mr. HEMENWAY. Services of clerks, including, if the gentleman pleases, in the great economy they seem to enforce here, men who are on the retired list of the Navy receiving as high as $1,950 a year retired pay, employed in this Hydrographic Office, to serve as civilian clerks. That is what this thing results in.

Mr. DAYTON. Was not that when no other men in the country qualified by examination to fill the places could be found?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Notwithstanding the gentleman's statement, there were hundreds of civilians in the country competent to fill every one of the places, and yet they seek to furnish berths for retired naval officers already receiving retired pay.

Mr. DAYTON. The gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am going to be fair, and if the gentleman will be patient, as I have only five minutes, I will name the salaries that were received.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to meet you on the question right there, so that it may go fairly before the House. Is it not true that the Civil Service advertised all over the country examinations for experts for this service, and that that examination was held, and that there were only two civilians that were able to pass it?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Who passed before a board of naval officers. Now, gentlemen, catch that statement—who passed before a board of naval officers, when civilians were contending for the places that retired naval officers wanted. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, if you want militarism in this country, if you

want this whole thing controlled by the Army and Navy, you follow the Committee on Naval Affairs in this instance. The Committee on Appropriations have no specialties to deal with. We deal with a number of questions, and I can readily see how gentlemen who have specialties to deal with lead off on one thing and can not see the other side of this question.

Now, I have called your attention to the appropriation for the Hydrographic Office on the legislative bill. From the appropriation of $40,000 they succeeded in spending $86,000, $46,000 more than they were entitled to spend.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman pardon me once more?

Mr. HEMENWAY. When I get through I will yield. Now, then, upon the legislative bill this year, seeking to prevent an expenditure of money unlawfully, we put this provision in:

No expenditure shall be incurred or authorized for personal service or otherwise under the Hydrographic Office, Washington, D. C., during the fiscal year 1901, except as herein authorized.

In other words, we undertook to say when we appropriated what was sufficient for that office—and I want to say that we appropriate every dollar they estimate for—we say, when you expend this money you have got to stop; you can not go grabbing around at every appropriation in existence, and taking something out and giving it to the Hydrographic Office. What do they seek to do? To take away from the Weather Bureau their duty. They go out and duplicate the work performed by the Weather Bureau. They duplicate the Weather Bureau's charts; they take from the work of the Weather Bureau and put it into form, and send it out as information from the Hydrographic Office, information that three months before was furnished by the Weather Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to yield to the gentleman two minutes more to answer this simple question and put himself on record in regard to it. Do you mean to cast reflection on the officers who conducted the examination of these men for employment in the Hydrographic Bureau?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I mean exactly what I have said. If the gentleman can torture it into a reflection upon the Navy Department he has a right to do it.

Mr. DAYTON. I will ask you one other question. In the employment of the civilians you stand up for, are they subjected to any such examination, or are they simply the patronage that pertains to the office and are to be handed out, perhaps, at the request of members of Congress?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not think members of Congress are such very bad men that they are going to force upon these Departments employees who are not competent.

Mr. DAYTON. Is there any examination of them?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I hope the gentleman will allow me to get through. I believe the gentlemen who represent the country on the floor of this House are conscientious; I do not believe they are so much below the officers in the Navy that they would seek to place in the Departments men who are not competent. But I do believe it is wrong to take an officer who has been retired from the Navy because he is incompetent, and who receives as retired pay $1,950 a year (less than the full pay) because he is incompetent to perform duty as a naval officer, and give him full pay as a civilian officer.

Mr. DAYTON. The gentleman has taken my time to pay a eulogy to members of Congress; but he has not answered my question. I ask is there a single employee in the Coast and Geodetic Survey who has been subjected to an examination by naval officers or any other scientific men before being employed?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] five minutes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman knows, as I suppose everybody else does who is informed on this subject, that all these officers are under civil-service rules and are obliged to stand a civil-service examination.

Mr. DAYTON. The gentleman will pardon me. How many of them have been subjected to such an examination? Will the gentleman say that 15 of them have been subjected to this examination?

Mr. HEMENWAY. There are no doubt men in this service who got in before the civil-service law was in force; but, as I understand, at the present time they are all under civil-service rules. And when it comes to the question of economy, everyone knows that this work can be done more cheaply by civilians than by naval officers. Every one of these naval officers engaged in this duty was withdrawn from the coast survey; and the statement was made at the time that they were withdrawn because their services were absolutely necessary in the Navy—that they had no time to devote to this service. I do not desire to criticise anyone, but here is a list of retired naval officers who are taken care of——

Mr. DAYTON. How many of them? Are there not only seven?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Seven or eight at any rate in the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. DAYTON. Name them.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not believe their names are given.

Mr. DAYTON. I have them.

Mr. HEMENWAY. But the number is seven, I think. Of the appropriation of $40,000 made last year quite a sum went to retired naval officers. I do not believe that when a man's condition is such that he can no longer be of value to the country in the Navy he is entitled to full pay as a civilian officer. I do not believe he ought to be employed in these Departments and given full pay.

Mr. THROPP. Is it not the fact that these officers are retired not because of incompetency to perform their duties but because they have reached the age limit prescribed by law?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, if they are retired on account of having reached the age limit, why should they take the places that civilians ought to have?

Mr. DAYTON. Why is the clerk of your committee a retired Army officer?

Mr. CANNON. Which one?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not know any clerk of our committee who is a retired Army officer.

Mr. DAYTON. I understand it is a fact.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman is in error on this point, as on many others.

Mr. DAYTON. According to my information, my statement in regard to clerk of the gentleman's committee is correct.

Mr. CANNON. Let us settle that thing right now. I say that such is not the case.

Mr. DAYTON. I was so informed. The gentleman, of course, states the fact, and I regret my misinformation.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And further, I want to say for the clerk of our committee that he is the most efficient clerk that ever served on any committee of this House. I think it will be generally conceded by all members, whether they belong to our committee or not, that the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations is practically the most competent that ever served on any committee of the House.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I would like to know why it is that the President of the United States, in case of emergency, during the war and since, has called upon retired naval officers, notably Mahan and others, for services that no one else could render?

Mr. HEMENWAY. It is perfectly proper that he should do so, and no doubt those officers are glad to render the service. But what I object to—and the gentleman must understand me—is taking these retired officers and giving them permanent places on civilian duty with full pay, while at the same time they are drawing their pay as retired officers of the Navy. There are a number of such men—I have a list before me—who are receiving retired pay as naval officers, and at the same time receiving full pay for performing civilian duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time remains for the discussion of this proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has twenty minutes, and the gentleman from West Virginia has eight minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from West Virginia if he desires to consume additional time?

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman in charge of this bill that I do desire to use the remainder of the time allotted to me but in this way. It will be impossible for me, in the limited time at my disposal, to answer the argument made by gentlemen against the proposition I have submitted. This matter, of course, will come before the House hereafter, and perhaps many times hereafter, for its consideration. I assume that the matter will not finally pass from the attention of this body until it is fully informed upon it, and for the purpose of placing the question clearly before it, I wish to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD, first, certain data in reference to the hydrographic work which has been done by the Navy Department. Second, I wish to ask to incorporate a statement showing what the Coast and Geodetic Survey has done in this connection. Third, another table showing the cost of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the salaries paid to the employees engaged in that service. I ask in the fourth place, Mr. Chairman, to incorporate a table which will show the number of naval officers who have been engaged in this service for some years past, to demonstrate that where naval officers are engaged in this service the expenditure on the part of the Government is greatly less, because of the fact that we have to pay them their salaries anyhow, and lastly, I ask to incorporate a number of memoranda and documents showing that this Department can and will do the work; that the Navy has the vessels with which to perform the work, while otherwise it might become necessary to either construct or employ vessels at an additional expense for this purpose.

I wish also to ask consent to incorporate in my remarks the correspondence between the two Departments of Government, the

Treasury and the Navy Department, in which the Secretary of the Treasury virtually admits that hydrographic work should be done by the Navy; and I also ask to incorporate a tabular statement of the accounts of these two bureaus for this service, in order to show what the expense has been under the management of each of them. In the same connection, Mr. Chairman, I will, if there be no objection, insert the protest of some of the maritime interests of the country against the methods which have been suggested here by gentlemen on the floor as to the prosecution of these surveys.

Now, I ask that I may be permitted to incorporate this data in my remarks, to show that this question from the very beginning originated in the last Congress; and I challenge gentlemen who shall follow me, in all kindness, to tell me if this is not true, that this trouble arose in the last Congress, when, without any hearing from the Navy Department, this provision was incorporated into the sundry civil bill? I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if he can produce a scratch of a pen showing that any other person appeared before the Committee on Appropriations except the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, upon whose request these words which I have sought to strike out from this bill were incorporated into the sundry civil bill, upon which authority they have undertaken to go to the Philippine Islands and establish a branch office there, and are asking $324,000 additional appropriation, with a number of additional employees, seamen, sailors, captains, and surgeons, to do this work, and at the same time without authority, under the navigation laws, to traverse the high seas and with no laws whereby they can put down mutiny and enforce order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention further, and I ask to incorporate in my remarks an absolute official statement answering the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] in regard to the employment of retired naval officers, which will show that everybody connected with the Hydrographic Office has been subjected to the severest examination as to his capabilities and special fitness for this work; that out of the eleven men who appeared for that examination some time ago but two civilians were able to pass it, and that is the only reason why the civilians are not employed. At the same time I will show that their salaries on an average are from $500 to $1,000 less than the salaries of the men who are not examined and who are civilians in this Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Further, I will show by the absolute official statement that the Coast and Geodetic Survey succeeded in manufacturing only five charts so far this year; that the salaries of the Coast and Geodetic Survey employees aggregated over $250,000, while those of the Hydrographic Office aggregated only $110,000. I want to show that the $250,000-institution gave us five charts, three of which were found to be absolutely unsuitable for purposes of navigation and one of them was a mere compilation from obsolete authorities, while the Hydrographic Bureau, that cost us $110,000, furnished thirty-five charts.

Then I want to incorporate in my remarks the memorial of the National Underwriters' Association, protesting against this; because the maritime world recognize that the charts furnished by the Coast and Geodetic Survey are not reliable, and that this work ought to be done by experienced naval officers. It is the old, old story whether or not the trained and equipped lawyer is better able to make up his brief than a clerk in his office who is studying law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this question is one, as I say, that must come before the House of Representatives. It must be settled. The Senate committee have restored the item of $100,000 for ocean surveys stricken out by the House from the naval bill. Conference reports will doubtless be had upon it. This House ought to settle it right. You ought to have this information before you, and when you have it before you I have an abiding faith that these reflections that were cast, for instance, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] upon the integrity and character of the work done by our naval officers will be dissipated into thin air.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAYTON. Yes; I will yield even in my time, although the gentleman controls plenty of time.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I want to say that the gentleman is putting into my mouth something I did not say, and I think he knows it.

Mr. DAYTON. Well, I want simply to say this, that when I asked you whether you intended to cast a reflection upon the naval officers I never did get an answer out of you, and I submit to the House whether I did or not. The American Navy has never failed to do its duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair understands that the gentleman from West Virginia desires to ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to publish certain documents.

Mr. DAYTON. Yes; and to publish in connection therewith various statements and documents that I have referred to.

Mr. THROPP. I wish to make a suggestion. If the gentleman in incorporating his remarks, when he makes comparisons, will give us the salaries of naval officers, what they get as additional compensation (see comparative table at end), and also what would be paid to civilians performing similar duty. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY], for instance, has said that a certain man gets $3,300, but he did not tell us what the man performing similar duty would get.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I herewith append statements and documents, heretofore referred to, as a part of my remarks.

APPENDIX.

SUBJECT INDEX.

Explanation in detail of the estimates for ocean and lake surveys.
Documents, etc., showing the establishment of the Hydrographic Office and Coast Survey.
Statutes establishing the Hydrographic Office; statutes establishing the Coast Survey; extract from President Cleveland's first annual message to Congress concerning the Coast Survey.
Brief history of the Hydrographic Office.
Correspondence between the Navy Department and the Treasury Department in reference to Mercator and polyconic projections used in chart construction, and relative duties of Hydrographic Office and Coast and Geodetic Survey.
Duplication of public work in the operations of the Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Treasury Department.
Memorandum concerning alleged duplication of work in the Hydrographic Office, Navy Department, in issuing charts of the Great Lakes.
Chart construction in the Hydrographic Office.
Statistics concerning the hydrographic survey work of naval officers.
Memorandum concerning the progress of hydrographic surveys of Porto Rico by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Amount of work performed by the U. S. S. *Eagle* and the U. S. S. *Yankton* during the winter of 1898 and 1899.
Requests for survey of the coast and harbors of Cuba.
Requests for survey of the Great Lakes.
Requests for survey of the harbor of Pensacola, Fla.
Foreign survey systems. Extract from the Government publication Facts Regarding the Principal Government Surveys of the World. The organization of the British service for helping navigation.
Memorandum of the personnel of the Coast Survey; roster of officers attached thereto.

EXPLANATION IN DETAIL OF THE ESTIMATES FOR OCEAN AND LAKE SURVEYS.

ESTIMATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1901.

Ocean and lake surveys—

Ocean and lake surveys; the publication and care of the results thereof; the purchase of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, and freight and express charges on the same; for the survey of the island of Guam, and continuing the surveys of the imperfectly known parts of the coasts and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago, of the Hawaiian Group, and of the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, with their bordering keys and waters, and minor outlying islands; deep-sea soundings and other observations for the survey of suboceanic telegraph cable routes; determinations of the magnetic variation, and other observations necessary for the construction of charts for the correction of the mariner's compass in oceanic navigation, and continuing the investigations and charting of reported obstructions to navigation in the United States waters of the Great Lakes, including the hire of vessels and the compensation, not otherwise appropriated for, of persons employed in the field work, under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and for every expenditure requisite for making hydrographic surveys that are required under the regulations for the government of the Navy, and any unexpended balance of the appropriation for ocean and lake surveys for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, is hereby also appropriated..... $100,000

Amendment to naval appropriation bill for 1901, submitted by Representative Joseph G. Cannon, April 19, and which was adopted by the House and passed April 21, 1900.

Ocean surveys:

For special ocean surveys and the publication thereof..... $10,000

APPROPRIATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1900.

Ocean and lake surveys, Bureau of Equipment, 1899 and 1900:

Ocean and lake surveys; the publication and care of the results thereof; the purchase of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, and freight and express charges on the same; preparing and engraving on copperplates the surveys of the Mexican coasts, and the publication of a series of charts of the coasts of Central and South America, and for surveys of the imperfectly known parts of the coasts and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago, and the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, with their bordering keys and waters and the minor outlying islands; to be made immediately available..... $100,000

MEMORANDUM OF APPROPRIATIONS IN THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR OCEAN AND LAKE SURVEYS.

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1900.

Previous to 1883 the naval appropriation bill provided for the work of making charts, etc., in the Hydrographic Office. The yearly appropriation varied from forty to sixty thousand dollars for this purpose. In the year 1883 appropriations for the Hydrographic Office were incorporated in the legislative bill, and have been since that time:

Naval bill—

1884. Special ocean surveys	$10,000
1886. Special ocean surveys	13,000
1887. Special ocean surveys	4,000
1888. Ocean surveys	5,000
1889. Ocean surveys	5,000
1890. Ocean surveys	5,000
1891. Ocean and lake surveys	10,000
1892. Ocean and lake surveys	14,000
1893. Ocean and lake surveys	14,000
1894. Ocean and lake surveys	14,000
1895. Ocean and lake surveys	14,000
1896. Ocean and lake surveys	14,000
1897. Ocean and lake surveys	14,000
1898. Ocean and lake surveys	14,000
1899. Ocean and lake surveys	44,000
1900. Ocean and lake surveys	100,000

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHAIRMAN HOUSE NAVAL COMMITTEE—EXPLANATION OF ESTIMATES IN DETAIL.

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1900.

Ocean and lake surveys.

1. "The publication and care of the results thereof." The intention of this clause is to provide for the manufacture and correction of charts in accordance with the data obtained and forwarded to the Department by ships engaged on surveying duty. The work is constantly coming in from Navy ships on general duty, as well as from ships engaged chiefly on surveying duty. At present there are twelve employees in the Hydrographic Office, viz, draftsmen, engravers, compilers, computers, plate printers, and laborers, paid out of this appropriation, their total annual salaries amounting to $11,413.

The legislative appropriation bill as passed by the House contains a clause as follows: "No expenditure shall be incurred or authorized for personal services or otherwise under the Hydrographic Office during the fiscal year 1901 excepting as herein authorized by appropriations under the Navy Department, or under appropriations that may be made for printing and binding."

The above bill does not, however, provide for the employment just referred to.

2. "The purchase of nautical books, charts and sailing directions, and freight and express charges on the same."

The existing resources of the Government are insufficient to provide for the printing of more than one-half of an outfit of charts necessary for a cruising ship. Large numbers of British Admiralty charts, also British Admiralty sailing directions, are purchased and supplied to ships of the Navy for their use; the cost thereof is defrayed from this appropriation. Other foreign charts are also purchased for the purpose of being printed in the Hydrographic Office, the inscriptions on these being changed to English and otherwise modified to accord with charts used by English-speaking nations.

3. "For the survey of the island of Guam, and continuing the surveys of the imperfectly known parts of the coasts and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago, of the Hawaiian group, and of the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, with their bordering keys and waters and minor outlying islands."

There are two auxiliary cruisers, formerly yachts (the *Yankton* and *Eagle*), engaged in surveying the coast of Cuba, and have been for more than a year past. A similar ship, the *Vixen*, is now surveying the outlying islands in the neighborhood of Porto Rico for the purpose of discovering suitable rendezvous for the ships of the Navy in that vicinity, also for the purpose of ascertaining the best location for a coaling station.

The U. S. S. *Ranger* is surveying the harbor of Panama, and upon the completion of that duty will continue a survey of the Mexican coast, which was commenced several years ago for the purpose of preparing accurate charts for the safe navigation of ships between Panama and San Francisco.

The U. S. S. *Yosemite*, the station ship at Guam, has completed a survey of the harbor of San Luis d'Apra, the port of the capital city of Agana, and has been instructed to survey the entire island.

The U. S. S. *Iroquois*, formerly an ocean tug, the station ship at Honolulu, has been directed to survey the Midway Islands, with a view of their being utilized as a cable station.

The U. S. S. *Marietta* made a survey of Maturin Bar at the entrance of the San Juan River in the Gulf of Paria last winter.

The U. S. S. *Dolphin* has recently surveyed the bar at the mouth of the Orinoco River.

The U. S. S. *Michigan* is employed every summer for surveying on the Great Northern Lakes, in accordance with urgent requests from maritime companies and interests.

Instructions have been sent to the commander in chief of the Asiatic Station to detail the *Bennington* and several other small vessels suitable for the purpose for surveying the coasts and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago.

A great number of hydrographic reports from regular cruising ships have been received indicating many hitherto unknown dangers to navigation on the coasts of the late Spanish possessions now controlled by the United States.

All expenses in connection with these surveys not properly chargeable to the equipment of vessels are paid out of the appropriation "Ocean and lake surveys."

4. "Deep sea soundings and other observations for the survey of suboceanic telegraph cable routes."

When these estimates were made the survey of the proposed trans-Pacific submarine cable route had not been completed. It was not known what difficulties would be encountered and how long a time would be consumed in making this survey. Happily the survey for a direct cable has been completed, and from a cursory examination of the data sent in by the cable survey ship *Nero* it is now believed that no further surveys will be necessary. The work was accomplished several months sooner than was expected, and reflects great credit upon the officers engaged therein. In addition, the results of the survey will make a most important scientific contribution to the general knowledge of the Pacific Ocean. It may be, however, necessary in the near future, to meet the wishes of Congress, to make surveys for other routes for branch cables, or for cables to Alaska, and therefore it is deemed wise to include in the estimates the quotation above given.

5. "Determination of the magnetic variation and other observations necessary for the construction of charts for the correction of the mariner's compass in oceanic navigation."

The variation of the compass in the Pacific Ocean generally is not known at the present time within two or three degrees. In order to traverse the shortest distance between two points it is absolutely necessary to know the deviation of the compass accurately, as accurately, for instance, as known in the Atlantic Ocean. Without this information, through imperfect navigation, the run of a day may be decreased by as much as from 1 to 2 knots per hour, thus causing the expenditure of an unnecessary amount of fuel and a loss of time in carrying the mails, etc. It is the desire of the Department to make observations throughout the Pacific for the purpose of ascertaining this magnetic variation. It is necessary that these observations should be made in a wooden sailing vessel, in order to prevent the disturbing influences of magnetic metal upon the compass used for the purpose. It is the intention, if this appropriation is granted, to hire a small wooden sailing vessel for this object, none being owned by the Navy.

6. "Continuing the investigations and charting of reported obstructions to navigation in the United States waters of the Great Lakes."

Since the survey of the Great Lakes was completed, the growth of commerce upon them has peen unparalleled. Our lake fleet alone is greater than the fleet of any foreign nation excepting that of Great Britain and Germany. In recent years the amount of tonnage annually constructed on the Great Lakes has been greater than that constructed on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts combined. More than half of the best steam tonnage in the United States is owned upon the Great Lakes. The vessels in these waters have been increased very much in size as well as in numbers, and their increased draft brings them into contact with obstructions which were not necessary to consider in a survey of a generation ago, when deep-draft vessels were not employed in the navigation of the lakes. It has become necessary in some of the shoaler straits and channels to use a drag in order to discover isolated rocks and other obstructions of small superficial area. This work can only be done by nautical people who understand the needs of the safe navigation of ships.

All expenses in connection with lake surveys, not including, however, the ordinary expenses of the ship, are defrayed out of the appropriation for "Ocean and lake surveys."

7. "Including the hire of vessels and the compensation, not otherwise appropriated for, of persons employed in the field work under authority of the Secretary of the Navy."

It is not contemplated to hire any vessels, except the one above referred to for magnetic observations and occasionally one in the Great Lakes for the purpose of locating some newly discovered danger to navigation. It is sometimes necessary to employ labor to assist landing parties when doing field work for transportation, etc. The field work done in connection with hydrographic surveying is for the purpose of locating prominent objects by means of which the mariner can ascertain his position when sighting land, establishing the coast line, measuring base lines, building signal stations, etc.

8. "For other expenditures requisite for making hydrographic surveys that are required under the regulations for the government of the Navy."

This clause is for small incidental expenditures impossible to foresee.

9. "Any unexpended balance of the appropriation for ocean and lake surveys for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, is hereby also appropriated."

Owing to the continuation of the insurrection in the Philippine Archipelago surveying work there did not commence as soon as anticipated. The Department, however, is now fitting out six small vessels with a complete surveying outfit in addition to their ordinary equipment as ships of war. It is anticipated that they will be able, in addition to their regular police duties, to make rapid progress in the survey of the coasts of the numerous islands of the Philippine group. In this connection your attention is called to the report of the Philippine Commission to the President, dated January 31, 1900, volume 1, pages 127 to 129, from which the following extract is made:

"A careful study of the physical and political conditions existing in the Philippines shows that the work devolving upon the Navy in these waters is great and increasing.

"Because of the above facts, communication for trade is almost entirely by water, not only between different islands of the group, but between different parts of the same island. The task of controlling and protecting this communication is necessarily on the Navy.

"The great increase and opportunities for greater increase in our commerce with the Far East render it advisable that we should have a large enough force to show the flag at the trading ports more often than it has been possible during the last two years.

"It has been shown above that nearly all of the trade communication in the islands is necessarily by water, and that a considerable force of expensive war vessels must be maintained in the Philippines. Even now there are many steamers and sailing vessels navigating in the archipelago, and their number will be greatly augmented with the increase in trade due to the development of the islands. These facts demand immediate consideration of the means to be taken to protect the shipping from danger of wreck. The recent loss of the cruiser *Charleston*, on an uncharted reef, and the grounding of many vessels on similar obstructions indicate the untrustworthiness of the existing surveys, and it is of vital importance that new surveys be made of the whole archipelago. The naval force can carry on this work while maintaining order."

The particular object of the language in the beginning of this paragraph is to enable the Department to utilize any portion of the appropriation for the present fiscal year, in addition to the appropriation for the next fiscal year, for the purpose of prosecuting the very large amount of surveying work already alluded to. In fact, it would be a very great advantage to make this appropriation continuous in order that the work may be constant and prosecuted without fear of interruption for want of funds.

10. The Government years ago established the Hydrographic Office for the purpose, among others, to receive, care for, prepare, and publish the results of such ocean and lake surveys, together with all data relating thereto, including the publication of the finished charts. The Hydrographic Office is now prepared to do so, and has done so in the past, it being only necessary to specifically provide in the appropriation for the employment of the needed technical force, such as compilers, computers, draftsmen, engravers, plate printers, helpers, etc.

It is the universal custom of maritime nations (there is no exception) to have all their hydrographic surveying done by naval officers. The navy possesses the highly trained personnel to do this most important work, which it has always done. It possesses in the large number of small vessels captured from Spain suitable craft to immediately take up and prosecute with energy the accurate charting of Cuba and our new possessions, including the Philippines. No other branch of the Government can do it promptly or even approximately. To safeguard our fleets and American commerce prompt action is all important. Good administration, economy, and governmental interests from every point of view demand that all surveying work be placed under the immediate control and direction of the Navy Department.

During the past few months naval vessels, at small additional cost, have accurately surveyed and turned in their work at the following mentioned ports: Santiago, Guantanamo, Cuba; Honolulu, Hawaii; San Luis d'Apra, Guam; verified the survey of Wake Island, Pago Pago, Samoa, and are now engaged and nearing completion in the ports of Gibara, Banes, Nuevitas, Cuba. In addition, surveys are going on at the island of Culebra, near Porto Rico, and at several points in the Philippines.

R. B. BRADFORD,
Chief of Bureau.

DOCUMENTS, ETC., SHOWING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE AND COAST SURVEY.

Report of Secretary of the Navy for fiscal year ending June 30, 1882, volume 1, bottom of page 26, and page 255.
Report of Secretary of the Navy for fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, volume 1, bottom of page 34.
Report of Secretary of the Navy for fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, volume 1, bottom of page 47.
House Report, first session, Fifty-third Congress, 1893, volume 2, Executive Departments, organization, and appendix No. 13, pages 3, 6, 7, 15, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29.
Report of joint commission of Congress, of which Hon. W. B. ALLISON was chairman, appointed by the act of Congress, approved June 7, 1884, to investigate the transfer of the hydrographic work of the Coast Survey to the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department.
President's Cleveland's first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1885. (Forty-eighth Congress, first session.)
Acts relating to the Coast Survey.
Surveying authorized by act of Congress of February 10, 1807.
Act of Congress of April 14, 1818.
Act of Congress of July 10, 1832.
Executive orders, 1834, 1836.
Act of Congress establishing the Hydrographic Office, June 21, 1866. (R. S. 431.)
Report of minority of joint committee on Coast and Geodetic Survey.
Bill introduced in the Fifty-third Congress, first session, with an amendment by the Hon. B. A. ENLOE, House of Representatives, to abolish the Coast and Geodetic Survey and provide for the transfer of the Coast Survey to the Navy Department.
Letter of ex-Secretary H. A. Herbert, dated March 14, 1894, to the Hon. B. A. ENLOE, regarding his amendment to the bill.

Report of the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey for 1895.

Facts Regarding the Principal Government Surveys of the World. Captain Wheeler, U. S. A. 1885.

Monthly Weather Review of the United States Weather Bureau for March, 1899, page 114; April, 1899, page 154; October, 1899, page 468.

STATUTES ESTABLISHING THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE—STATUTES ESTABLISHING THE COAST SURVEY.

[Extract from President Cleveland's first annual message to Congress concerning the Coast Survey.]

TITLE X.—THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

* * * * * * *

Hydrographic Office.

21 June, 1866, c. 129, s. 1, v. 14. p. 69.

SEC. 431. There shall be a Hydrographic Office attached to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department, for the improvement of the means for navigating safely the vessels of the Navy and of the mercantile marine, by providing, under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, accurate and cheap nautical charts, sailing directions, navigators, and manuals of instructions, for the use of all vessels of the United States and for the benefit and use of navigators generally.

Maps, charts, etc.

21 June, 1866, c. 129, s. 2, v. 14, p. 69.

SEC. 432. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to cause to be prepared at the Hydrographic Office attached to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department, maps, charts, and nautical books relating to and required in navigation, and to publish and furnish them to navigators at the cost of printing and paper, and to purchase the plates and copyrights of such existing maps, charts, navigators, sailing directions, and instructions as he may consider necessary and when he may deem it expedient to do so, and under such regulations and instructions as he may prescribe.

Money received from sale of maps, charts, etc.

21 June, 1866, c. 129, s. 3, v. 14, p. 69.

SEC. 433. All moneys which may be received from the sale of maps, charts, and nautical books shall be returned by the Secretary of the Navy into the Treasury of the United States, to be used in the further preparation and publication of maps, charts, navigators, sailing directions, and instructions for the use of seamen, to be sold at the rates as set forth in the preceding section.

* * * * * * *

30 Statutes at Large, p. 374.

and the Hydrographic Office shall hereafter be attached to and be a part of the Bureau of Equipment.

TITLE LVI.—THE COAST SURVEY.

President may authorize surveys.

10 Feb., 1807, c. 8, s. 1, v. 2, p. 413.
10 July, 1832, c. 191, s. 1, v. 4, p. 570.

SEC. 4681. The President is authorized to cause a survey to be taken of the coasts of the United States, in which shall be designated the islands and shoals, with the roads or places of anchorage, within twenty leagues of any part of the shores of the United States; and also the respective courses and distances between the principal capes or headlands, together with such other matters as he may deem proper for completing an accurate chart of every part of the coasts.

Surveys beyond 20 leagues from shore.

10 Feb., 1807, c. 8, s. 2, v. 2, p. 413.

SEC. 4682. The President may also cause such examinations and observations to be made with respect to St. George Bank, and to any other bank or shoal, and the sounding and currents, although beyond the distance of 20 leagues from the shore to the Gulf Stream, as he may deem especially subservient to the commercial interests of the United States.

Mode of conducting surveys.

3 Mar., 1843, c. 100, s. 1, v. 5, p. 640.

SEC. 4683. All appropriations made for the work of surveying the coast of the United States shall be expended in accordance with the plan of reorganizing the mode of executing the survey, which has been submitted to the President by a board of officers, organized under the act of March 3, 1843, chapter 100.

Employment of officers of the Army and Navy.

Ibid.

SEC. 4684. The President shall carry into effect the plan of the board as agreed upon by a majority of its members, and shall cause to be employed as many officers of the Army and Navy of the United States as will be compatible with the successful prosecution of the work; the officers of the Navy to be employed on the hydrographical parts and the officers of the Army on the topographical parts of the work; and no officer of the Army or Navy shall receive any extra pay out of any appropriation for surveys.

Power to use books, etc., and to employ persons.

10 July, 1832, c. 191, s. 2, v. 4, p. 571.

SEC. 4685. The President is authorized, in executing the provisions of this title, to use all maps, charts, books, instruments, and apparatus belonging to the United States, and to direct where same shall be deposited, and to employ all persons in the land or naval service of the United States, and such astronomers and other persons as he shall deem proper.

Power to employ vessels.

10 Feb., 1807, c. 8, s. 3, v. 2, p. 414.
14 Apr., 1818, c. 58, s. 1, v. 3, p. 425.

SEC. 4686. The President is authorized, for any purpose of surveying the coast of the United States, to cause to be employed such of the public vessels in actual service as he deems it expedient to employ, and to give such instructions for regulating their conduct as he deems proper, according to the tenor of this title.

Manner of employment of officers of Army or Navy.

17 June, 1844, c. 105, s. 1, v. 5, pp. 681, 691.

SEC. 4687. Officers of the Army and Navy shall, as far as practicable, be employed in the work of surveying the coast of the United States whenever and in the manner required by the department having charge thereof.

Allowance for subsistence.

12 June, 1858, c. 154, s. 1, v. 11, pp. 319, 320.

SEC. 4688. The Secretary of the Treasury may make such allowances to the officers and men of the Army and Navy while employed on coast survey service for subsistence, in addition to their compensation, as he may deem necessary, not exceeding the sum authorized by the Treasury regulation of the 11th day of May, 1844.

Salary of Superintendent.

3 Mar., 1853, c. 97, s. 2, v. 10, p. 209.

SEC. 4689. The salary of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey shall be $6,000 a year.

Report.

3 Mar., 1853, c. 98, s. 1, v. 10, pp. 214, 217.

SEC. 4690. The Coast Survey report shall be submitted to Congress during the month of December in each year, and shall be accompanied by a general chart of the whole coasts of the United States, on as large a scale as convenient and practicable, showing, as near as practicable, the configuration of the coasts and showing, by lines, the probable limits of the Gulf Stream, and showing, by lines, the probable limit to which the soundings off the coast will extend, and showing, by the use of colors and explanations, the exact portions of our coasts, of which complete charts have been published by the Coast Survey; also, showing such other parts of the coasts of which the

Disposal of maps and charts.

3 June, 1844, c. 37, v. 5, p. 660.

triangulation, the topography, and the soundings have been completed but not published, and, also, such parts of the coasts of which the triangulation and topography, or the triangulation only, have been completed.

SEC. 4691. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to dispose of the maps and charts of the survey of the coast of the United States at such prices and under such regulations as may from time to time be fixed by him; and a number of copies of each sheet, not to exceed three hundred, shall be distributed among foreign governments and Departments of our own Government, and literary and scientific associations as may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S FIRST ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, DECEMBER 8, 1885.

[Twenty-eighth Congress, first session.]

The work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey was during the last fiscal year carried on within the boundaries and off the coasts of thirty-two States, two Territories, and the District of Columbia. In July last certain irregularities were found to exist in the management of this Bureau, which led to a prompt investigation of its methods. The abuses which were brought to light by this examination and the reckless disregard of duty and the interests of the Government developed on the part of some of those connected with the service made a change of superintendency and a few of its other officers necessary. Since the Bureau has been in new hands an introduction of economies and the application of business methods have produced an important saving to the Government and a promise of more useful results.

This service has never been regulated by anything but the most indefinite legal enactments and the most unsatisfactory rules. It was many years ago sanctioned apparently for the purpose regarded as temporary and related to a survey of our coast. Having gained a place in the appropriations made by Congress, it has gradually taken to itself powers and objects not contemplated in its creation and extended its operations until it sadly needs legislative attention.

So far as a further survey of our coast is concerned, there seems to be a propriety in transferring that work to the Navy Department. The other duties now in charge of this establishment, if they can not be profitably attached to some existing department or other bureau, should be prosecuted under a law exactly defining their scope and purpose, and with a careful discrimination between the scientific inquiries which may properly be assumed by the Government and those which should be undertaken by State authority or by individual enterprise.

It is hoped that the report of the Congressional committee heretofore appointed to investigate this and other like matters will aid in the accomplishment of proper legislation on this subject.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE.

MEMORANDUM.

FEBRUARY 23, 1900.

BRIEF OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE.

On the 29th November, 1829, the Board of Navy Commissioners, in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, recommended the establishment of a depot of charts, etc. This recommendation was the initial step toward establishing a branch of the Navy Department devoted exclusively to furthering the interests and lessening the dangers of navigation. On the 6th December, 1830, Lieutenant Goldsborough, U. S. N., was directed to collect instruments, charts, etc., and bring them to Washington, and charged with the purchase and care of the instruments furnished United States vessels. Early in 1831 this duty was increased so as to include the purchase of all charts, etc.

In May, 1835, on the recommendation of the board of commissioners, a lithographic press was purchased, and in the following autumn the first lithographic charts made their appearance. During 1837, four engraved charts were published by the depot from surveys made by officers of the United States Navy. In November, 1841, the board of commissioners urged the establishment of a large and permanent depot. This was indorsed by the Secretary of the Navy, and on August 31, 1842, Congress passed an act to provide for the building of a suitable house for the charts, instruments, etc., of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy, November 26, 1842, defining the duties and responsibilities of the several bureaus, directed that the Depot of Charts and Instruments should be attached to the Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography and should constitute the hydrographic Branch of that Bureau. Under the act of July 5, 1862, reorganizing the Navy Department, the Depot of Charts, etc., was transferred from the Bureau of Ordnance to the Bureau of Navigation.

On the 21st of June, 1866, the connection between the Observatory and the Depot of Charts and Instruments was severed by law. The act of Congress passed on that date established a Hydrographic Office for the improvement of the means for navigation supplied the vessels of the Navy and mercantile marine, by providing, under authority of the Secretary of the Navy, accurate and cheap nautical charts, sailing directions, navigators, and manuals of instruction for the use of all vessels of the United States and for the benefit and use of navigators generally. (See U. S. Statutes at Large, Volume XIV, p. 69; and Revised Statutes, sections 431, 432, and 433.) This act further provides that the Secretary of the Navy be authorized to cause to be prepared in the Hydrographic Office thus created, such maps, charts, and sailing directions and nautical books relating to and required in navigation, and to publish and furnish them to navigators at the cost of printing and paper, and to purchase plates and copyrights of such existing charts, maps, sailing directions, etc., as he may consider necessary.

A building, generally known as the "Old Octagon," situated on the northwest corner of New York avenue and Eighteenth street, in the northwest section of Washington, was rented by the Government, and the charts, books, and instruments, with the exception of the chronometers, were removed to it. Commander Thomas Scott Fillebrown, U. S. N., was the first officer ordered to take charge of the Hydrographic Office, and assumed his duties on the 1st of August, 1856. Steps were taken to carry out the provisions of the law authorizing the purchase of plates for printing charts, and a board, composed of experts, examined and recommended the purchase of certain articles, which were accordingly bought by the Hydrographic Office. These articles were stereotyped plates of books, chart plates, drawings of charts, copyrights of books, etc.

The few copper and steel plates that had come previously into the possession of the Hydrographic Office had generally been left in the hands of the engravers and lithographers who had executed the particular work authorized from time to time by Congress. These comprised the engraved plates of the surveys made by the Wilkes exploring expedition in 1838-1842, and the North Pacific and Arctic surveying expeditions under Commander John Rodgers in 1853-1856, as well as some plates of surveys made by the exploring expedition to Japan under Commodore M. C. Perry in 1852-1855. The publication of charts from plates and original surveys by United States vessels and a volume of sailing directions was regularly commenced this year by the Hydrographic Office. In the latter part of 1867 the labor of correcting the purchased charts, plates, etc., was begun, owing to changes and more reliable information, they having been found full of errors.

The first Hydrographic Notice and Notice to Mariners were published and sent out from the Hydrographic Office in 1867. In August, 1869, agents for the sale of the publications of the Hydrographic Office were appointed in New York, Boston,

New Orleans, and San Francisco. Later there were established one or more agencies for the sale of Hydrographic Office publications in all the important maritime cities, on the Great Lakes, and some foreign. On the 21st of January, 1871, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation issued an order, approved by the Secretary of the Navy, reorganizing the Hydrographic Office, the officer in charge of which was thereafter to be known as the Hydrograper to the Bureau of Navigation, and to be responsible for everything emanating from the office. While United States vessels of war had been assigned to duties of surveys in the various parts of the world from time to time, hereafter it was systematically done under plans laid down by the Hydrographic Office.

In 1873 the system of soliciting meteorological data from merchant vessels for the construction of charts, etc., which had been adopted previous to the civil war by Lieutenant Maury, was again put into practice. By the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1882, there had become a great demand for charts and other publications of the Hydrographic Office, which, together with the activity of our naval vessels in making surveys and forwarding the data for publication, entailed increased labors upon the office, which, by means of an international system of exchange of hydrographic information and the energy with which foreign governments were carrying on extended surveys and investigations, kept the office constantly in receipt of reports of discovered dangers and changes, and necessitated the commencement of a system of archives. The satisfactory character of charts produced by the process of lithography and the enormous labor required to keep them corrected by hand was brought to the attention of Congress, which, in August, 1882, passed an act appropriating $15,000 to begin the transfer of photolithographic charts to copper plates.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, the work of the Hydrographic Office had increased so much that more space was necessary than was available in the building of the State, War, and Navy; therefore Congress made an appropriation of $1,200 for the rent of a suitable building for the engraving and printing of plates. The growing appreciation of the importance of the work of the Hydrographic Office to the seafaring world was shown during the year by the constantly increased demand for its publications. Merchant captains evinced their interest in furthering the objects of the office by eagerly contributing hydrographic information obtained on their voyages, in some cases even cabling from Europe to the office at their own expense accounts of storms, etc., encountered on their voyages across the Atlantic. By the naval act of May 4, 1898, the Hydrographic Office was transferred from the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, to the Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, under which Bureau it is at present.

There are now in possession of the Hydrographic Office 1,058 engraved chart plates having the latest available information incorporated on them, and are ready for the issue of reliable charts to the vessels of the Navy and the mercantile marine. There were printed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, for issue to navigators, 145,922 copies of nautical charts; there were issued to United States vessels, sold to merchant vessels, etc., 68,784. There are 1,208 Hydrographic Office charts, of which 1,027 are plate and 181 are lithograph. At present the Hydrographic Office publishes and issues 51 books for purposes of navigation and sailing directions; of these 9,359 were issued during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899. During the past year 1,242 announcements of importance to navigators were published in the usual form of notices to mariners, 70,200 copies of which were issued to the maritime community of the world. In addition to these, 803,495 extracts were also put into circulation.

BRANCH HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICES.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, in order to bring the nautical information furnished by the Hydrograghic Office within easier reach of shipmasters and seafaring men in general, branch hydrographic offices were established in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. These have been increased to 15, established at the important cities on the seaboard and Great Lakes, and others have been requested. Shipmasters and others interested in navigation were invited to bring their charts to these offices for comparison and correction, and many of those who availed themselves of the offer discovered that their charts were full of dangerous errors. Through the branch offices merchant captains were enabled to secure more readily the latest publications of the main office, and to obtain information on all subjects of a nautical character.

Hydrographic notices and notices to mariners were consolidated under the name of the latter. Prior to the establishment of the branch offices many of these notices had failed to reach the persons most concerned, but they were now brought into direct contact with the commercial marine, and their value was thus greatly enhanced. The demand for them was consequently increased, while the number issued and the field over which they were extended enormously expanded by the establishment of a system of mutual exchange of such notices with every office or department of other countries in any way likely to receive hydrographic information. By 1895 the branch offices had assumed greatly increased importance in the eyes of the commercial world: they served as agents for the dissemination of hydrographic matter of every kind, and became veritable bureaus of nautical information for merchant captains, shipowners, marine insurance companies, and persons of every class engaged in general navigation.

PILOT CHARTS.

On December 1, 1883, the monthly issue of the Pilot Charts of the Atlantic Ocean was commenced. These charts showed graphically all information relating to the navigation of the Atlantic Ocean collected from reports received by the Hydrographic Office during the preceding month; such as the position of all wrecks and drifting buoys, the prevailing winds, their force and direction, the locality of calms and their duration, the position of fishing fleets, the prevailing currents, the tracks of cyclones and directions for avoiding their centers. Upon these data predictions for the ensuing month were based and represented graphically upon the charts, showing the routes steamers should take in order to keep clear of fishing fleets and icebergs, the best sailing routes between New York and the equator, also between the equator and Europe, and a résumé of the Notices to Mariners issued during the preceding month.

Experience has shown the issue of pilot charts to have been one of the most felicitous works of the office. Merchant captains, the first to recognize the value of these charts, began to cooperate heartily in the labor of collecting and forwarding the information. The demand for the charts increased enormously, and to supply the growing want for such a bulletin, corrected to the latest data, it was soon found to be necessary to issue a weekly supplement. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, 44,400 Pilot Charts of the North Atlantic Ocean, 19,200 Pilot Charts of the North Pacific Ocean, and 28,600 Weekly Bulletins have been issued. There are 1,992 observers, of nearly all the nationalities of the world. The issue of the Pilot Chart of the North Pacific was a little irregular at first; three charts were issued in 1894, since which year they have been issued regularly each month.

BRIEFLY.

The mission of the Hydrographic Office is to provide for the safe navigation of American shipping to all parts of the world; hence it publishes many nautical books and sailing directions, also about 1,225 different charts, besides which it issues to naval vessels between 400 and 500 Coast Survey charts and 2,170 British Admiralty charts. The Hydrographic Office, therefore, keeps corrected and issues more than 3,800 different hydrographic charts. It has also its drafting, engraving, and printing division, as the Coast Survey establishment has. Its work of hydrography and chart publication parallels that of the Coast Survey, but exceeds it in scope. Its province is to publish hydrographic charts of all the harbors and coasts of the world. The head of every division in the Hydrographic Office, whether scientific or otherwise, is either a naval officer on the active list or a graduate of the Naval Academy.

The Hydrographic Office publishes periodicals, both weekly and monthly, for the special information of mariners, and is known more widely than the hydrographic offices of other nations. In fact, it stands so high among mariners that it has secured, through its publications and helps to mariners, the voluntary services of about 2,000 observers of the weather and other conditions at sea. Hundreds of foreigners representing all maritime nations are enrolled on its list of voluntary observers. It has 15 branch offices in the various seaport and lake cities, giving information and advice to mariners.

FACTS AS TO THE REPEATED SUGGESTION AND RECOMMENDATION BY THE SECRETARIES OF THE NAVY, COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS, CHIEFS OF BUREAU, AND HYDROGRAPHERS THAT THE HYDROGRAPHIC PART OF THE COAST SURVEY SHOULD BE TRANSFERRED TO THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1882, states:

"For the past fifty years the Coast Survey has required and received the support and assistance of the Navy. Thirty naval officers a year on an average have been engaged in the work, and during the last ten years the number has steadily increased. Of the officers now in the active list of the Navy, 232 have at various times been so employed. The amount expended from the naval appropriation for the pay and maintenance of the officers and men employed on Coast-Survey duty in the year 1881 was $220,931.64. As the direct appropriation for the Coast Survey for the same year was $567,507.06, it appears that nearly one-third of the total expense of the survey was borne by the Navy.

"The preparation of charts and sailing directions is a work which falls properly within the scope of a naval establishment. It has no inherent connection with the affairs of any other department of the Government. As now organized it is carried on by a nearly independent bureau of the Treasury Department, but the work is largely done by naval officers and largely supported by naval appropriations.

"In view of these considerations the union of the Coast-Survey administration with that of the Navy is suitable and proper and would be advantageous to both.

* * * * * * *

"A total of 1,510 naval officers, including 1,279 from the line and 231 from the staff, have been attached to the Coast-Survey service at one time or another since 1832. Many names are of course repeated. Also, that of the commissioned line officers of the Navy (the line being the corps which performs the surveying duty) now on the active list of the Navy, 24 per cent of the whole have been attached to the Coast Survey."

Since that time some 600 odd naval officers have been assigned to duty with the Coast Survey, making a grand total, since 1832 of about 2,200 naval officers.

NOTE.—In addition to the hydrographic work done for the Coast Survey by naval officers, the following shows the surveying done and hydrographic information obtained in all parts of the world by naval officers attached to regular vessels of war temporarily assigned to the duty of surveying—a class of work properly coming under that of ocean and lake surveys. Besides this work thousands of wind and current, track, trade wind, pilot, whale, thermal, and storm charts were collected and compiled by naval officers, to say nothing of the numerous chart data obtained from the Wilkes exploring expedition of 1838–1842, the North Pacific and Arctic surveying expedition under Commander John Rodgers in 1853–1856, as well as from some plates of surveys made by the exploring expedition to Japan under Commodore M. C. Perry in 1852–1855—all surveys being done by naval officers.

The following surveys were made and hydrographic information obtained in various parts of the world by vessels of war, under command of United States naval officers:

Fiscal years.	Average number of vessels sending in surveys or hydrographic information.
1868–1872	1
1872–1882	5
1882 to date	20

With the exception of the United States, all hydrographic surveying of all the different nations is done under the direction of the navy department and by naval officers.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, states:

"The Coast Survey, originally established for the purpose of making hydrographic charts, has of late years extended its functions in a totally different direction—that of geodetic surveys in the interior. In making this extension it has gradually abandoned the water survey to the Navy, until now the actual work in this field is done almost exclusively by naval officers withdrawn for the purpose from the direction and control of their own Department. By an extraordinary anomaly in legislation the United States Hydrographic Office, an indispensable branch of this Department, is allowed to survey and make charts of every coast in the world but that of the United States, while the best naval surveyors are claimed by another Department to perform this work under its supervision. Sixty-seven naval officers are now diverted in this manner from the direction of the Navy, and 280 seamen, out of the 7,500 allowed to the Navy, are now on board Coast Survey vessels.

"For such an arrangement there might be some show of reason if the work upon which the officers are engaged were specially connected with the department under which they are placed, and remote from the subject of which their own department has cognizance; but, in view of the fact that no part of this work has the faintest traceable connection with the general purposes of the Treasury, that its effectual performance is of vital importance to the Navy, and that an office exists to-day in the Navy Department where similar work is necessarily carried on, it is inconceivable why so inconvenient, artificial, and indefensible an arrangement should be perpetuated. The existing office might properly continue the geodetic work, which seems gradually to be absorbing its attention and its appropriations, which the hydrographic surveys on our coast, now performed by naval officers, under a naval inspector, in the office of the Geodetic Survey, should be carried on, like other hydrographic surveys by the Naval Hydrographic Office."

The Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, states:

"A third fleet, that of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, is at the present time intrusted to naval officers. Their duties include not only the navigation of the vessels, but the execution of all the hydrographic and a part of the topographic surveys for coast charts, as well as the prosecution of scientific investigations of the bed of the ocean. In performing these duties they work under another department, being withdrawn for the time from the direction and control of their

natural head, and placed on a subsidiary footing elsewhere. For this artificial arrangement there is not a shadow of reason, and it presents grave difficulties of a positive kind.

"In the first place, the withdrawal of the officers of the Navy from the direction of the Navy Department is in itself prejudicial to discipline, and a constant source of inconvenience. Secondly, there is a clear injustice, whatever efforts may be made to avoid it in practice, in requiring naval officers to perform naval duties under another chief, with whose office they can never be identified, and giving them work to do, the results of which will be formulated and published by other hands, whose real efforts are devoted to a work remote from maritime affairs. The Coast Survey, by its gradual development into an office for geodetic operations, has transferred its main sphere of employment to the interior of the country and the observations necessary for the coast charts have been turned over to the naval officers, detailed for duty under the Superintendent, who still retains the direction of their labors. At the same time the Navy Department is maintaining as a necessary part of its organization a hydrographic office, which performs exactly the same work upon foreign coasts which the Coast Survey, through the assistance of naval officers, performs upon our own.

"Every reason exists for a reorganization of these two offices in such a way that all the hydrographic surveying of the Government shall be performed under a single head, and that the direction of the naval officers who do the actual work shall proceed from the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department.

"It is believed that the above and all other branches of Government service, whose duties are essentially nautical, demanding the same requirements and the same experience as are to be found among naval officers, should be thrown open to them, and that the direction of the services should be intrusted to the Navy Department, whereby greater unity of purpose and consistency of action would be secured. The Navy, in time of war, comprises the whole maritime force of the Government, and each partial nucleus of that force should be brought permanently under the general naval administration instead of continuing as a foreign growth in a department organized for a totally different purpose.

"It is with a deep conviction of its essential truth, only strengthened by added experience and observation, that the Department now takes occasion to repeat the fundamental doctrine upon which the above conclusions rest—a doctrine first enunciated two years ago and renewed in the report of last year, 'that the officers and seamen of the Navy should be employed to perform all the work of the National Government upon or in direct connection with the ocean.' Notwithstanding the opposition of those who, suspecting in the doctrine an impending danger to themselves, assailed with rancor the administration of the Department and the motives of naval officers, and endeavored by personal assault to divert attention from the main question and to confuse the broad and indisputable principal with irrelevant issues, there are unmistakable signs of a growing sentiment in favor of the proposition and of its application to the organization of the public service.

"It is believed that the day is not far distant when that sentiment will make itself heard with no uncertain voice and will demand recognition. That changes so considerable and so far-reaching should be accomplished at once is not to be expected; but the ultimate result, although delayed, is inevitable, and it is a source of satisfaction to the Department that the way to accomplish it has been clearly pointed out."

[Extract from the report made to the Joint Commission of Congress by C. W. Haskins and E. W. Sells, experts specially employed for the purpose of investigation, under direction of the commission; taken from House Report, first session Fifty-third Congress, 1893, volume 2, Executive Departments, Organization, etc.]

Your experts having made an examination of the organization of the bureaus conducting the surveying of the United States, with a view to establishing a better arrangement of the business of surveying, beg to submit the following report and lead recommendations thereon:

* * * * * * *

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

This Survey was authorized under the title of Coast Survey by the act of February 10, 1807, in pursuance of a recommendation of President Jefferson to establish a national coast survey for the purpose of making complete charts of our coast, with adjacent shoals and soundings, and the work was assigned to the Treasury Department, although the Survey was not organized until 1817. It was discontinued by act of Congress April 14, 1818, the office of superintendent being abolished and appropriation refused, but was restored by act of Congress July 10, 1832, and the work was again assigned to the Treasury Department.

There have been frequent attempts to have the Survey transferred to the Navy Department, as the navy men were doing the principal part of the work, and commissions have been appointed from time to time to decide upon this matter, but generally with the conclusion that it was advisable that the Coast Survey should remain under the Treasury Department, at least until the work was completed.

The Survey was empowered by the appropriation act of March 3, 1871, to establish geodetic points in each State, and to include transcontinental geodesy—that is, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific system of triangulations by geodetic operations carried on across the continent. The name of the Survey was changed by the appropriation act of March 3, 1879, to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The work of the Bureau is principally devoted to geodetic work, which is considered the best of its kind in the world. With the exception of the production of the charts from data furnished by the hydrographic inspector, all the hydrographic work is done under the hydrographic inspector and is performed by naval officers, and the boats are manned by seamen, all of whom are paid out of the Navy appropriation, running about $250,000 per annum.

* * * * * * *

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, HYDROGRAPHIC DIVISION.

All the hydrograhpic work of the Bureau comes under the direction of the hydrographic inspector, a naval officer, and the notes made by the vessels of the Coast Survey are approved by him before they are accepted. After revision these notes are given to the draftsmen in this division, who convey them to charts. The charts are then used by the draftsmen of the drafting division to combine with the topographical maps of the shore line to make the chart of the Coast Survey.

* * * * * * *

There is a well-defined line between the hydrographic work and the topographical and shore work of the Bureau. No work is done by the civil officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey so far as the survey of the water goes. The Coast and Geodetic Survey was at one time under the charge of a naval officer.

The expenditures made by the Navy Department out of the appropriations for the pay of the Navy, for the surveys performed in the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the last four years, have been as follows:

1891	$257,953.60
1892	205,659.86
1893	199,948.33
1894	198,868.15

It will thus be observed that the amount of money disbursed by the Navy Department on account of surveying work done by naval officers for the Coast and Geodetic Survey is equal to very nearly one-half of the entire sum appropriated yearly for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and within a few thousand dollars of the total sum expended on the so-called Hydrographic Division of the Coast Survey Office. It will be further noted that under the head of this Hydrographic Division the work done by it is not hydrographic work (which is done by naval officers), but transcontinental, triangulation, topographical, astronomical, magnetic work, etc.—inland work almost entirely.

* * * * * * *

SUMMARY.

It will be seen from the foregoing that there are three surveys doing mensuration work, the Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the land surveys by contract, and that there are two surveys doing hydrographic work, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department. Such a division of work and confusion of offices is not in the interest of economy, nor does it produce the best results. To attain the best results, and at the same time secure economy, the surveying of the United States should be under the direction of two bureaus, one to direct the land surveys, including geological and scientific investigation, and the other to direct the hydrographic surveys.

* * * * * * *

To make the organization consistent, the hydrographic work should be eliminated from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, as provided further on, and the efficient methods of the Geodetic Survey and the Geological Survey brought together.

* * * * * * *

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY.

Consolidating the Geodetic Survey, the Geological Survey, and the survey of public lands in one bureau called the United States Survey, makes the transfer of the hydrographic work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department desirable and consistent. There is no logical reason why the Coast and Geodetic Survey should any longer exist under its present designation, since its work on the coast is practically completed, and its money is expended in scientific surveys in all parts of the country. Its efficient function is that of a land survey, and the name of Coast Survey has been a misnomer. The following are some practical reasons why the hydrographic work should all be done under the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department:

First. Because all the work is done under the immediate direction of a naval officer and paid for out of the navy appropriation. The following is quoted from a memorandum prepared in the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department:

"All foreign surveys by the United States Government, whether on the shore or on the water, are made by its naval officers serving on board United States men-of-war. All hydrographic surveys of its own coasts are made by the United States naval officers on board Coast Survey ships. In the former case the Navy Department controls the operations throughout; that is to say, it orders, directs, and makes the surveys and publishes the resulting charts. In the latter case the Navy Department has no power of administration or general direction, but it does the fieldwork and meets the greater part of the expense. The Coast Survey establishment engraves and publishes the charts, and thereby absorbs the credit belonging to the Navy; it reaps the benefit of a misapplied advertisement."

Second. Because the Navy, being composed of sailors, is best qualified to judge what sort of charts should be prepared for the use of mariners. The method of projecting or constructing charts in use by the Navy Department is the one that is adopted in establishments in all other parts of the world where nautical charts are made. It is called the Mercator projection and shows the meridians as straight lines parallel to each other and equidistant apart, and the parallels of latitude as straight lines perpendicular to the meridians, and placed at distances apart which increase in going north or south from the equator in the same proportion that meridians converge on the surface of the earth. It is a chart to which simple methods can be applied for determining the course to be followed throughout a voyage, and has been used for centuries by seamen all over the world. It is so intrenched in the estimation of mariners that other methods of projection for charts do not find favor with them.

The charts of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are constructed according to a different method, which does not offer the same advantages in navigation as the Mercator projection. They are constructed on the polyconic projection, a projection on a number of represented conical surfaces, the meridans showing as converging curved and the parallels of latitude showing as curved lines, producing a chart which is approximately correct in detail, and showing the relative sizes as they are actually on the surface of the earth, and can have applied to all parts of it the same general scale of measurement.

Commodore C. H. Davis, a member of the National Academy of Sciences and Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, April 15, 1864, wrote a letter to Professor Hilgard, in which he said:

"You can not be surprised that I should insist, as a practical navigator, upon the use of the Mercator projection. The Mercator projection belongs to the sea, just as the modern compass does, and I may say that it finds its proper and peculiar value only on the ocean. So, also, the compass and Mercator's projection belong to each other. Thus it is only on the sea that people direct their way by the compass, both for the moment and in prospect. It is only on the sea that they have occasion to project a compass course as a guide, and it is only on Mercator's chart that such a course or rhumb line can be projected and inspected without calculation. All this is familiar to you as it is to me in principle, but it is not so in practice; and it is precisely this difference in practice which prompts me to speak so freely." * * *

The charts of the Coast Survey go too minutely into topography of the shore and show details that are of no value to the mariners.

Third. On the plea of economy. Combining the work of the two offices would result in economy of administration, and possibly the avoidance of duplication of certain parts of charts, and economies in engraving and printing. The following is also taken from a memorandum prepared in the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department:

"The Government is making and publishing Hydrographic Surveys in two different Departments, but in one instance under the direction of that Department which does not provide the personnel nor the greater part of the money. This system permits the use of two separate fleets of surveying vessels. It maintains two separate establishments on shore for digesting and publishing the results. Thus we find two independent corps of civilian employees, two of naval employees, two independent drafting corps, two independent engraving corps, and two independent printing establishments. We find two great independent issues of charts, two corps of agents for the sale of these, two independent issues of notices to mariners—a large one at the Navy Department and a minor one at the Coast Survey Office, and two independent issues of coast pilots or sailing directions—a large one at the Navy Department and a minor one at the Coast Survey Office."

The Hydrographic Office prepares and issues annually about 1,000 different charts, the Coast and Geodetic Survey about 300.

Fourth. On account of the facility that will be afforded to the people for whom this work is designed by combining the two offices and issuing charts from a single source, and that source the office from which they can obtain the most information. Quoting again from the memorandum prepared in the Hydrographic Office:

"The Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department has connections with the nautical world unattainable by the Coast Survey establishment. It publishes a monthly pilot chart of the North Atlantic Ocean, which is a chart compiled from

the cooperative work of nearly 3,000 voluntary observers of the weather, etc., at sea, chiefly captains of vessels, including all maritime nationalities. The Hydrographic Office, besides its agencies for the sale of charts, has 11 branch offices in various maritime cities of the United States, which are in charge of officers of the Navy and nautical experts, where advice and information are given gratis to the nautical community, and where all kinds of reports of the weather and nautical occurrences are rendered by the maritime community without charge.

"The Hydrographic Office also takes cognizance of the existence of wrecks and derelicts over the oceans, and publishes reports of them for the benefit of shipping. It receives daily reports of these menaces to commerce and forwards the reports to the Secretary of the Navy, who directs the destruction of many of them by employing naval vessels for the purpose. Besides over 900 different hydrographic publications of its own that it sells to the public and issues to naval vessels, it keeps correct and issues to the United States men-of-war the publications of the Coast Survey and about 2,000 separate publications of the British Admiralty. It therefore issues upward of 3,000 hydrographic publications. It also maintains a system of exchange with the hydrographic offices of every other maritime nation. It is not a new institution, for it has existed for nearly thirty years as a branch of the Navy Department."

The foregoing reasons seem ample to justify the proposed transfer.

A joint commission of Congress, of which Hon. W. B. ALLISON was chairman, consisting of three Senators and three Members of the House, appointed by the act of Congress approved July 7, 1884, investigated this transfer of the hydrographic work of the Coast Survey to the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department, and the majority of said commission reported as follows:

"The members of the commission, finding this survey under the control of the Treasury Department continuously for a period of fifty-four years (with the exception of two years, from 1834 to 1836), with men at the head of the Survey confessedly of the highest scientific attainments during all this period, do not feel justified in proposing a change in the organization and method of the Survey unless the most urgent reasons therefor can be given, especially in view of the fact that those best qualified to judge who have testified before the commission, not including some eminent officers of the Navy, uniformly agree that, at least until the survey of the coast shall be completed, the work should be continued under the present organization. The commission submitted this question, among others, to the National Academy of Sciences, a committee of which reported that, for the present at least, or until the original survey is completed, no change should be made." * * *

And again:

"Without considering the question of the resurvey of portions of the coast made necessary by changes which are constantly taking place in the shores and channels, partly from natural and partly from artificial causes, it is estimated by those in charge of the survey that with the present scale of appropriations five years will complete the Atlantic coast and nine years will complete the Pacific coast. A majority of the commission concur with the view expressed by the Academy of Sciences that when the original survey shall have been completed it will be time enough to raise the question whether or not the hydrographic work involved in these resurveys may not be transferred to the Navy Department; but until that time the undersigned believe that question should not be seriously considered."

The objections to the transfer advanced by this distinguished committee are now fully met. The survey of the cost has been practically completed. There is a small part of the Pacific coast along the States of Oregon and Washington for which the final surveys have not been made, but preliminary surveys have been completed, accurate enough for the preparation of charts, from the soundings which are now being made; and the survey of the coast of Alaska has not been made.

These surveys could be made by the United States Survey, the new bureau proposed, establishing the geodetic points of the coast by triangulation and making the topography. The data for the preparation of maps could be furnished by this survey to the Hydrographic Office for the preparation of their charts. It is not necessary that the land and water forces should work at the same time or under the same direction, as it is only necessary, and it is practically carried out now, that the water force should recover the established geodetic point on the shore before beginning their soundings, after which the soundings are made from the established geodetic point.

The work of the water force and land force would harmonize. If for any reason in isolated districts, for instance in Alaska, it should be economical and desirable to have both surveys run at the same time, there is no reason why an arrangement for that purpose could not be perfected through the two departments that will have charge of the land and water surveys.

The other proposition presented the committee, that they would not approve of the transfer until urgent reasons were advanced, is met in the facts set out in this report, and the further fact that the trained force, and the efficient methods of the Geodetic Survey and Geological Survey are required as a basis for the United States Survey.

It is but reasonable to suppose that the Navy Department, on account of the nautical training of its officers and their familiarity with the practical and technical requirements of ocean navigation, is the best qualified to prepare charts for the use of mariners.

In a minority report made by Hon. Hilary A. Herbert and Hon. John T. Morgan, of the joint commission to investigate the subject of Government surveys, after setting out various reasons, they concluded with the following:

"For these reasons we believe that the Coast Survey proper should be transferred to the Navy Department."

President Cleveland's first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1885 (Forty-eighth Congress, first session), contained the following:

"The work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey was, during the last fiscal year, carried on within the boundaries and off the coast of thirty-two States, two Territories, and the District of Columbia. In July last certain irregularities were found to exist in the management of this bureau which led to a prompt investigation of its methods. The abuses were brought to light by its examination, and the reckless disregard of duty and the interests of the Government developed on the part of some of those connected with the service made a change of superintendency and a few of the other officers necessary. Since the bureau has been in new hands an introduction of economies and the application of business methods have produced an important saving to the Government and a promise of more useful results.

"This service has never been regulated by anything but the most indefinite legal enactments and the most unsatisfactory rules. It was many years ago sanctioned apparently for a purpose regarded as temporary and related to a survey of our coast. Having gained a place in the appropriations made by Congress, it has gradually taken to itself powers and objects not contemplated in this creation, and extended its operation until it sadly needs legislative attention.

"So far as the further survey of our coast is concerned, there seems to be a propriety in transferring that work to the Navy Department. The other duties now in charge of this establishment, if they can not be profitably attached to some existing department or other bureau, should be prosecuted under inquiries which may properly be assumed by the Government and those which should be undertaken by State authority or by individual enterprise.

"It is hoped that the report of the Congressional committee heretofore appointed to investigate this and other like matters will aid in the accomplishment of proper legislation on this subject."

* * * * * * *

It is recommended that the hydrographic work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey be transferred to the bureau of the Navy Department, to be called the Hydrographic Bureau, and there consolidated with the work of the present Hydrographic Office.

This would involve the transfer of the whole tidal division, the whole hydrographic division, the whole Coast Pilot division, 5 draftsmen from the drawing division, 6 engravers, 5 copperplate printers, 1 electrotyper, and 1 helper from the engraving division; 2 chart correctors and 1 buoy colorist from the chart division, and that portion of the archives which relates to hydrography, together with the plates, drawings, and charts, and the drawing, engraving, and chart-printing machinery, materials, implements, and instruments to the Hydrographic Bureau of the Navy Department.

The remainder of the force of the drawing and engraving divisions could be dispensed with, obtaining the same results as at present, or the entire present force could be retained, with the effect of increasing the annual output of the Hydrgraphic Office in pursuance of their policy of issuing charts to cover the waters of the world, the data for these being obtained from surveys made by other Governments.

The law relating to weights and measures assigns this business to the Secretary of the Treasury, and it should properly remain under his jurisdiction. The force engaged upon this work is small, and it can be left where it is, under a chief to report to the Secretary of the Treasury. The weights and measures are primarily for the use of custom-houses, which are, of course, under the Treasury Department.

The transfer of the land work of the Coast and Geological surveys to the proposed United States Survey, and the transfer of the hydrographic work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Hydrographic Bureau of the Navy Department, could be made, without any interruption of work or disorganization, in this manner: the present work could be continued in the buildings of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the gradual removal there of the force of the Geological Survey, and an addition to the present building, if necessary, could be made for that purpose; the force of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, now engaged upon the hydrographic work to be transferred to the Hydrograhic Bureau, could be provided for in a special building for that purpose, to which all the hydrographic work of the Navy Department could be transferred. The rent of this new building need not be in excess of the rent which is now paid for the buildings of the Geological Survey, say $14,200, and the rent of the new buildings now occupied by the Hydrograghic Office of the Navy Department, $1,500, making a total, say, of $15,700.

It is also recommended that in making appropriations for surveys and resurveys of the Northern and Northwestern lakes provision may be made that the same work shall not be duplicated.

* * * * * * *

It is difficult to estimate exactly the saving that would be made by this consolidation, but it will undoubtedly be found that when these forces are combined many employees can be dispensed with, or, if not, the combination of forces and unification of control and methods will result in the production of more and better maps and publications.

With much better results than are obtained at present, the following approximate saving will be made—$119,643.

* * * * * * *

Instead of the present unsystematic and expensive system of surveys, as a whole, it is proposed to combine in a single bureau under the Navy Department, where it properly belongs, all the hydrographic surveys and issuance of charts therefor; and to constitute one general organization under the Interior Department, having complete control of the entire corps of land surveyors, geologists, paleontologists, and other scientists at the disposal of the Government, who can be made to work harmoniously together, with a view to securing (in addition to better results for immediate use) a complete, accurate, scientific, and satisfactory survey and description of the United States. These two organizations, each under a single head, of the various surveying and scientific corps of the Government, working without friction and without duplication, should accomplish maximum results with minimum expenditure, and with the single comprehensive end in view indicated herein be of great and lasting benefit to the people generally.

Respectfully submitted.

C. W. HASKINS,
E. W. SELLS,
Experts.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE.

[Extracts from reports of joint commission relating to Hydrographic Office and Coast and Geodetic Survey.]

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE.

By an act approved August 31, 1842 (Vol. V, p. 576, Stat. L.), the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to contract for the building of a suitable house for a depot of charts and instruments of the Navy of the United States on a plan not exceeding in cost the sum of $25,000.

In 1846, under this act, an observatory and chart depot was established, and was engaged in the double work of making astronomical observations, correcting chronometers, and of supplying charts to the Navy, the establishment being styled the United States Naval Observatory and Hydrographic Office.

Commander Bartlett, in letter addressed to the National Academy of Sciences, states that—

"In 1846 Lieut. M. F. Maury, when in charge of the Naval Observatory and Chart Depot, which was at that time under the Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography, began the collection of information from the logs of vessels, according to a carefully devised scheme, for the purpose of making charts to show the prevailing winds and currents, their limits and general characteristics, and, in general, all the physical features of the ocean, including its meteorology, the limits of icebergs, the feeding ground of whales, and all facts of interest and value to the maritime community. It was a long time before important results were obtained, but gradually mariners of all nations became interested, and sent their logs for examination. From the data thus gathered Lieutenant Maury constructed his famous wind and current charts, and wrote his sailing directions. These charts and sailing directions have become known the world over, and the routes therein laid down for passages are followed to this day. It was estimated that the saving of time by the routes thus determined was equivalent to many millions of dollars annually. Two hundred thousand of the charts and twenty thousand of the sailing directions were distributed gratuitously to the masters of vessels who had contributed their logs. The continuance of this work, of invaluable benefit to the maritime interests of the world, was interrupted by the war, Maury's last publication appearing as Monograph No. 3 in May, 1861."

In 1866 an act was passed definitely establishing the Hydrographic Office (see Vol. XIV, p. 69, Stat. L., and secs. 431, 432, and 433, Rev. Stats.). This act is as follows:

"There shall be a Hydrographic Office attached to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department, for the improvement of the means for navigating safely the vessels of the Navy and of the mercantile marine, by providing, under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, accurate and cheap nautical charts, sailing directions, navigators, and manuals of instruction for the use of all vessels of the United States, and for the benefit and use of navigators generally.

"SEC. 2. * * * That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to cause to be prepared, at the Hydrographic Office attached to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department, maps, charts, and nautical books relating to and required in navigation, and to publish and furnish them to navigators at the cost of printing and paper, and to purchase the plates and copyrights of such existing maps, charts, navigators, sailing directions, and instructions as he may consider necessary, and when he may deem it expedient to do so, and under such rules, regulations, and instructions as he may prescribe.

"SEC. 3. * * * That the moneys which may be received from the sale of all such maps, charts, and nautical books shall be returned by the Secretary of the Navy into the Treasury of the United States, to be used in the further preparation and publication of maps, charts, navigators, sailing directions, and instructions for the use of seamen, and to be sold at the rates as set forth in the preceding section."

The committee of the Academy of Sciences describe the work of the office and its utility as follows:

"Before that time the functions of the office had been confined to the purchase and distribution of foreign charts. Under the new organization a drawing and engraving division was established, which constructs charts of foreign coasts and seas for distribution to vessels of the Navy, and for sale, at the cost of printing and paper, to navigators generally.

"The officer now in charge of the Hydrographic Office appeared before your committee in person, and gave it a very clear account of the work his office is actually doing. A memoir by this officer, transmitted to the committee by the honorable the Secretary of the Navy, accompanies this report.

"Besides the hydrographic work of the Coast Survey, which is conducted, and has always been conducted, under existing laws, under the direction of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey, this Hydrographic Office is not only supplying corrected charts to the vessels of the Navy, but is collecting information as to ice, which endangers every ship or steamer of the great lines which connect our Northern ports with Great Britain and France, and it also publishes constantly information as to changes in lights and buoys, and discoveries by all nations of shoals and dangers not laid down upon the charts in common use. It publishes at short intervals not only printed information by bulletin sent to commercial centers in this country, but pilot charts, especially of the North Atlantic, giving the latest intelligence in regard to currents and winds, and the location, when last seen, of all floating wrecks and derelicts, and of the icebergs and other floating ice which through the whole spring, summer, and fall seasons lie along the eastern edge of the Great Banks, directly in the track followed by hundreds of steamers and sailing vessels, carrying many thousands of travelers, passengers, and immigrants, and the millions of dollars of our exports and imports.

"This work of the Hydrographic Office is evidently of great value and importance to our commercial and business interests, and must save many vessels from wreck and many lives from destruction. Naval vessels under direction and instruction of the Hydrographic Office also survey foreign coasts and unsurveyed harbors and channels, aiding powerfully in the extension and introduction of our commerce to such coasts and harbors, and they contribute to the knowledge of the earth and its inhabitants by deep-sea soundings, by observations of the currents and winds and storms, and of the bottom of the ocean and of its shores."

Commander Bartlett further describes the work of the office as follows:

"As provided for in the statute establishing the Hydrographic Office, books relating to navigation, sailing directions, and other information of use to the navigator have been prepared from time to time and published; correspondence has been carried on with foreign hydrographic offices, and the information thus obtained has been republished in the form of Notices to Mariners, which have been distributed gratuitously to marine agencies and insurance companies, and to masters of vessels who have applied for them.

"Efforts were resumed in 1873 to collect meteorological data from the merchant service for a new edition of Maury's charts, and with the additional information obtained during the last twenty years from the logs of our ships of war a set of charts for the North Pacific has been prepared and published.

"The work of the office, as now organized, is arranged in six divsions: Plate and printing; Hydrographic Office charts; British Admiralty charts; books, notices, and archives; drafting and engraving; and meteorology."

For details as to the work of these several divisions reference is made to report of the Academy, found on pages 35, 36, and 37 of said report, and to the report of Commander Bartlett, found in the last Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy.

This office employs in Washington from twelve to twenty junior officers of the Navy, a small civilian force, and a considerable force of draftsmen, engravers, copyists, copperplate printers, laborers, etc., at a cost of about $40,000 per annum. It has branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, and San Francisco. This office is rapidly growing in importance and usefulness, not only to the Navy, but also to navigation interests generally, and with this growth and increased usefulness the expenses are likely to be increased moderately from year to year.

The present chief hydrographer, Commander Bartlett, is administering this important branch of the naval service with exceptional ability and energy, and the commission recommend no change in its organization. The specific appropriations for this office for the current fiscal year are $74,040, and the estimates for the next fiscal year are $98,640. This includes all expenses of the office except such as are paid from naval appropriations, which include pay of naval officers employed in the office and expense of naval vessels surveying on foreign coasts, etc.

The commission unanimously recommend that this office be maintained by appropriations from year to year in its present state of efficiency.

* * * * * * *

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The undersigned favor the transfer of the Coast Survey proper to the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department. We mean to include not only the hydrography—that is, soundings, etc.—now done by naval officers under the direction of the civilian head of the Coast Survey, but all the topography upon nautical charts, including such triangulation as is incident thereto. We believe the Navy would execute this work more economically and speedily, and therefore more effectively, than it is now being done. The points at which the minority and majority of the commission diverge in the consideration of this subject are apparent from the following statements in the report of the majority. They say:

"A committee of the present force of the Survey, consisting of Messrs. C. A. Schott, H. Mitchell, and B. A. Colonna, at the request of the commission, presented a concise statement of the actual work performed by the Survey and the relations of hydrography to that work (see pages 539, 540 of the testimony), from which we make the following extract:

"'I.—*The relation of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to hydrography.*

"'1. To understand the relation of hydrography to the general work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, it is necessary to set forth the work of the Geodetic Survey. The field work of the Geodetic Survey is in eight different lines, all but one (the fifth) of which are necessary to the production of a perfect map. These divisions are:

"'First. Triangulation, including base measurements, by means of which distances between prominent points are made known.

"'Second. Astronomical observations, by means of which directions of all measured lines are made known, and also the locations of points on the earth are made known by astronomically measuring their distances from the equator (latitude) and their distance from a prime meridian (longitude).

"'Third. Leveling, by means of which the heights of objects above the mean level of the sea are made known.

"'Fourth. Tidal observations for determining the mean level of the sea, from which heights are reckoned; also for predicting the rise and fall of tides for the use of navigators and others, and also for the reduction of soundings taken at any time to what they would have been if made at low water.

"'Fifth. Gravity observations, for determining the density of the earth.

"'Sixth. Topography, or the picturing by conventional signs of all the surface features of the land, its elevations and depressions, its streams, roads, canals, its forests, plains, and mountains, its towns, fields, etc.

"'Seventh. Hydrography, by means of which the configuration of the bottoms of the sea, lakes, and rivers become known; also physical hydrography, which makes known the character of river, tidal, and ocean currents, and their effects in producing progressive or periodic changes in the configuration of the bottom.

"'Eighth. Magnetic observations, from which we learn the direction in which the compass needle points, the changes in this direction, the intensity of the magnetic force which directs the needle, and the variations of this force, and thus get material to foretell the changes of direction to which the compass needle is subject and variations of the force directing it.

"'The order in which these operations are carried on is not an arbitrary but a logical one, and in this logical order the hydrography comes last.

"'2. The first need of the hydrographer in making his survey is a projection or skeleton outline map, showing the parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude, together with the shore line and all the land features visible from the water, prominent objects, church spires, houses, artificial signals, capes, headlands, and outlying rocks and islands visible from the shore. If "offshore" or deep-sea hydrography is to be executed, the variation of the compass and the latitude and longitude of all prominent objects must be first made known and shown on the projection, to furnish points of departure and to correct the tracks after returning.

"'3. Before the hydrography is begun, therefore, we, in general, require the astronomical work, the magnetic work, and the topography; and, furthermore, tidal observations must accompany the hydrography. Of all the data required by the hydrographer the scale of the proposed work and the projection come first in importance. On this projection must be shown in proper relative position all conspicuous points and marks useful for determining the position of the sounding boat. In short, all topographical features and complete shore line are necessary, and before these can be had the triangulation upon which this topography rests must be executed.

"'Thus the hydrography requires for its execution, first, if inshore, the triangulation and topography together with tidal observations; second, if offshore, it requires the same data, together with the astronomical and magnetic observations.

"'4. After the execution of the hydrographic field work the rough original sheets are to be carefully verified by replotting the soundings, drawing the contours, making the finished drawing, engraving, and printing. This work is done by trained experts, who, by natural ability, education, and long experience, attain the best possible results.

"'5. The hydrographic surveys are made in part by naval and in part by civil parties. Civil parties are usually engaged upon hydrography in regions where it is expedient for economy's sake to execute the secondary triangulation, typography, and hydrography simultaneously. This is usually in the interior waters, sloughs, lagoons, bayous, etc., where parties are organized to work advantageously on land or water, as need arises.

"'6. It is, therefore, obvious that to separate the hydrography from the topography and triangulation would be idle, since it would require two distinct organizations to do the same shore work. Besides, since very considerable portions of our sea and river shores are alluvial, much of the future work will be the repetition of surveys in districts where the sea by undermining the land has acquired material for shoal building, or where the caving of river banks has caused channels to be obstructed. In such instances the topographical and hydrographical parties must be intimately associated, because their operations must furnish reciprocal results.'

"From this statement it will be seen how small a portion of the present work of the Survey is comprised within the term hydrography."

It is precisely at this point that we differ. The majority find no fault with the preponderance the Coast Survey gives to matters other than hydrography. We believe that hydrography ought to be the principal consideration. The Survey was established primarily and mainly to warn sailors against the perils of the sea, and thereby to encourage and aid commerce. To do this, soundings must be thorough and frequent, and the mapping of the shore line is merely incident thereto.

A second difference between the majority and minority arises out of the following statement in the report of the former:

"It has been said that the methods of the Coast Survey, especially as respects its topography, are too minute and accurate for practical purposes, because this topography can not be delineated upon any map or chart of the coast, and therefore this work is not of value to mariners. A majority of the commission is not prepared to pass judgment upon this question, especially as the methods adopted and the work accomplished has uniformly received the approval of the scientific men not only of our own country, but of other countries.

We believe that the topography of the Coast Survey is so minute and extensive as to be tedious in its execution and costly in its outcome, and that much of the delay in completing the work results from this fact. We believe, also, that it is our duty to pass judgment on this question, and we see no reason why members of Congress are not competent to form an intelligent opinion, especially after nearly two years' study of the question. Our commission was organized "with the view to secure greater efficiency and economy of administration," if possible, in this Bureau. Even though we should agree that this work had "uniformly received the approval of the scientific men, not only of our own country, but of other countries," it would yet remain for us in the discharge of duty to form and express our own opinion. We see no reason why a scientist who spends his life in his study should be more competent than a Congressman to say how much topography a sailor would want on his chart. If it were simply a question as to the best method of obtaining absolute exactness, the judgment of a pure scientist would outweigh the opinion of the man of affairs; but not so when the question is as to the adaptability of the work accomplished to the purpose of the law.

The real scientists on this subject of nautical maps are educated sailormen, naval officers, who everywhere the world over, except in the United States, execute or control the execution of coast surveys. So far as the testimony before us goes, all this class of scientific men, or at least a decided majority of them, agree that the topography of the Coast Survey is unnecessarily elaborate and expensive. The scientists who appland this extensive and elaborate topography we understand to be generally professors in colleges, great mathematicians, astronomers, geodecists, and electricians. These are delighted with the work executed in their several fields by the Coast Survey, while naval officers are disappointed that so much money has been expended in matters other than hydrography, and so much time has elapsed while the survey of the coast of the United States is yet uncompleted.

We think the following review of the evidence before us, incomplete though it is, will suffice to show that the civilian organization now controlling the survey of our coasts has, for at least fifty years past, looked upon their survey and the making of nautical maps as simply a stepping-stone to a larger and more congenial field of work, which, when once entered, will afford it perpetual employment, and that it has constantly shown a disposition not only to get into this field of geodesy and extensive topography, but never to complete the survey of the coast until it shall fully attain its ultimate purposes.

The Coast Survey of the United States was inaugurated by act of Congress February, 1807, and assigned to the direction of the Treasury Department. There it remained until 1817, when Congress enacted that the Survey should be conducted only by naval officers. July 10, 1832, it was reorganized and the conduct of the work transferred again to the Treasury Department. In 1834 the Survey was again transferred as an organization to the Navy Department, this time by Executive order. But in 1836 it was retransferred to the Treasury Department, where it has since remained. Thus for a period of fifty years the Coast Survey has been a civil organization. During the whole of that period the Navy has been claiming that it should conduct this Survey, but it is believed that no serious attempt has been made in Congress to transfer this work to the Navy Department since 1851.

The orginal act reads as follows:

"An act to provide for surveying the coast of the United Stases.

"*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the President of the United States shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to cause a survey to be taken of the coasts of the United States, in which shall be designated the islands and shoals, with the roads or places of anchorage, within twenty leagues of any part of the shores of the United States; and also the respective courses and distances between the principal capes or headlands, together with such other matters as he may deem proper for completing an accurate chart of every part of the coast within the extent aforesaid."

Certainly the purpose of this act was to provide nautical maps for the use of sailors.

In 1843 the Survey was reorganized. Congress provided for the appointment of a board which should prepare a plan, the act providing, among other things:

"And the plan of said board shall cause to be employed as many officers of the Army and Navy of the United States as will be compatible with the successful prosecution of the work; the officers of the Navy to be employed on the hydrographical parts, and the officers of the Army on the topographical parts of the work; and no officer of the Army or Navy shall hereafter receive any extra pay out of this or any future appropriation for surveys."

In Europe topographical surveys have usually been conducted by army officers and coast surveys by naval officers.

Congress seems to have had in mind the same reasons which have prevailed in European practice. But while providing that army and navy officers should be utilized, it placed the bureau under civilian control. The civilians do not seem to have had much to do with the work upon water, as the soundings, except during the civil war, have been done mostly by naval officers, but army officers have for many years had no part whatever in the Survey.

The important features of the plan adopted by the board in 1843 were as follows:

"*a.* A series of main triangles, having sides as long as practicable, shall be carried along the whole line of the coast, and be connected, at proper intervals, with bases measured by the most approved means which modern science affords.

"*b.* At the most favorable points of this main series, observations shall be made for the determination of latitude, longitude, and azimuth, and also such magnetic observations as circumstances and the state of the annual appropriations may allow. It is also urged, and deemed essentially necessary, that the difference of longitude between some main points of the survey and the meridians of any or all of the European observatories be ascertained immediately.

"*c.* A series of secondary, and, where necessary, of tertiary triangles, based upon the lines of the primary triangulation, shall be made, if practicable, at the same time as the primary.

"*d.* From the points thus furnished by the several triangulations, the topography shall be executed, using always the most approved instruments and principles. The topography to be carried as far inland as may be necessary for a proper delineation of the shore, and for purposes either of commerce or of defense.

"*e.* From the data thus obtained, soundings shall be made along the whole line of the coast, as far inland as the ports and harbors for commerce, and as far seawards as to soundings of 120 fathoms depth."

Then the plan went on to provide that from these surveys nautical maps should be made.

Thus it will be seen that in the reorganization scheme Congress still contemplated a coast survey, and nothing else, except what was necessarily incident to it.

To survey and chart the coasts of the United States might be called a very practical undertaking. Congress, in providing for such a survey, certainly designed that the work should be done in a scientific manner, but most assuredly it was never intended that the organization created to execute this work should spend more than $24,000,000 and linger over its task for more than three-quarters of a century without completing even the first survey of our coast line. Yet this is the outcome, a result due largely to a disposition on the part of this Bureau to get away from its limited task and into the boundless field of physical science.

The gratification of this disposition has been the easier, because the Survey has had little surveillance. Especially has this been the case for the last twenty-five years. The Secretary of the Treasury during that period has had little or no time to devote to it, and so it has been practically an independent Bureau. The effect has been bad in many respects.

When the present Secretary of the Treasury sent a committee, during the last summer, to examine into its methods of conducting business, its expenditures of money were found to be shamefully loose and even corrupt, and the Superintendent, Hilgard, was compelled to resign his position. Among other things he was shown to have paid persons their salaries who for years had rendered no services. A distinguished officer of the Survey, whose devotion could not be questioned, but whose character was a guarantee for his truthfulness, was called upon to report upon its condition. In speaking of persons who received pay but did no work he used this language: "The fact of the case is, that these people have been practically pensioned without the law to justify it."

Another practice long indulged in has been, as the report of Mr. Colonna shows, to permit the assistants of the Survey, who are paid annual salaries and who are in the field during the summer months, to stay at home during the winter under the claim that they are working up their field notes, while the Government is paying a large office force to perform work, a portion at least of which these assistants might do. The present Superintendent, Mr. Thorn, on page 284 of the "Estimates of Appropriations, 1886-87," speaks of these winter months spent at home by employees as a "period of comparative idleness."

These were by no means the worst practices found by this investigation to have been indulged in, but we cite them because these things must have been generally known to the employees, and the organization is therefore responsible. Such practices indicate, as we think many other things do, a disposition on the part of this Survey to be a law unto itself.

For example, the undersigned do not see and have not been shown by the officials of the Survey any authority of organic law on which a grand arc of triangulation has been constructed all along the Appalachian chain of mountains. It was begun without even being mentioned in the appropriation bill, though the officials claim that the appropriation bills were based on estimates including it. But we have examined the estimates referred to, and we find that, for at least two years after this work began, the appropriation, which was in bulk, was for a sum so much less than the total estimated for that it is impossible to affirm that this estimate was included. Afterwards, when the work had considerably progressed, it was appropriated for. The estimates were of course advocated on the ground taken by the witnesses before the Commission that it was essential to a correct survey of the coast. This work was done during the years 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, and 1878. It extended over eleven years and employed in all seventeen parties about four months each.

But the testimony abundantly shows that the Survey has always been able, by means of its triangulation "along the coast," to construct accurate maps; that is to say, maps so accurate that no discoverable error in the survey could be traced upon them. To illustrate: The evidence of Mr. Colonna shows that in the surveys along the Atlantic seaboard no error greater than about 175 feet is supposed to exist, and he also says that such an error is so insignificant that it could not be represented upon the nautical maps the Coast Survey constructs. It will also be noted that Mr. Schott, one of the most eminent men in the Survey, says that the positions along the Atlantic coast are "only about 50 or 60 feet in uncertainty."

If this be true, it is for any purpose of nautical map making a waste of money to run a system of triangulation along the Appalachian chain of mountains hundreds of miles away from the seacoast in order to "check or correct any errors in the smaller system of triangles contiguous to the coast."

To further demonstrate that this work was not essential to the construction of maps, it should be mentioned that much of it was done (page 868) after the territory with which it was proposed to be connected by subsequent triangles had already been mapped. The final explanation of the purpose of this Appalachian triangulation is contained in the answer of Mr. Colonna on page 868:

"Question. But for the purpose of map making, it [referring to this triangulation which we have claimed as unnecessary] would be of no use?—Answer. Of no use in map making, so far as the delineation of separate sheets, but of much use to make these sheets join."

We confess we can not comprehend this, unless the Coast Survey expects to construct a single map of the United States large enough to show on its face errors which it can not delineate upon the separate charts or sheets it makes for the mariner.

But we can understand this grand arc of triangles, and indeed we consider it quite intelligible and entirely consistent with all the facts when we regard it as part of a system which the Coast Survey, without authority of organic law, and by what have been aptly called "unobtrusive provisions" in appropriation bills, has undertaken for the survey of the whole United States. The testimony seems to be conclusive that this organization long since determined for itself that it would undertake such a survey.

On page 704 of the testimony taken by the Commission, Mr. Carlisle Patterson, former Superintendent of the Survey, in a letter of date January 18, 1879, indignantly repels the charge made by General Comstock that "the Coast Survey was organized for the survey of the seacoast solely," as follows:

"As the country has developed, its higher intelligence has appreciated the work of the Coast Survey, and Congress, in response to the sentiment of the country, has from time to time enlarged the scope of its operations. The implication in the foregoing quotation that the idea of the nonextension of the geodetic system of the Coast Survey prevailed during the early stages of the work is refuted by the following extract from an elaborate report on the Coast Survey made on the 18th of April 1836, four years only after the coast survey had been actually begun. In addressing the Hon. Levi Woodbury, then Secretary of the Treasury, J. J. Abert, lieutenant-colonel Topographical Engineers, thus wrote: 'It [the Coast Survey] is likewise a work which must of necessity endure for many years; must call for great expenditures, and will no doubt in time extend to an exact survey of the whole country.'"

The committee of the Academy of Sciences, on page 4 of the printed volume of the testimony, says:

"In recent times a great extension of the field of operations of the Survey has been made, apparently looking to a triangulation covering the entire territory of the United States."

And on same page it speaks of work in the interior "done by the Coast and Geodetic Survey," in a way "indicative of a plan designed ultimately to cover the entire territory." The testimony of Major Powell as to the plan of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is to the same effect. Professor Hilgard also, on page 133, says that when the act of 1871, providing for a trigonometrical belt across the continent was passed there was underlying it the "idea of an ultimate trigonometrical survey of the whole area of the country." But this was only the idea of the Bureau. It was not avowed in the law, and was not the pretext upon which the law was passed.

It will be noted, also, that the act of 1871 does not authorize, and is not claimed as a support for, this triangulation we have been discussing, and that there is, in fact, no law whatever to justify the great plan which the Academy says the work done by the Survey indicates. The work is, therefore, a self-imposed task. The act of 1871 is exceedingly limited in scope.

"ACT APPROVED MARCH 3, 1871.

"For continuing the survey of the western coast of the United States, * * * *Provided*, That the operations shall include a hydrographic development of the dangers of ocean navigation between San Diego and Panama.

"For extending the triangulation of the Coast Survey, so as to form a geodetic connection between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States, * * * *Provided*, That the triangulations shall determine points in each States of the Union which shall make requisite provisions for its own topographical and geological surveys."

The principal purpose of this act seems to be "a geodetic connection between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts." When asked to explain to the commission the purpose of this, Professor Hilgard said:

"Such a connecting link is a necessary and proper part of a survey of the 'coasts and adjacent islands, etc., of the United States,' as originally provided for by law, in order to bring into harmony the measurements along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts."

"To bring into harmony the measurement along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts" is a high-sounding phrase, but we think it clear, from the considerations we have mentioned, that the value of such a connection, in so far as maps of the coast are concerned, is simply nothing. For the purpose of obtaining correctly the longitude of the Pacific coast, it would seem to be equally worthless, when we recollect that telegraphic and astronomical methods of obtaining longitude are now so exact that Coast Survey officials claim to have corrected in Washington an error in the calculation of the difference in longitude between Paris and Greenwich, theretofore relied upon by the English. This, of course, was done without any belt of triangles across the Atlantic.

Scientific methods instead of practical results.

In another respect the Coast and Geodetic Survey seems to have been more careful to adhere to scientific methods of operation than to make maps acceptable to the sailor. Practically, charts used by sailors up to the time when the Coast Survey adopted a different method were upon what is called the Mercator projection; that is to say, the lines of longitude ran parallel to each other. Sail-

ors could thus, with the aid of compasses, determine with ease directions and make their estimates.

The Coast Survey introduced, as more scientific, the polyconic projection, which shows upon the map somewhat such a convergence and deflection of the lines of longitude and latitude as really appear upon a globe representing the earth. For the purposes of science this was a success. For the purposes of the sailor it has failed.

The Survey has sought diligently to explain to the mariner and popularize its method. Among other efforts we mention that in 1853 Maj. E. B. Hunt wrote a paper published in the Coast Survey Report for that year. September 15, 1875, a learned article on the same subject, by Assistant Charles A. Schott, was written, and that same article was reprinted in 1882 as an appendix to the report for 1880. So also Lieutenant Pillsbury, now in the service of the Survey, wrote a paper in 1884 commending the polyconic projection used by the Coast Survey. But all these efforts have failed. In his paper Lieutenant Pillsbury says: "The Mercator projection for the construction of charts is the one in general, I may say almost universal, use." The Survey, seeming to recognize its failure, has at last commenced a chart on the Mercator projection, thus admitting that it has long been persisting in error. Seeing the force of this fact, Mr. Colonna, in a letter of date March 25, 1886, says in explanation that it is using the Mercator projection "for the reason that it [the map] is to embrace a maximum distance in longitude under conditions where the polyconic might mislead the mariner not familiar with it." But, so far as our information extends, that is the first instance, since its adoption, in which the Coast Survey has recognized the fact on any of its maps that the polyconic projection could mislead the mariner. Naval officers have all the time insisted that the Mercator projection should be used.

April 15, 1864, Commodore C. H. Davis, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, wrote a letter to Professor Hilgard, in which he said:

"You can not be suprised that I should insist, as a practical navigator, upon the use of the Mercator projection. The Mercator projection belongs to the sea, just as the modern compass does, and I may say that it finds its proper and peculiar value only on the ocean. So, also, the compass and Mercator's projection belong to each other. Thus it is only on the sea that the people direct their way by the compass, both for the moment and in prospect. It is only on the sea that they have occasion to project a compass course as a guide, and it is only on Mercator's chart that such a course or rhumb line can be projected and inspected without calculation. All this is as familiar to you as it is to me, in principle, but it is not so in practice; and it is precisely this difference in practice which prompts me to speak so freely."

This letter of the sailor to the landsman illustrates strongly a reason why a practical sailor, "who looks upon the land from the sea, should make maps intended to be used at sea, rather than one who looks at the sea from land."

A letter from Lieut. Henry H. Barroll, United States Navy, now stationed at Philadelphia, says:

"To satisfy myself, * * * I submitted the following letter and questions to the firm of Riggs & Bro., the leading chart dealers of this city:

"PHILADELPHIA, *January 28, 1886.*

"Mr. RICHARD RIGGS:

"DEAR SIR: Will you kindly answer for me the following questions in relation to the sale of your charts: * * *

"Do you find the polyconic projection of Coast Survey Chart A satisfactory to the majority of merchant marine officers, or do they prefer the Mercator projection of hydrographic chart No. 942, which covers the same ground?

* * * * * * *

To this was returned the following answer:

"PHILADELPHIA, *January 28, 1886.*

"Lieut. HENRY H. BARROLL, U. S. N.:

"DEAR SIR: In answer to your request we are pleased to submit the following information as received from purchases of Hydrographic and Coast Survey charts:

"In answer to your first and third, we find that the Mercator projection of chart No. 942, H. O., is preferred nine times out of ten to that of the polyconic projection of Coast Survey Chart A.

"We are, respectfully, yours,

"RIGGS & BRO.,
"Per F. A. HOER."

We have no disposition to detract from the reputation for scientific methods the Coast and Geodetic Survey has acquired. One fact, however, developed by the evidence seems somewhat inconsistent with its claims in this respect.

The evidence shows that it uses an English formula (Clarke's) upon which to base its geodetic calculations; that this formula is not the result in any manner of the work of our Survey, but is founded on geodetic work done in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Peru, and that our Survey continued to use a formula of inferior accuracy (Bessel's) for fourteen years after the English formula was published. (See p. 776.)

There is no doubt, however, that in the improvement of instruments, in methods of determining longitudes, in the contributions to zoology which it enabled Prof. L. Agassiz, Mr. Pourtales, and Prof. Alexander Agassiz to make, and in its magnetic observations, it has made valuable contributions to science.

We do not object to the conduct of the Survey because it has used scientific methods to accomplish the purposes for which it exists by law. We are, indeed, rejoiced if incidentally it contributes to the advancement of science; but what we do object to is that it has sacrificed results to methods and that it is continually seeking to get away from the simple work of coast surveying into new fields. It is now at this session of Congress seeking an appropriation to enable it to construct a magnetic map of the whole of North America.

Slow progress.

The Government has always appreciated the necessity of having charts of our coast and has appropriated liberally. Including the contributions made through the Navy, $24,593,143[1] have been spent mainly for this purpose by the Coast Survey up to January, 1886—page 532, Venice Report. Congress has been very patient, but it has occasionally inquired when the survey would be completed.

In 1857 Superintendent Bache responded that it would be finished at the then rate of appropriations within fifteen years. The annual appropriation was, in 1857, $463,000. Since then twenty-nine years have passed; the average annual appropriation has been $549,190, and we have spent altogether, including 1886, $16,474,209.

Yet Professor Hilgard testifies, on page 58, that it will take about five years yet to finish the work on the Atlantic coast; and, on page 140, that the work on the Pacific coast is about three-fifths done, and that it will require about nine years to complete it at present rate of appropriation.

The "majority of the commission concur with the view expressed by the Academy of Sciences, that when the original survey shall have been completed it will be time enough to raise the question whether or not the hydrographic work involved in these resurveys may not then be transferred to the Navy Department; but until that time the undersigned believe that question should not be seriously considered."

[1] The majority omit from their estimate the amounts spent by the Navy.

According to the statements of Professors Hilgard and Bache, given by us above, we have in twenty-nine years gotten six years nearer the date of the completion of the coast survey. If we exclude the four years of the war we have twenty-five years during which we have gained six. In other words, experience shows that the estimates of the Bureau as to the time of completing this work must be multiplied by four. If we do this, then, thirty-six years are to elapse before the time will come when, in the opinion of the majority, we are "seriously to consider the question of a transfer."

Unnecessary and expensive topography.

This inexcusable delay is in a large part accounted for by the testimony which shows that the topography of the coast charts is needlessly elaborate, extended, and expensive. Major Powell discussed it very intelligently, and we think his testimony on this point has not been successfully contradicted.

We call attention to the following portions of his evidence:

"In the United States the geodetic organization, as distinct from the Coast Survey, has not executed topographic work, as I have defined that term, but the Coast Survey has made charts of the coast. These charts are maps of a peculiar character. The water areas are hydrographic maps, necessary for mariners, but in order to subserve this purpose properly certain land areas of the coast are included. On these land areas it is necessary that the salient land marks should be plotted, as guides to mariners, and so far the work is a proper chart for mariners. But much additional material is placed on these charts. To a large extent the charts are cadastral maps, on which are plotted estates. On some of the maps relief topography also is introduced to a greater or less extent, but usually this is lacking, and when introduced it is subordinate to the cadastral purposes of the chart. It will thus be seen that the so-called topographic maps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are not what I have described as topographic maps, but rather what I have described as cadastral maps. The Coast Survey has not made a cadastral survey by surveying properties and establishing marks on the ground, but it has made cadastral maps. (Pages 166, 167.)"

And again, on pages 184 and 185:

"Maj. J. W. Powell then appeared and continued his statement as follows:

"By Mr. LYMAN:

"Q. Major, on page 166, about 8 lines from the bottom, in your statement, speaking of the Coast Survey, you say: 'To a large extent the charts are cadastral maps, on which are platted estates.' Would you not wish to modify that statement a little? As I understand it, they only put in the estates in this sense, that they draw the fences and indicate the positions of houses, roads, etc., that connect. Now the fences might not have anything to do with the estates, so that the cadastral map, in the European sense of making what they called the Domesday-Book, in the Middle Ages, could not be constructed from that kind of a map?

"A. Oh, no, sir; I think subsequently I have made that clear.

"Mr. LYMAN. I see you have on page 167: 'The Coast Survey has not made a cadastral survey by surveying properties and establishing marks on the ground, but it has made cadastral maps.'

"Major POWELL. Yes, sir.

"Q. I noted that modification; but, as you understand, it would not be proper to say that they have put in estates as you see them indicated in town maps?

"A. They have not made a cadastral map by looking up titles and plotting the boundaries of properties described in titles; but they have marked out the essential features of estates, such as the houses, the fields, the private roads, and various matters of that nature which belong to what I have defined as a cadastral map and which do not belong to what I have defined as a topographic map. It should be understood that topography means a description of places, and that the term 'topographic' might well enough be used to describe what I have called a cadastral map.

"Q. That is minute topography, as, I suppose, you might call it?

"A. Yes, sir; you might call it topography, but it would not be topography in the sense in which I have used the term and in which I have defined the term. Etymologically, topography means a description of places. We may describe places on maps by their natural characteristics or by their cultural characteristics, and I have used the term 'topography' to mean a cartographic description of the country by its natural characteristics—its mountains, hills, valleys, streams, bodies of water, etc.—together with certain cultural features, such as highways, boundary lines of townships, counties, States, etc. But where a chart is constructed in such a manner as to a large extent to neglect the natural characteristics by placing upon the chart the boundaries and improvements of estates, I have called that a cadastral map, even when it is not based upon a cadastral survey—that is, a survey intended to mark the boundary lines of estates upon the ground."

Again, on pages 197, 198:

"The Coast and Geodetic Survey constructs maps, or, more properly speaking, charts, of the coast. These charts represent in part water areas and in part land areas. On the water areas are represented the soundings and important features of the sea and river bottoms. Other things also are represented, such as buoys, lights, etc. The land areas represented are in part islands and in part mainland. On these land areas are represented the landmarks which are used by mariners in the navigation of the waters. So far they are strictly coast charts, useful in navigation.

"In surveying the land areas, the Coast Survey does something more by extending the map work back a short distance into the country, varying from half a mile to 5 miles. This additional work is of a peculiar character. All streams, large and small, that run in or through this margin of land are platted upon maps; all coast marshes are platted; all rocky ledges and points are indicated, and to some extent hills are represented. In addition to this, many artificial features are platted, such as city, town, and village plats, country roads, farms, fields, houses, and many other artificial or cultural details. The surveys made for these cultural details do not include complete cadastral surveys, but only sufficient cadastral surveying to make it possible to correctly plat such items upon the maps. I am unable to state any useful purpose which this cadastral or artificial element in the coast charts subserves; first, because it is not executed so as to form a complete cadastral map; second, because these artificial topographic features are ephemeral—that is, this culture changes from year to year in such a manner that the charts speedily become misleading.

"In illustration of this fact I may state that one of the commissioners of the Massachusetts survey informs me that he has lately examined certain charts made in Massachusetts on this plan, and he discovers that in the areas coming under his eye 50 per cent of the houses placed upon the chart twenty years ago have disappeared or been removed to new sites; that in addition to this a large number of new houses have been erected which do not appear on the old charts, and that the confusion arising from these two causes renders the charts almost unintelligible. He also informs me that the same confusion arises from the delineation of fences, but to a greater extent, and that a similar confusion arises through the delineation of minor public or private roads, but not to so great an extent."

An illustration of the truth of Major Powell's statement that this method of map making renders resurveys necessary is afforded in the tables on page 832. Accounting for expenditures in 1885, the witness says $15,119.43 were expended for topography on Long Island Sound, and $1,092.75 for triangulation. All this topography had been done long before. Here the same organization was, in 1885, doing over work it had done years before.

An inspection of the maps themselves will also justify these extracts from Major Powell's testimony. They delineate with great care the country for considerable distances back, which is unnecessary, if not confusing, to the marines. Eldridge, a publisher in Boston, makes it his business to reprint, among other nautical maps, those of the Coast Survey. He leaves out almost all the topography with which the Coast Survey loads its maps, and sells his reprints at a much higher price than the Coast Survey obtains for the original charts. Eldridge sells charts for $2.50 for which the Coast and Geodetic Survey gets 50 cents.

Cost of topography.

The cost per square mile of the topography executed and mapped by the Coast and Geodetic Survey has long been a much-mooted point. When in 1878 the Academy of Sciences had recommended the transfer of all United States mensuration surveys to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, General Comstock, of the Engineer Corps of the Army, estimated that the cost of the topography of the Coast and Geodetic Survey was $584 per square mile. The then Superintendent, Mr. C. P. Patterson, contended (pp. 703, 704) that the cost ranged from $12 to $97 per square mile. We seem now to have accurate data upon which to estimate the cost of this work. Superintendent Hilgard, on page 148, testifies:

"In reply to your third question, I have to say that, as a rule, the topography extends from 1 to 3 miles from the shore line, but in special cases it may extend much farther inland or be much narrower.

"The relative percentage of cost of hydrographic to trigonometric work I estimate at three-tenths and two-tenths of the whole work. The topography I estimate at four-tenths, and the remaining one-tenth for work of a general character. The cost of publication is not included in this statement."

In Capt. George M. Wheeler's Report upon the Geographical Congress at Venice (p. 530) he gives the areas actually surveyed January 5, 1886, as obtained from the Coast and Geodetic Survey at that date. The survey estimates its total topography at 31,919 miles. Captain Wheeler gives, on page 532 of the same report, the amounts appropriated for this work from 1806 to 1886. He then estimates, taking Superintendent Hilgard's distribution of the appropriations as the basis of his calculations, that the topography cost $333 per square mile. He includes in his estimate expenditures toward hydrography from Navy appropriations. We think this is correct, and Professor Hilgard meant to be so understood. But if we eliminate expenditures that came through the Navy, and say that Professor Hilgard meant only that the topography cost four-tenths of the amount appropriated for coast survey alone, we still have $250 per square mile as the cost of the topography.

It would seem that this calculation can not be unjust to the Coast Survey, inasmuch as the area of topography and the aliquot proportion of the appropriation devoted to it come from the Survey itself, and the amount of money appropriated is aggregated from the laws of Congress. It must also be remembered that the Coast Survey has been previously attacked upon this point, and it can not be supposed that officials of the Survey would make statements bearing upon it which would be unjust to the Bureau.

Topography elaborated—Dangers of the sea neglected.

We think it may be taken as self-evident that a mariner needs on a chart only a proper outline of the shore and a delineation of such objects as he can see from his vessel. Any more topography than this must be confusing, because he will look in vain to discover on shore those things he sees upon the map.

It is absolutely certain, too, that, flat as most of our coast is, much of the topography on the Coast and Geodetic Survey maps can not be seen from a vessel when such topography runs from 1 to 3 miles from the shore.

Neither is the elaborate topography of Coast Survey maps necessary for purposes of defense. If fences and houses were essential, then, of course, it would become necessary to remap as often as these are changed. This is absurd. The plan of 1843 could only have intended that for this purpose such natural features should be given as would give information as to points at which troops might land and how these points might be approached by our forces.

But the mariner, for whom Coast Survey maps are made principally, does need to know the location of shoals and bars and other dangers. If naval officers were in charge of the Coast Survey it is not to be presumed that they, who themselves need nautical maps, would expend millions of dollars on useless geodetic and topographic work and at the same time neglect to give warning of the dangers of the sea, as Professor Mitchell, of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shows, on page 549 in the following testimony, that Bureau has done:

"Yes, I mean, having made a good survey, we have necessitated a better survey. Having made a good survey forty years ago, when our commerce was small, we need a better one now that it is large.

"For instance, sometimes on a single day there pass Nantucket Shoals twenty millions of property in ships and cargoes, besides twelve to fifteen thousand passengers. Every endeavor is made to run a straight course, so far as safe avoidance of these shoals will admit, and we do not know to-day the true locations of these dangers, so that there is loss of time to the costliest fleet in the world."

Geodetic work.

To recall just here the nature and purpose of the "strictly geodetic work" on the Appalachian chain will assist us in estimating the extent to which the Survey has neglected practical for scientific work. Geodosy is the science of measuring the shape of the earth. Surveyors had arrived at this with considerable accuracy two hundred years ago.

The advance that has been made in this science within the last fifty years is shown by Mr. Colonna on page 824, when he compares results deduced from the value of Bessel, published in 1837, and Clark's, published in 1866, and now used. The difference in the length of an arc of 1 mile on the earth's surface, calculated according to the two values, is from five-tenths to eight-tenths of a foot, or about 6 inches. When the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall have discovered a new formula by which it will have gained 1 inch on preceding investigators it hopes to acquire more glory than it anticipates from pointing out the present true location of Nantucket Shoals.

As yet it has done neither.

It has been stated that navy officers do now, and have done since 1843, under the Coast Survey, the hydrographic work. They make all the soundings and fix them on the map with reference to points on the shore. It often happens that they go ashore and triangulate. This they do either when the points are too far apart or when they can not be found.

Why should they not do all the coast survey?

COAST SURVEY SHOULD BE UNDER THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

All the commission unite in saying that the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department does its work well. It is doing, and has for years been doing, the work of surveying foreign coasts, but is inhibited from surveying our own. It has surveyed and made good maps of the Bay of Samana. It is surveying and will chart the western coast of Mexico, along which run the steamers plying between San Francisco and Panama. Naval officers have done this topography and all the triangulation on shore, and much besides, and have done it well, and the Hydrographic Office now has engravers, and other plant similar to that used for nautical charts by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. By having navy officers themselves to do the necessary topography, and all the triangulation incident thereto, we should save the expense of such civilian employees as are now engaged in this work. In this manner we should have real cooperation between the parties triangulating on shore and those doing hydrography. An inspection of Coast Survey charts will show that in very many cases years intervene between the work on shore and on water. Fifty years' experience has demonstrated that we will not have under civilian management that close cooperation between shore and water parties the majority think so desirable.

Such surveys are under the conduct exclusively of the marine ministries or navy departments in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Japan, Sweden, Holland, Chile, British India, Portugal, Denmark, Spain, Russia, Belgium, Norway, and Java (East Indies). In fact, it is believed that in no country except the United States can such a survey be found, conducted in other departments. The Committee of the Academy of Sciences say, on page 3:

"The hydrographic surveys of the coasts of Europe appear in every country to be the work of the naval establishment."

The reasons which have induced all other countries to put such surveys under charge of a marine department would seem to be the following:

First. The prime purpose of such a survey is to make maps to be used by the mariner. Sailors best know what is needed to be sketched upon such a map; how frequently the soundings should be made, and how noted; how much topography is necessary; what objects on the shore should be sketched, and what should be omitted. They also understand better than civilians upon what projection a map should be made.

Second. By doing such work upon their own coasts, naval officers familiarize themselves in time of peace with every bay, harbor, inlet, and possible landing-place of the shores they are to defend in time of war.

Third. The work falls naturally within the scope of their profession. By exercising their faculties in useful activities, they will keep themselves bright.

Fourth. Navy officials, who feel reasonably secure in their positions, and whose official life does not depend upon favor to be acquired by assuming unauthorized functions, will not be so easily allured to depart from the work they are set to do as civilians often are by the prospect of gaining éclat among scientists or favor among politicians, with the hope of thus prolonging their official existence.

Fifth. However it might have been formerly, the personnel of our Navy since the operation of our excellent Naval Academy has had full effect is, in capacity and education, fully qualified to conduct this survey. The claim that young men educated at Annapolis are not competent to do geodetic work is not worthy of notice when coming from an official who is shown frequently to have put in charge of triangulation parties professors who were utterly without experience in the field.

It is insisted by one of the officials of the Coast and Geodetic Survey that one of the purposes of employing college professors here and there to do triangulation is to enable them better to instruct the youth of the land. If this be true, it is another glaring instance of departure from the purposes of the law. But the undersigned can see in this application of public moneys only an intent on the part of the Coast and Geodetic Survey thus to fortify itself against any attempt Congress may make to correct abuses or retrench expenditures.

Sixth. As naval officers are already in the pay of the Government, it would be more economical to utilize their services than to pay civilian employees for doing the work of this survey.

A very vigorous effort has been made by the coast survey officials to show that it would not be economical to transfer to the Navy the Coast Survey, together with the shore topography and triangulation, but we think it has failed. We have not time to discuss it in detail. We call attention simply to one table given on page 610 by a Coast and Geodetic Survey witness. The claim in this table is that it shows the civilians, when during the war they were doing the hydrography, did more work per man than navy officers do; that they especially made more soundings. But navy officers reply that this table carefully omits the number of square miles surveyed; that this is the test; and also that the civilians during the time were doing shallow soundings in inside waters.

However this may be, the coast and geodetic survey official who compiled the table at page 610 seems to yield his case when he says in a note, "This table is of little use if we are to dwell on the fact that naval officers are to be supported anyhow." This is a fact that Congress must dwell on, and it seems to us conclusive, not only as to hydrography, but as to topography also.

The pay of these civilians and naval officers is significant. The average pay of the coast survey officials, assistants, subassistants, and aids, as given by Mr. Colonna, is $2,449.32. Commander Bartlett gives the average pay during the year 1884 of the naval officers attached to the Coast and Geodetic Survey at $1,901.54.

But perhaps the controlling consideration in favor of the transfer is that it is not to be presumed that naval officers would waste time and money in unnecessary and expensive topography and abnormal adventures, as the evidence shows the Coast and Geodetic Survey has done.

For these reasons we believe that the Coast Survey proper should be transferred to the Department of the Navy, and we would most heartily indorse the following from the message of the President:

"The work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey was, during the last fiscal year, carried on within the boundaries and off the coasts of thirty-two States, two Territories, and the District of Columbia. In July last certain irregularities were found to exist in the management of this Bureau, which led to a prompt investigation of its methods. The abuses which were brought to light by this examination and the reckless disregard of duty and the interests of the Government developed on the part of some of those connected with the service, made a change of superintendency and a few of its other officers necessary. Since the Bureau has been in new hands an introduction of economies and the application of business methods have produced an important saving to the Government and a promise of more useful results.

"This service has never been regulated by anything but the most indefinite legal enactments and the most unsatisfactory rules. It was many years ago sanctioned apparently for a purpose regarded as temporary, and related to a survey of our coast. Having gained a place in the appropriations made by Congress, it has gradually taken to itself powers and objects not contemplated in its creation, and extended its operations until it sadly needs legislative attention.

"So far as a further survey of our coast is concerned, there seems to be a propriety in transferring that work to the Navy Department. The other duties now in charge of this establishment, if they can not be profitably attached to some existing department or other bureau, should be prosecuted under a law exactly defining their scope and purpose, and with a careful discrimination between the scientific inquiries which may properly be assumed by the Government and those which should be undertaken by State authority or by individual enterprise.

"HILARY A. HERBERT.
"JNO. T. MORGAN."

[Extracts from a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, in response to resolution of the Senate of December 20, 1899, a report by the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, etc., Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, Senate Document, No. 120.]

"It will be noted that so far as Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the smaller island groups under the jurisdiction of the United States are concerned, the resources of the Survey are adequate to complete this survey quickly and economically."

Later the same report states:

"At present the *G. S. Blake* is the only seaworthy steamer on the Atlantic coast."

These two statements appear to conflict somewhat, and in their request for

more vessels it seems as if the Coast Survey wished to have a second naval establishment.

"The first survey of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts has been completed to the extent that we have data that permits of the publication of charts for all essential localities. On the Pacific coast the progress has been very similar to that described on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. The whole coast line has been surveyed, but there are places north of the California boundary where finished work was deferred until the country had become more settled, and it could be carried on more economically. * * * It has been repeatedly pointed out that the shore line of Alaska has an approximate extent of about 26,000 miles, exceeding that of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts by over 11,000.'

If it has taken the Coast Survey from its first establishment (1807) to 1900—ninety-three years—to only make the first survey of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts of the United States, with its 15,000 miles of shore line, there is no telling how long it will take them to do that of Alaska and the island possessions of the United States.

In referring to the survey of Porto Rico, the Coast Survey seems to lay more stress on the trigonometrical and topographical survey of the interior and of the part lying on the coast than on the actual hydrographic work, which is the only part of value to the national and mercantile marine of the United States.

"With regard to the Hawaiian Islands, at present the Coast Survey steamer *Pathfinder*, the newest and best equipped steamer in the service, is at work on the surveys of Hilo and Kahului harbors."

The survey of the principal ports of the Hawaiian Islands, such as Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, has been already thoroughly and accurately done by the Navy.

"*Samoan Islands.*—The existing charts of this whole group of islands are based on surveys made by the Wilkes Exploring Expedition in 1838-42."

The harbor of Pago Pago, on the island of Tutuila—the only harbor of much value in the Samoan Islands—has already been thoroughly surveyed by naval officers.

"*Guam* * * * is shown on Coast Survey chart No. 4202, which is a reproduction of a foreign chart."

The principal harbor of this island has been completely surveyed by a United States vessel of war, and a chart of it is now in course of preparation by the Hydrographic Office.

A vessel of war has received preliminary orders to survey Wake and Midway islands.

"*The Philippines.*—At the instance of the Philippine Commission the Department of State requested the Coast Survey to undertake the reproduction of a series of maps of islands composing the Philippine Archipelago. These maps, now in the course of publication, were prepared recently by the Jesuit fathers at Manila at the request of Philippine Commission," etc.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR OCEAN AND LAKE SURVEYS.

The appropriation for ocean and lake surveys has sprung from the union of three separate appropriations in the acts of past years making appropriations for the naval service.

The first of these three appropriations appears in the portion of the naval act of the second session of the Forty-second Congress, relating to appropriations under the Bureau of Navigation, in the following words:

"For nautical and astronomical instruments, nautical books, maps, charts, and sailing directions, and repairs of nautical instruments for ships of war, ten thousand dollars."

At the time of the passage of this act this appropriation had been for many years current in the naval appropriation acts in nearly the above form, and it is continued as a separate item at $10,000 a year until June 30, 1882, when it was merged, unchanged in wording, with many other items that had been before separately appropriated for, into a general appropriation of $100,000 for navigational instruments and materials, to be expended by the Bureau of Navigation.

The second of the three appropriations above referred to first appears in that portion of the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, which relates to the Bureau of Navigation, and is in the following words: "For special ocean surveys and the publication thereof, ten thousand dollars."

This appropriation became current in the successive appropriation bills and remained in the yearly naval acts without change of wording until 1887, when the amount appropriated became $4,000 instead of $10,000. The amount became $5,000 in 1888, but the language concerning it remained otherwise unchanged until it was merged with other appropriations, in a manner to be described hereafter, in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892.

The third of the three appropriations under discussion appears in the naval act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, and is also under that portion which relates to the Bureau of Navigation, and in the following words: "For preparing and engraving on copperplates the surveys of the Mexican coast, and for publishing the same, seven thousand dollars."

This appropriation also became current in the successive naval acts and remained unchanged, except that the amount was reduced to $5,000, until June 30, 1890, when the scope was somewhat enlarged by the following wording: "For preparing and engraving on copper plates the surveys of the Mexican coast and the publication of a series of charts of the coast of Central and South America, $5,000." There was no change in this appropriation until June 30, 1892.

The appropriations that have been discussed in paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 were merged into the following form in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892:

"*Ocean and lake surveys.*—For ocean and lake surveys, the publication and care of the results thereof, the purchase of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, and freight and express charges on same, preparing and engraving on copper plates the surveys of the Mexican coasts, and the publication of a series of charts of Central and South America, $14,000."

This appropriation then became current in the appropriations for the Bureau of Navigation in the successive naval acts until work of the character provided for was transferred to the Bureau of Equipment, soon after which, in the naval act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, the appropriation was transferred to the Bureau of Equipment, in the following form:

"*Ocean and lake surveys.*—Ocean and lake surveys; the publication and care of the results thereof; the purchase of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, and freight and express charges on the same; preparing and engraving on copper plates the surveys of the Mexican coasts, and the publication of a series of charts of the coasts of Central and South America, and for surveys of the imperfectly known parts of the coasts and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago, and the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, with their bordering keys and waters, and the minor outlying islands; to be made immediately available, $100,000."

In the estimates submitted to Congress for framing the appropriation bills for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, the provisions have been expanded into the form that is now under discussion.

The Coast Survey conducted surveys on the coast of Porto Rico during the winter of 1898 and 1899, and has since published a chart of Ponce, which is largely from the work of the corps of engineers of the United States Volunteer Army, in 1898, and also a chart of the harbor of Jobos, situated about 25 miles east of Ponce. An examination is also reported to have been made in San Juan Harbor, and it is stated that a blue print of this examination was furnished to the naval station at San Juan, but no such print or copy has been furnished to the Navy Department nor been made available for the navigation of the Navy or the mercantile marine.

The Coast Survey has also recently published charts of Cuba, Porto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and the island of Guam (see Coast Survey charts Nos. 482, 910, 4100, and 4202), though for what purpose it is not obvious, since these charts are nearly duplications of the Navy Department charts of Cuba, Porto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and the island of Guam (see Hydrograhic Office charts Nos. 1550, 1001, 1368, 1381, 1800, and 1748), which have been issued for years by the Hydrographic Office, and for the construction and publication of which the Government has now been obliged to pay twice over.

The Navy Department conducted surveys of the harbor of Santiago de Cuba and of Guantanamo Bay during the winter of 1898 and 1899, and made a thorough hydrographic and topographic survey of 21 square geographical miles of area in the former harbor and of 132 square geographical miles of area in the latter, so that the total extent of the naval survey of Cuba last winter covered 153 square geographical miles. The extent of similar work by the Coast Survey in Porto Rico was 92 square geographical miles.

And, moreover, the Coast Survey did no surveying work last year in any of the newly acquired possessions but Porto Rico, whereas the surveying vessels of the Navy, in addition to the surveys in Cuba and elsewhere, surveyed the harbor of San Luis d'Apra, in the island of Guam, and laid the foundation for a trigonometrical and hydrographic survey of the whole island; visited Wake Island and contributed mensuration work to amend the Navy Department chart of that island, surveyed a practical route across the Pacific Ocean for the laying of a telegraphic cable line from Honolulu to Guam via the Midway Islands, and thence to the Philippines and to Japan. The Navy has also, within the last few years, surveyed the harbors of Honolulu and Pearl Lochs, and in previous years has surveyed many of the smaller islands of the Hawaiian group, and the results of all these surveys now appear in the charts issued by the Navy Department.

During the present winter the Coast Survey is continuing the survey commenced last winter on the south coast of Porto Rico, and a coast survey vessel is also at work in Hilo Bay, in the island of Hawaii. This bay was surveyed in 1882 by the Hawaiian Government survey (see Hydrographic Office chart No. 1096).

The Navy Department is now carrying on surveys with the steamers *Yankton* and *Eagle* in the harbors of Nuevitas, Gibara, and Nipe on the north coast of eastern Cuba, in the islands of Culebra and Bieque, lying eastward and forming a part of Porto Rico, with the steamer *Vixen*, and in the island of Guam with the steamer *Yosemite*, and has issued the necessary instructions for the survey of the Midway Islands, together with Seward Roads and Welles Harbor, in the Hawaiian Islands, by the steamer *Iroquois*, and for the commencement of the survey of the Philippines by the steamer *Bennington* and five others of the smaller steamers now attached to the naval forces in the Philippines.

In addition to the surveys mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, under the provisions of acts of Congress, the Navy has, within the last quarter of a century, surveyed the Nicaragua, Panama, and Tehuantepec routes for a canal across the Central American Isthmus, the harbors of Greytown and Brito at the Atlantic and Pacific termini of the Nicaragua Canal route, the harbors of Colon and Panama at the Atlantic and Pacific termini of the Panama Canal route, the route for an ocean telegraph cable from California to the Hawaiian Islands, the west coast of Mexico and Central America from San Diego to Panama, including all the harbors of that coast and embracing an extent of coast line equal to that of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, the southern entrance to the Detroit River, and the harbors of Chicago, Cleveland, and Erie, on the Great Lakes, and also the survey of many important obstructions to navigation in those waters, the harbor of Bluefields in Nicaragua, the Bay of Honduras, and the harbors of Puerto Barrios and Puerto Cortez in Honduras and Guatemala, and San Juan River, and approaches to Guanoco and Venezuela, and a large amount of geographical and cartographical information relating to all parts of the world has been contributed by the officers of the vessels of the general naval service under the provisions of the regulations for the government of the Navy, which requires reports and surveys concerning the imperfectly known localities that are visited.

SUMMARY.

1. All maritime nations, without exception, do their marine surveying work under their naval departments.

2. Naval officers are in every respect better qualified than any others to obtain the necessary hydrographic data and determine what is most needed on a chart for maritime use.

3. Naval officers, for sixty years, have done the hydrographic work used by the Coast Survey, the latter doing unnecessary topographical and other outside work not needed on charts for the use of mariners.

4. After more than ninety years the Coast Survey has not completed our own coast proper, with more than twice as much coast line added by that of Alaska and the new possessions.

5. With the sum now appropriated for the Coast Survey added to the current ones for the Navy it may be safely stated that with the resources now in possession of the Navy the needed charts of the entire world would be at our disposal in ten years from date of consolidation under the Navy Department.

6. It is of vast importance to the naval officers to have good charts; it is to his own interest, as well as that of the country at large, to have them promptly; hence the incentive to produce quick results, so wanting in the Coast Survey after an existence of nearly a century.

7. The experience of all nations having navies, good governmental administration, economy, promptness of work, with quick publication, all point to the advisability of placing all marine Government survey work under the direction of the Navy Department.

As late as April 19, 1892, the following letter was received from the superintendent of the Coast Survey. The Territory of Alaska had then been in the possession of the United States Government since 1867:

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1892.

Commodore F. M. RAMSAY, U. S. N.,
Chief of Bureau of Navigation,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not having been extended as yet to western Alaska, this office is in possession of but little information of value in preparing a Coast Pilot for that part of our coast. As a number of our naval vessels are about to visit the waters of Bering Sea, I would request that the commanding officers be instructed to collect and report all reliable information that would be of assistance in the compilation of the proposed Coast Pilot.

Sketches or views of the Aleutian Islands near the principal passes and the positions and appearance of isolated rocks or shoals will be particularly valuable. Descriptions of the appearance of headlands, islands, or any conspicuous natural feature which the mariner can recognize and what will naturally assist him in determining his position are very desirable.

The Coast Survey has just issued and furnished the Hydrographic Office with a new chart of the Pribilof Islands. The value of these charts would be greatly increased if one of our naval vessels could be directed to execute the hydrography

of the anchorages around both islands. At the present time our information in that respect is very limited.

Very respectfully,

T. C. MENDENHALL, *Superintendent.*

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND TREASURY DEPARTMENT IN REFERENCE TO THE RELATIVE MERITS OF THE MERCATOR AND POLYCONIC PROJECTIONS USED IN CHART CONSTRUCTION AND IN RELATION TO FUTURE SURVEY WORK BY THE TWO RESPECTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

UNITED STATES FLAGSHIP NEW YORK, FIRST RATE,
Newport, R. I., August 25, 1899.

SIR: 1. I desire to offer an expression of opinion, which I believe to be that of the service at-large, with reference to the character of chart supplied by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

2. I regard the polyconic projection as unfitted to the general uses of the mariner, and the charts furnished are misleading in many instances to the vast proportion of men who follow the sea and have charge of smaller merchant vessels. I know that I rarely use one myself without a feeling of personal aggravation on account of its peculiarities.

3. The variations from the ordinary projection can never, by any possibility, supplant the latter, and I beg to suggest that in view of this (to my mind) plainly established fact, and in view of the general dislike of the seafaring fraternity to the Coast Survey projection, that steps should be taken to discontinue the issue of charts on this projection as rapidly as others based upon the Coast Survey data can be supplied. The time has come, it seems to me, to discontinue an adherence to an unpractical idea, which, so far as the sailor is concerned, should never have had birth.

4. I have yet to meet an officer of the service expressing views dissenting from the above.

Very respectfully,

F. E. CHADWICK,
Captain, United States Navy, Commanding.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

[First indorsement.]

UNITED STATES FLAGSHIP NEW YORK,
Newport, R. I., August 29, 1899.

Respectfully forwarded.

W. T. SAMPSON,
Rear Admiral, Commander in Chief U. S. Naval Force, North Atlantic Squadron.

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, *August 31, 1899.*

Respectfully referred to the Bureau of Equipment (Hydrographic Office) for such comment as it desires to make.

Please return.

A. S. CROWNINSHIELD, *Chief of Bureau.*

[Memorandum for the Bureau of Equipment.]

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE, BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
September 12, 1899.

Respectfully returned to the Bureau of Equipment.

The Hydrographic Office fully concurs in the views expressed in the within letter and regrets that it has not been able to supply United States men-of-war with charts of the coasts of the United States, constructed on the Mercator projection, because the making of these charts has not come within the province of the Hydrographic Office.

It is respectfully recommended that this subject be referred to the Coast and Geodetic Survey for such action as that office may see fit to take, with the request that the Navy Department be informed of the intentions of the Coast Survey in the premises.

Upon hearing the result of referring this subject to the Coast Survey, the Hydrographic Office would be prepared to make further recommendations.

J. E. CRAIG.
Captain, United States Navy, Hydrographer.

[Third indorsement.]

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, *September 12, 1899.*

Respectfully returned to the Bureau of Navigation. Attention called to the memorandum of the hydrographer.

The Bureau fully concurs in the recommendation of the commanding officer of the *New York* and with the memorandum of the hydrographer.

It is recommended that these papers be forwarded to the office of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for consideration, with request for a reply as to what action, if any, is taken.

R. B. BRADFORD, *Chief of Bureau.*

[Fourth indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *September 15, 1899.*

Respectfully referred to the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the comment of the office of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the within papers.

CHAS. H. ALLEN, *Acting Secretary.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., November 11, 1899.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith your communication of September 15 with its inclosures containing the recommendation of the Hydrographic Office, Bureau of Equipment, for the publication of coast charts upon the Mercator projection. I respectfully call your attention to the reply of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which is inclosed. In accordance with this reply, I have to say:

1. This matter of the publication of charts upon a new projection has required careful consideration, inasmuch as it involves a large expense. It is the desire, however, of this Department to furnish all possible facilities to the vessels of the Navy Department, and I have the pleasure to say that charts upon the Mercator projection, such as are desired by the Navy Department, will be prepared by the Coast and Geodetic Survey as rapidly as the facilities of the office will permit.

2. In this connection it seems proper to call attention to the hydrographic surveys of the new possessions of the United States, which are now being prosecuted by both the Coast and Geodetic Survey and by the Navy Department. It seems to me desirable that there should be certain cooperation between the two Departments in order to prevent unnecessary duplication of the work. As you are doubtless aware, the act of Congress of March 4, 1899, extended the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to all islands "under the jurisdiction of the United States," both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific oceans. In time the Coast and Geodetic Survey will, doubtless, publish charts of all these islands, but the Treasury Department realizes that the survey of the extended coast line of the Philippines, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands involves enormous work and gladly welcomes any survey work which the Navy Department may find it possible to do. I deem it desirable, however, that the Navy Department should not include in its estimate for survey appropriations the names of such islands as are already being surveyed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

3. In accordance with the suggestions just made, I have to request that Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands be omitted from the estimates of the Navy Department for survey work for the coming year, inasmuch as surveys of both of these islands by the Coast and Geodetic Survey are now in progress and the work will be rapidly pushed to completion.

I shall be glad to know your wishes with regard to this matter.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., November 11, 1899.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith the communication of the Secretary of the Navy, forwarded under date of September 15, and referring to the question of the form of projection to be used on Coast and Geodetic Survey charts. In reply I have to say:

1. The question of the relative merits of the Mercator and polyconic projections for the use of coast charts is one which has long been under discussion in this office and in the other offices of the Government which have to do with navigation.

The advantages of the Mercator projection are that it is in common use and that the meridians and parallels shown on it are straight lines, so that a course laid down on it is a rhumb line. Its weaknesses are that the course laid down is not a great circle and, therefore, not the shortest distance between two points; and, in addition, the chart is distorted, so that there is no uniform scale throughout. For instance, in the chart of the Bering Sea published by the Hydrographic Office on the Mercator projection, the scale varies 100 per cent from the bottom to the top of the chart, and an island at the top of the chart would appear four times as large as the same island at the bottom.

The advantages of the polyconic projection are that the course laid down upon it is practically a great circle, and, furthermore, the chart is true to scale over its whole area. An objection to it is that the meridians and parallels are no longer parallel lines, and the course laid down upon it will have different bearings at different parts of the course.

The question as to which of these is better for chart purposes will always remain a question of judgment, and will always be one upon which the opinion of experienced navigators will differ, and the preferences of experienced navigators are by no means accordant. In order to obtain the opinion of experienced navigators of the merchant service on this and other matters pertaining to the Survey, circulars were sent out over a year ago. A copy of this circular is attached. In the circular the preference of the ship captains on the matter of projection was requested. To this circular 61 replies were received, representing a much larger number of navigators. Of this number, 22 preferred the polyconic, 20 the Mercator projection, 7 the polyconic for offshore and the Mercator for inshore, and the remainder expressed no preferences.

Furthermore, there is no such accordance in this matter among naval officers as Captain Chadwick would seem to think. In the Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute, volume 10, page 187, will be found a most clearly written article by Lieutenant-Commander Pillsbury on "Charts and chart making." In this matter he discusses this question completely and points out clearly the superior advantages of the polyconic projection, and answers fully the objections which have been made to it. The opinion of Commander Pillsbury on this subject accords with the views of many other officers of the Navy who are considered among the most scientific hydrographers and navigators in the service.

In brief, it may be stated that the Mercator chart is known to more people and will generally be preferred, but the polyconic chart, according to my experience, is preferred by those who have become accustomed to its use.

It may be noted in passing that the Navy Department also issues an additional set of charts on the gnomonic projection for great circle sailing. The polyconic charts, being great circle charts, fulfill the purpose of both the Mercator and gnomonic charts.

3. Notwithstanding the facts which have been set forth, it is true that the Mercator projection is the one whose use is almost universal for sailing charts. Furthermore, it is the desire of this office to furnish the Navy Department that form of chart which is considered most desirable for their use. I have, therefore, to recommend that coast and sailing charts of the United States on the Mercator projection be issued from this office as rapidly as the facilities will permit. For the Pacific coast some charts on the Mercator projection can be issued shortly, but some time will be required for the preparation of charts for the Atlantic coast. The matter will receive my earnest attention and will be expedited as much as possible.

4. It is to be remembered that the Coast and Geodetic Survey publishes not only charts for general navigation, but also a large number of harbor charts on a large scale. Its charts thus serve two very different purposes, and there can be no question but that the polyconic projection is the proper one for the last-mentioned class of charts. I take it, therefore, that the request of the Navy Department will be entirely complied with by publishing on the Mercator projection such coast and sailing charts as are a scale of 1:200,000 or more.

I shall be glad to be informed as to whether this will be satisfactory.

Respectfully,

HENRY S. PRITCHETT,
Superintendent.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

CIRCULAR TO SHIPMASTERS AND OTHER NAUTICAL EXPERTS.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1898.

It is the wish of this bureau to produce charts which shall, in every essential feature, be suited to the needs of the navigator. While it is believed that our charts do now in the main meet such requirements, the value of expert criticism is recognized, and therefore your opinion is requested on the following points in especial, as well as on any others that may occur to you:

1. *The projection.*—Do you prefer the polyconic or the Mercator, and would you prefer one of the two for all classes of charts, or one projection for one class and the other for another class, according as the chart may be designed for offshore or inshore navigation? The polyconic projection differs mainly from the Mercator in that it has a scale applicable to its whole surface and its parallels of latitude are curved, while the Mercator has no such scale and parallels and meridians are straight lines. A course on the polyconic is approximately an arc of the great circle, while a course on the Mercator is a rhomb line.

2. *Soundings.*—Would you prefer that these should be less in number and printed larger?

3. *Dangers.*—Rocks, shoals, reefs, etc. Are these so clearly marked that they can readily be recognized as such?

4. *Compasses.*—Do you prefer the magnetic compass, showing points and degrees, or the double compass, showing points and degrees magnetic and points

and degrees true, or any compromise between the two, or one kind of compass for offshore and another for inshore charts? It is to be remembered that the elaboration of the compass symbol tends more or less to obscure soundings and other information.

5. *Currents.*—Do you find the present mode of representation useful? If not, can you suggest a better?

6. *Aids to navigation.*—Light-houses, buoys, etc. Are these so marked as to be readily distinguishable.

7. *Natural objects* useful for navigation, towers, spires, standpipes, prominent houses, etc.—Are these sufficient in number and well marked?

8. *Shore line.*—Is this bold enough to mark the distinction between land and water?

9. *Curves of depth.*—Are these so shown as to readily define channels and dangers?

10. *Descriptive notes.*—As to lights, tides, etc. Are these satisfactory in number and in the definiteness of the information?

HENRY S. PRITCHETT, *Superintendent.*

[First indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *November 15, 1899.*

Treasury Department forwards reply of Superintendent Coast and Geodetic Survey to the indorsement on the letter of the commanding officer U. S. S. *New York*, in which suggestion is made that the issuance of coast charts constructed on polyconic projection be discontinued; state charts on Mercator projection will be prepared by Coast and Geodetic Survey as rapidly as possible; calls attention to surveys being made in new possessions by Coast and Geodetic Survey and to the desirability of Navy Department not including in its estimate for surveys appropriations the names of such islands as are already being surveyed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Respectfully referred to the Bureau of Navigation (via the Bureau of Equipment), attention being invited to paragraph 18, article 1610, United States Navy Regulations, relative to official correspondence between the Navy Department, its bureaus and officers, with other Executive Departments.

The construction placed by the Department upon this paragraph of the Navy Regulations is that such communications as are referred to therein shall be press-copied in the Secretary's office, and a brief of the subject-matter thereof placed on its key. When reply is received, it will be taken up on the records of the Secretary's office, and will then be referred by the Department to the proper bureau or office.

CHAS. H. ALLEN, *Acting Secretary.*

NAVY DEPARTMENT, EQUIPMENT,
Washington, January 2, 1900.

SIR: 1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of November 11, 1899, with its inclosures, and desire to express the appreciation of this Department at your determination to reconstruct the coast and sailing charts issued by the Coast and Geodetic Survey on scales of 1-200000 and smaller, upon the Mercator projection, as desired by this Department.

2. Before referring to the subject of the second paragraph of your letter I desire to explain the position of this Department in connection with the subject-matter discussed in the letter of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey accompanying your communication.

3. This letter, which, in part, refers to the course that has hitherto been pursued by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in constructing its nautical charts upon the polyconic projection, in opposition to the universal practice of the maritime world, sets forth that one of the imperfections of the Mercator chart is that a ship's course laid down upon it is not a great circle, and therefore not the shortest distance between two points. To illustrate, suppose there is a ship at sea, in latitude 36° north and longitude 68° west of Greenwich, bound for New York.

The shortest, or great circle, distance on the surface of the ocean between the point of departure just stated and Sandy Hook light-ship is 384 $\frac{11}{100}$ knots. The length of the rhumb line, which is a straight line drawn upon a Mercator chart, is 384 $\frac{78}{100}$ knots. The difference between these distances, one representing the length of the great circle arc, or a straight line on the polyconic chart, and the other the length of the rhumb line, or a straight line on the Mercator chart, is equal to two-thirds of the height of the Washington Monument, or about half the length of a modern steamer of the larger class. This difference does not amount to one-fiftieth part of the average uncertainty in position resulting from one day's run of a trans-Atlantic steamer when based upon the highest accuracy of which the art of navigation is capable.

4. The Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey also sets forth in his letter that uniformity of scale is a merit of the nautical charts at present issued by the Treasury Department. This is not a matter of importance in charts intended for purposes of navigation. The mariner is concerned with the means supplied for navigating his ship from point to point of land with facility and safety, but he is not concerned with the relative sizes of these points as they are represented upon the charts any more than he is with the means for obtaining the utmost refinement of distance between places separated by wide stretches of the sea.

5. Navigation depends chiefly upon the compass, and what the mariner most needs is a chart which readily supplies means of determining the direction with reference to meridians of longitude and parallels of latitude of the line that represents the track of his ship, so long ao she maintains the same true heading. In this important respect the polyconic chart is very unsatisfactory. For example: If a shipmaster, in latitude 36° north and longitude 68° west of Greenwich were to lay a course by a straight line on a polyconic chart to Cape Henry, he could traverse that track only by altering the true heading of the ship by successive changes at intermediate meridans from north 88° 20′ west at the point of departure, to south 87° west at the point of destination. To make these alterations it would be necessary to ascertain the latitude and longitude of the ship at each of the intermediate points in order to determine the course to be steered. Should he proceed according to the usual methods of navigators and, after measuring the true course from the chart at the point of departure, steer on a corresponding compass course, he would not reach Cape Henry, but make his landfall among the shoals and foul ground off Cape Charles. With a Mecartor chart, however, the course once laid from the point of departure, already mentioned, to Cape Henry would, unless the ship was deflected by winds or currents, take the ship safely and directly to Cape Henry.

6. The Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey mentions also in his letter the great circle sailing charts issued by the Hydrographic Office, which are constructed on the gnomonic projection, in support of this contention in favor of the polyconic projection and against the Mercator projection. In this connection it is necessary to understand that each one of the five charts so constructed embraces an entire ocean. They are designed to facilitate transoceanic navigation along the area of great circles of the earth thousands of miles in length, and have no connection whatever with the subject under discussion, since Coast Survey charts relate only to coastwise navigation and approaches to our own shores.

7. Referring to the second and third paragraphs of your letter, in which you express the desire for cooperation between the two departments, I have the honor to state that this proposition is much to be desired.

8. In order to bring about this result it appears necessary to agree, if possible, upon some division of work. The Revised Statutes, Title LVI, sections 4681 to 4691, inclusive, seem to clearly indicate that the surveys made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey are to be confined to the coast of the United States and islands within 20 leagues therefrom. The name Coast and Geodetic Survey appears to indicate the same. The statement is made by you that the duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey were extended by act of Congress of March 4, 1899, to all island under the jurisdiction of the United States. It is presumed that you refer to the sundry civil act of March 3, 1899, making appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The Department notes that the wording of the above-mentioned act is:

"For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the survey of the coasts of the United States, and of coasts under the jurisdiction of the United States," etc.

It is also noted that heretofore the wording of similar acts making appropriations yearly for the maintenance of the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been:

"For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the survey of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts of the United States, and the coast of the Territory of Alaska," etc.

In connection with the above your attention is invited to the naval act of March 3, 1899, making an appropriation for "Ocean and lake surveys, Bureau of Equipment, 1899 and 1900." The wording of this act makes specific provision for surveys of the imperfectly known parts of the coasts and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago and the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, with their bordering keys and waters and minor outlying islands. This act is positive in its nature, and admits of no doubt as to its meaning. Notwithstanding this fact, owing to representations made by your Department that you desired to survey the coasts of the islands of Porto Rico, all hydrographic work contemplated for that island was suspended, and the carefully prepared instructions drawn by this Department for the same were turned over to the Coast and Geodetic Survey office for its use.

10. The Department, however, proceeded with the survey of the coast of Cuba, and had two ships fully employed there during the past winter. The results were important. The same ships are now prosecuting the survey of Cuba with vigor. Preparations have been made for work in the Philippines. Other work of a similar nature, fully set forth in the report of this Department and the reports of its subordinate bureaus, has been accomplished during the past year.

11. Your attention is further invited to the fact that every ship of war, with the instruments supplied for navigation purposes, is capable of making a good hydrographic survey wherever she may be. Work of this character has been going on ever since the establishment of the Navy. It is essentially the work of seamen, and the Department is of the opinion that the Navy, with its trained officers and men, is better adapted to make hydrographic surveys than any other department under the Government. In this connection attention is called to the fact that the Coast and Geodetic Survey is without trained seamen, except such as may be hired.

12. In consideration of the facts above mentioned, this Department suggests that, in future, the labors of the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confined to the coasts of the United States proper, which is the evident meaning of the law in Title LVI, Revised Statutes, already referred to, and to topographical work in outlying colonial possessions of the United States. Topographical work is as much needed in the new possessions and the newly annexed territory of this country as hydrographic work, and there is a wide field for extensive operation in this direction for many years to come. The Navy is not prepared to do this kind of work, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey is.

13. The Department notes your statement that the "Treasury Department realizes that the survey of the extended coast line of the Philippines, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands involves enormous work and gladly welcomes any survey work which the Navy Department may find it possible to do." In consideration of the act of Congress quoted in paragraph 9, authorizing this Department to survey the coast and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago and the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, and of the fact that this Department has been doing survey work the world over for a hundred years, and that similar work of the Treasury Department has been until within the past year confined to the coast of the United States, the Department can not admit the assumption implied, that the Navy Department has entered a field of labor not its own, or is in any way encroaching upon the prerogatives of the Treasury Department.

14. Referring to paragraph 3 of your letter, the Department desires to state that its estimates were made in the month of September; the reports of the bureaus of the Department were made in October, and upon them the report of the Department was founded. This request is dated November 11. In consideration of the enormous amount of work involved in the survey of the recently acquired colonial island territory, as admitted by you, it does not appear to this Department desirable to omit any estimates made.

15. The foregoing is a result of a very full consideration of the matter by the Naval Bureau of Equipment; it is a summary made by its efficient chief, Rear-Admiral Bradford, in which I concur, and I am sure it will commend itself to your favorable consideration.

Respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your communication of January 2.

Paragraphs 1 to 6 of your letter are devoted to a discussion of the relative merits of the Mercator and polyconic charts. Inasmuch as the Coast and Geodetic Survey is now constructing charts on the Mercator projection to meet the request of the Navy Department, there seems no occasion to discuss further the relative merits of these two projections. The remaining paragraphs of your letter refer to two other matters to which I beg to reply briefly. I allude to the statements that the surveys conducted by the Coast and Geodetic Survey should, under law, be confined to the coast of the United States and to the island within 20 leagues thereof; and, secondly, that hydrographic surveying can best be performed by officers of the Navy.

As a matter of fact, Congress has recognized that the work of the Coast Survey Bureau should keep pace with the acquisition of territory by the United States, and has extended its functions accordingly, from time to time, as such acquisitions have occured. When the coast of Alaska came under the jurisdiction of the United States, a survey was instituted and was extended tot he new territory as soon as it came under the control of the United States; and in a similar manner the functions of the Survey were extended to the recently acquired islands as soon as the jurisdiction of this Government was extended to them. It would be a singular condition of affairs if this were not the case. Whatever may be thought of the wisdom or unwisdom of maintaining a specific bureau for the work of surveying the coast, it can hardly be imagined that a Government would maintain such a bureau and not extend its functions to any new territory which it acquired.

The resources of the Survey are abundantly able to handle the work in Hawaii

and Porto Rico, and these territories are already considered as a part of this country, and your suggestion that the work of this Survey should not be extended to them seems to be without justification. I am the more surprised at this position by the reason of the fact that the surveys in Porto Rico were instituted at your request, and at that time your idea seemed to be that the Coast Survey was the properly constituted office for taking up the hydrographic survey of that island.

I respectfully call your attention to your letter of August 5, 1898 (a copy of which is inclosed), in which you request of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey "that a survey be made of the coast and harbors on the south side of the island of Porto Rico at the earliest practicable date." Your action at this time is entirely in accord with the principle of administration which I am seeking to maintain, namely, that so long as specific bureaus are maintained by the Government for special technical work, such work should be left to these bureaus and should not be taken up in a desultory way by other Departments of the Government. In view of your action in August, 1898, in requesting a survey of Porto Rico by the Coast and Geodetic Survey (a survey which is being rapidly prosecuted), I am somewhat at loss to understand why you should now take the position that this bureau should not extend surveys more t an 20 leagues from the coast of the continent.

The second statement mentioned, namely, that naval officers are, by reason of their nautical education, better fitted to undertake technical surveying than specially trained enginers, is a proposition which this Department is not prepared to admit. There is no desire on the part of the Treasury Department to belittle the work of the officers of the Navy, but, at the same time, it is to be stated frankly that naval officers are not engineers or surveyors, and but few of them are acquainted with survey work. That this work, which involves special training, can be done better by men to whom such service is but a passing incident in their careers than by men who make it their profession is a position that I am sure you would not undertake to maintain.

While it is true, as you state, that vessels fitted up as war vessels have certain qualifications for undertaking survey work, it is equally true that their real business is something far different, and that surveys accomplished in this way are expensive and necessarily incomplete. This fact is illustrated in the case of the two ships sent to Cuba by the Navy-Department. These are not war vessels, but are specially fitted up for survey work and not for the work of the Navy. If men-of-war were well fitted to carry on this service, the whole of the West Indies and of the Philippines might have been surveyed years ago.

Your suggestion that the Coast and Geodetic Survey should confine itself in the newly acquired islands to topographical and trigonometrical work would also take away the chief advantage which comes from intrusting coast survey work to a bureau specifically prepared for its conduct. Under the régime which exists in the Coast and Geodetic Survey a field corps is maintained, composed of engineers and trained nautical men, by which the entire survey of the coast is carried on simultaneously. Our vessels complete the hydrography, the topography, and coast triangulation simultaneously.

It requires but a moment's consideration to see that it would be far more expensive to have the hydrography executed by one bureau and the shore topography and coast triangulation performed by another. It is impossible to separate the survey of a coast by a sharply drawn line and say that all surveys in the water shall be done by one party and all on land by a different one without enormously increasing the cost. This work is really one, and the very reason for the existence of such a corps of engineers as is maintained in the Coast Survey is to be found in the fact that it is organized to carry on all the operations of a survey, whether on land or sea, as a part of one consistent plan.

As to the topographic surveys of the interior of the United States, those, as you are aware, are carried on by the United States Geological Survey, using the trigonometric surveys of the Coast and Geodetic Survey as a basis to start from.

The whole question, in a word, is one of administration. Congress has seen fit to create and to maintain certain bureaus for the specific work of surveying, and in the course of years a corps of men specially trained for the work has been brought together. It would seem to me wiser for naval officers to confine their attention to their regular duties and leave the work of surveying to those bureaus of the Government which have been specifically organized for this purpose, except in cases where survey work is needed at points which these organizations can not reach, and which does not require that continuity of plan which is necessary in the prosecution of extensive surveys, and which the Navy finds it possible to do.

With the expansion of territory and the increase of the Navy there would seem to be more need for officers of the Navy in regular naval duty. In fact, the Navy Department has recently called attention to the difficulty in meeting this demand. The Light-House Board finds it difficult to secure naval officers for its service. In view of all this there would seem to be no reasonable excuse for the Navy Department to assign its officers to undertake survey work in regions in which the Coast and Geodetic Survey is already at work, and to begin surveys which that bureau is entirely able to handle.

It is my understanding of the action of Congress at its last session that it intended to intrust the surveys in the newly acquired islands to the Coast Survey. As you point out, it also authorizes the Navy to make surveys in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. It was in view of this very fact, and to avoid duplication of work, that I have ventured to suggest that the Navy Department should confine its survey work to such regions as are not now reached by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, until the intention of Congress in this matter is more clearly indicated.

The foregoing statements are presented for your consideration with the most friendly intent, and your consideration of them, as they relate to the matter of good departmental administration, is respectfully urged.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, August 5, 1898.*

SIR: The Department requests that a survey be made of the coast and harbors on the south side of Porto Rico at the earliest practicable date, and is ready to detail officers for such coast survey vessels as may be designated for this service.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

SUPERINTENDENT UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY,
Treasury Department, Washington.

[First indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *January 17, 1900.*

Relative to proposition that surveys conducted by the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confined to the coast of the United States and islands within 20 leagues thereof, urges that as a matter of good departmental administration the Navy should do only such survey work as can not be done by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and gives reasons for that view of the case.

Respectfully referred to the Bureau of Equipment for comment and recommendation.

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, February 3, 1900.*

SIR: 1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th ultimo in which you suggest that the surveys of the coasts and waters of the newly acquired dependencies of the United States should be prosecuted by the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Treasury Department, rather than by the surveying vessels of the Navy, upon the ground "that naval officers are not engineers or surveyors, and but few of them are acquainted with survey work." In reply Admiral Bradford points out that the marine hydrographic and coast surveys of the world are almost wholly the result of the labors of the navies of the different maritime nations.

In Argentine, Austria-Hungary, Brazil, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain, and Sweden, and in their outlying colonies, possessions, and dependencies—in various parts of the world—such surveys are executed and administered by the naval establishments. Moreover, it should be stated that there are no coast surveys of Belgium, and the Belgians have no navy. So that it may be said that foreign nations, including alike those in which the highest regard has been paid to economy and those in which trustworthiness, completeness, and celerity of execution are held to be all important, have recognized that coast surveys are nautical operations which come within the natural domain of naval work.

2. The Treasury Department is aware that under the requirements of the statutes, the hydrographic operations of the survey of the coasts of the States and Territories of the United States have been almost wholly performed for more than fifty years past by the officers and enlisted men of the Navy who have been detailed by this Department for service in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and in the light of this the import of my letter, dated at the time of the invasion of Porto Rico, will be made more clear, since the country was then engaged in a war, the necessities of which precluded the assignment of any vessel of the Navy for surveying operations.

3. About one-third of the commissioned officers of the Navy, besides a large number of staff officers, have served on the Coast Survey. Until the outbreak of hostilities with Spain, the services of about 45 naval officers were diverted each year from the Navy to the survey of the coast, not to mention the crews of the vessels of the Coast Survey, which have also been provided by the Navy. An inspection of the files of the Navy Register discloses the fact that about 1,400 different naval officers have served in the Coast Survey; so that the sum of hydrographic experience in this country, as in the rest of the world, is to-day in the naval establishment; and the officials of the Coast Survey, who maintain that they are better qualified to perform marine hydrographic surveying than the officers of the Navy, have not had that long experience declared in your letter to be necessary for the successful prosecution of such work which would entitle their opinions to the weight that might be attached to them if the hydrographic operations had ever heretofore been in their hands.

4. In responce to your late request for cooperation between the surveyors of the two Departments, the Navy Department has suggested that the labors of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the outlying dependencies, which are not yet territories of the United States, might be confined to other than nautical fields. To this suggestion your reply is that it would be exceedingly lacking in economy to separate the topographical from the hydrographical work of a coast survey. An inspection of the charts of the Coast and Geodetic Survey will result in a refutation of this claim of coordination. The triangulation appears to have been done at one time, the topography at another, and the hydrography at still another; and those times are frequently widely separated. Moreover, the experts of the joint commission of congress to inquire into the status of laws organizing the Executive Departments reported: "To attain the best results, and at the same time secure economy, the surveying of the United States should be under the direction of the two bureaus, one to direct the land surveys, including geologic and scientific investigation, and the other to direct the hydrographic surveys." (Report No. 1954, Fifty-third Congress, third session.)

5. Abandoning the inclination to venture over seas into unsurveyed waters concerning which they will have no intimate and personal interest in making nautical surveys well and quickly, the forces of the Coast and Geodetic Survey will have more time to devote attention to the completion of the surveys of the coasts of the United States, and thus lessen the responsibility of the Treasury Department for leaving portions of them unsurveyed and hazarding lives and cargoes after the lapse of nearly three-quarters of a century of surveying. Can it be doubted that the sentiment underlying the yearly appropriation of money to the support of the Coast Survey has been to facilitate the movement of commerce along our coasts and to preserve the lives of seamen. Besides, if the functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey were extended to these new islands, the work of charting their coasts might be delayed, as it has been on the coasts of the United States.

6. The time set in the testimony of the officials of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the winding up of the affairs of that office is now several years overdue, and within the last few years the experts of the Congressional Commission of Inquiry, appointed by act of Congress approved July 7, 1884, recommended "that the hydrographic work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey be transferred to the bureau of the Navy Department, to be called the Hydrographic Bureau, and there consolidated with the work of the present Hydrographic Office," because, as they stated in the report of their investigations, all the work to be transferred was done and paid for by the naval establishment, because the Navy, being composed of sailors, is best qualified to judge which sort of charts should be prepared for the use of mariners, because of the economy resulting from the consolidation, and because of the facility that would be afforded to the people for whom this work is designed by issuing charts from a single source, and that source the office from which they can obtain the most information.

7. In conclusion, it is important to state that there is no other branch of the public service besides the Navy in which the effect of the experience gained in marine surveying operations reacts so markedly in favor of the welfare and defense of the nation.

8. I am not sure that this discussion between the chief of your bureau and the chief of mine is not becoming academic. I take it, each of us not being an expert, gives special weight to the views of his own officer, in whose competency and honesty he has full confidence. I can not, however, escape the view that with work enough to do for both organizations, on land and on sea, the land work would best be done by landmen, and the sea work done by the seamen; especially in view of the fact that the Navy has been doing sea work for so many years, and has qualifications of training and experience.

Why is it not a sensible thing for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for its main work, to do coast and geodetic work on the coast, and for the Hydrographic Office of the naval service to do the hydrographic work on the water. There will, of course, be cases where they will overlap now and then, and perhaps do a little of each other's work, but if this general rule of division of work were adopted, it seems to me it would be in the interest of economy and efficiency, and that at any rate we ought to be cooperative and not pulling apart. If we can not agree, then of course, Congress must decide.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1900.

SIR: The following estimates in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey are before the Committee on Appropriations:

Pay and subsistence of professional seamen serving as executive officers and mates on the vessels of the Survey, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, $27,500.

Pay and subsistence of engineers, surgeons, captains' clerks, ships' draftsmen, cadets, and enlisted petty officers and seamen of all classes, in accordance with the regulations established by the Secretary of the Treasury, $182,745.

Under the first item an appropriation was made for the first time at the last session of Congress. The second item is submitted for the first time, and is for the ensuing year. Both seem to be submitted notwithstanding sections 4684 and 4685, Revised Statutes.

In connection with the foregoing, I have the honor to request that you will, at your earliest convenience, advise me, for the information of the committee, as follows:

1. What number of officers and men of the Navy, if any, are now detailed for service with the Coast and Geodetic Survey?

2. What number of officers of the Navy are detailed for duty in the Navy Department at Washington; the rank and pay of such officers, and the number detailed in each bureau or office in said Department?

3. What number of officers of the Navy are detailed for or are on shore duty in the District of Columbia, other than in the Navy Department proper, together with rank, pay, and particular duty of each?

4. What number of officers and men of the Navy, together with the rank and pay of each of the former, are on duty with the branch hydrographic offices?

5. What number of officers and men of the Navy are engaged in the survey of the coasts of Porto Rico, Cuba, Hawaii, Guam, the Philippines, or Alaska; the number and character of vessels of the Navy engaged in such work, and what ones, if any of them, were or are being particularly fitted out for such service, and at what actual or estimated cost?

Very respectfully,
J. G. CANNON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, H. R.

Hon. JOHN D. LONG,
Secretary of the Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, EQUIPMENT,
Washington, February 13, 1900.

SIR: 1. The Department has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 5, 1900, making certain inquiries in connection with the estimates submitted for the maintenance of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the next fiscal year.

2. A copy of your letter is prefixed to this communication for your convenience when consulting the answers to your inquiries.

3. Answer to query No. 1. "What number of officers and men of the Navy, if any, are now detailed for service with the Coast and Geodetic Survey?"

1 passed-assistant paymaster	$1,530
332 enlisted men, pay and rations	179,280

4. Answer to query No. 2. "What number of officers and men of the Navy are detailed for duty in the Navy Department at Washington, the rank and pay of such officers, and the number detailed in each bureau or office in said Department?"

Office of the Secretary:	
The Admiral	$13,500
1 lieutenant (junior grade)	1,275
Office of the Assistant Secretary:	
1 lieutenant-commander	2,125
1 lieutenant	1,530
Library and War Records Office:	
1 professor of mathematics	2,400
Bureau of Yards and Docks:	
1 rear-admiral	5,500
1 professor of mathematics	2,400
3 civil engineers	7,200
Bureau of Equipment:	
1 rear-admiral	5,500
2 lieutenant-commanders	4,250
4 lieutenants	6,120

SUBORDINATE BRANCHES, BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT.

Naval Observatory:	
1 captain	2,975
1 lieutenant	1,530
4 professors of mathematics	10,200
Nautical Almanac Office:	
1 professor of mathematics	4,200
Hydrographic Office:	
2 commanders	5,100
2 lieutenant-commanders	4,250
1 lieutenant	1,530
Compass Office:	
1 lieutenant-commander	2,125
Bureau of Navigation:	
1 rear-admiral	5,500
1 captain	2,975
1 commander	3,000
2 lieutenant-commanders	4,250
1 lieutenant	1,530
2 lieutenants (junior grade)	2,550
Office of Naval Intelligence:	
1 captain	2,975
1 commander	2,550
3 lieutenant-commanders	6,375
3 lieutenants	4,590
Bureau of Ordnance:	
1 rear-admiral	5,500
1 lieutenant-commander	2,125
3 lieutenants	4,860
Bureau of Construction and Repair:	
1 rear-admiral	5,500
3 naval constructors	9,800
Bureau of Steam Engineering:	
1 rear-admiral	5,500
4 lieutenant-commanders	8,500
4 lieutenants	6,120
Superintendent of building:	
1 commander	3,000
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:	
1 rear-admiral	$5,500
2 paymasters	3,350
1 passed assistant paymaster	1,275
1 assistant paymaster	1,190
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:	
1 rear-admiral	5,500
1 medical inspector	3,000
1 assistant surgeon	1,190
Office of the Judge-Advocate-General:	
1 captain	3,500
1 lieutenant	1,530
Duty with Isthmian commission:	
1 lieutenant-commander	2,125

5. Answer to query No. 3. "What number of officers of the Navy are detailed for or are on shore duty in the District of Columbia, other than in the Navy Department proper, together with the rank, pay, and particular duty of each?"

Navy-yard:	
1 rear-admiral	$4,675
2 commanders	5,100
5 lieutenant-commanders	10,625
6 lieutenants	9,180
1 lieutenant (junior grade)	1,275
1 surgeon	1,530
1 assistant surgeon	1,190
1 pay director	2,975
1 paymaster	1,530
1 chief boatswain	1,400
2 chief gunners	2,800
3 gunners	3,300
1 acting gunner	900
1 pharmacist	900
Board of inspection and survey:	
1 rear-admiral	4,675
1 captain	2,975
2 commanders	5,100
1 lieutenant-commander	2,125
1 naval constructor	3,400
Naval examining boards:	
3 rear-admirals	15,375
3 captains	8,925
3 medical directors	8,925
2 medical directors	5,100
1 surgeon	2,125
Naval Hospital:	
1 medical director	2,975
1 assistant surgeon	1,190
Naval pay office:	
1 pay inspector	2,550
General inspector of pay corps:	
1 pay director	2,975
Naval Museum of Hygiene:	
1 medical director	2,975
1 surgeon	2,125
Naval Dispensary:	
2 surgeons	3,655
1 pharmacist	900
Fish Commission:	
1 lieutenant (junior grade)	1,275
Marine Barracks:	
1 surgeon	2,125
1 carpenter	1,000

6. Answer to query No. 4: "What number of officers and men of the Navy, together with the rank and pay of each of the former, are on duty with the branch hydrographic offices?"

Branch hydrographic offices:	
1 lieutenant at Boston, Mass	$1,530
1 lieutenant-commander at New York	2,125
1 lieutenant at Buffalo, N. Y	1,530
1 lieutenant at Philadelphia, Pa	1,530
1 lieutenant at Baltimore, Md	1,530
1 lieutenant at Norfolk, Va	1,530
1 lieutenant (junior grade) at Savannah, Ga	1,275
1 lieutenant-commander at San Francisco, Cal	2,125
1 lieutenant (junior grade) at Portland, Oreg	1,275
1 lieutenant (junior grade) at Port Townsend, Wash	1,275
1 lieutenant (junior grade) at Cleveland, Ohio	1,275
1 lieutenant (junior grade) at Chicago, Ill	1,275
1 lieutenant (junior grade) at New Orleans, La	1,275

7. Answer to query No. 5: "What number of officers and men of the Navy are engaged in the survey of Porto Rico, Cuba, Hawaii, Guam, the Philippines, or Alaska; the number and character of vessels of the Navy engaged in such work, and what ones, if any, of them were or are actually being particularly fitted out for such service, and at what actual or estimated cost?"

(*a*) PORTO RICO.

There are no officers and men of the Navy engaged in surveying the island of Porto Rico. Soon after the Spanish war the necessity for new charts of the coasts of Porto Rico and Cuba became apparent; navigation about the coasts and harbors was hazardous. Ships of the Navy and other vessels were constantly running upon uncharted shoals and were frequently seriously injured thereby.

The Department therefore decided to detail three converted yachts, formerly on duty in the blockading squadron, for survey work. The U. S. S. *Vixen*, of 806 tons displacement, was assigned to the survey of Porto Rico. Elaborate instructions were prepared for this work. Upon the representation of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Department that this branch of the public service desired to survey the coast of Porto Rico, the Department turned over to him its instructions for the work and detailed the *Vixen* for both cruiser and survey work at Bluefields, Nicaragua. The Department has recently detailed the *Vixen* for an examination and survey of Culebra and Crab islands, off the east end of Porto Rico, with a view of ascertaining if either island possesses suitable harbors for a coaling station and naval base. The *Vixen*, however, is armed and can at any time do the ordinary duty of a small ship of war. Total cost, thus far, about $4,000 for surveying outfit for the *Vixen*.

(*b*) CUBA.

The *Yankton*, a converted yacht of 975 tons displacement, and the *Eagle*, a converted yacht of 434 tons displacement, were fitted out late in the year 1898 for the purpose of surveying the coast of Cuba. These ships are armed, and are capable of doing other duty. They were employed during the winter of 1898-99 and up to July, 1899, in surveying the harbor of Santiago and Guantanamo Bay. The survey of the latter required five and a half months. The bay contains more than 100 miles

of water front and 25 square miles of water area. More than 25,000 soundings were taken. Up to the time of this survey, so far as known, there existed a channel of 19 feet only, leading from the outer bay up to the port of Caimanera, 7 miles inland. Owing to the shoal water the railway was about to extend its line to the lower bay.

The survey, however, developed a new channel, totally unknown, containing 26 feet of water. These two ships are now engaged in surveying the northeast coast of Cuba, the *Yankton* in Nipe Bay and the *Eagle* at Nuevitas. The charts of this section of Cuba are very defective. The United Fruit Company is largely investing in the vicinity of Nipe Bay, and is spending during the present winter $1,000,000 on sugar plantations. The Department is in receipt of information showing that the work of these ships is of the utmost value in assisting American capital to develop the resources of Cuba. Any man-of-war with her regular outfit can make a good hydrographic survey. To make a refined survey both afloat and ashore, additional instruments and other appliances, costing about $4,000 per ship, are necessary. The number of men and officers attached to the *Yankton* and *Eagle* are as follows, and the total amount expended for coal, thus far, on this survey is $7,059.22.

2 lieutenant-commanders	$5,000
2 lieutenants	3,600
4 ensigns	5,600
2 assistant surgeons..m	2,800
1 passed assistant paymaster	1,500
125 enlisted men, pay and rations	67,500

(c) HAWAII.

Very little surveying is necessary in the Hawaiian Islands. The charts for the most part are sufficiently accurate for nautical purposes. The station ship at Honolulu, viz, the sea-going tug *Iroquois*, has instructions to make a survey of the harbor of Honolulu when her regular duties will permit; also to do small amount of survey work at a few other places. The *Iroquois* also has instructions to proceed to the Midway Islands, about 1,200 miles from Honolulu, for the purpose of making a thorough survey of the islands with a view of ascertaining their adaptability for a cable station. These islands have already been partially surveyed by naval ships in years past. As the surveying work of this ship is in addition to her other duties, its cost will be slight, amounting to little more than the cost of the extra coal consumed. Total cost thus far about $3,000 for surveying outfit for *Iroquois*.

(d) GUAM.

The station ship at Guam, viz, the *Yosemite*, has instructions to make a complete survey of the entire island. The survey of San Luis d'Apra, the seaport of the capital, Agana, has already been completed and shows that the Spanish chart of that harbor was entirely incorrect. As this work has been done by the regular station ship it has been attended by no extra cost, except the value of the additional instruments and appliances supplied for the purpose, amounting to about $4,000.

(e) PHILIPPINES.

As yet no surveying has been done in the Philippine Islands. Navigation will not be safe, however, anywhere about the group until its surrounding waters are thoroughly surveyed and charted. This will probably require the services of as many as six ships for ten years. Instructions have been forwarded to the commander in chief of the Asiatic Squadron concerning these surveys, and the work is to begin at the most important points for commercial purposes. A complete outfit for one surveying ship has been forwarded. It is proposed to forward additional outfits of instruments and other necessary appliances, so that in the near future the small vessels formerly belonging to Spain, many of which are admirably adapted for surveying duty, may, in addition to their other work, commence to make surveys on a well-defined plan. It is estimated that an entire new survey of the Philippine group can be made by the Navy in ten years, using six vessels, for the sum of $2,000,000, not including office work.

(f) ALASKA.

No officers, men, or ships of the Navy are engaged upon survey work in Alaska.

(g) The U. S. S. *Marietta*, during the past winter, made a survey of Maturin Bar, at the entrance to the San Juan River, in the western part of the Gulf of Paria, lying northeastward of Trinidad, and also of the river courses leading up to Guanaco, Venezuela.

(h) The U. S. S. *Michigan* has been employed during the past summer, while not engaged in instructing naval militia, in sweeping and sounding for rocks in the Straits of Mackinac and the approaches thereto; also in Squaw Island Passage. Numerous isolated rocks, dangerous to navigation, were discovered. While this method is slow, it is the only positive means available for the discovery of small obstructions which, although dangerous to navigation, cover but little surface.

8. In connection with your inquiries, the Department desires to submit certain statements bearing upon the subject of marine or hydrographic surveying.

9. The Revised Statutes, Title LVI, sections 4681 to 4691, inclusive, appear to confine the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the coast of the United States proper and to islands with a distance thereof not exceeding 20 leagues. Until the present fiscal year all ocean surveying outside of the coast of the United States has been done by the Navy and, on account of its knowledge of nautical affairs, it appears best for the Navy to continue this work.

10. Previous to the present fiscal year the acts of Congress appropriating money for the maintenance of the Coast and Geodetic Survey were worded as follows:

"For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the survey of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts of the United States and the coast of the Territory of Alaska," etc.

For the present fiscal year they are worded as follows:

"For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the survey of the coasts of the United States and of coasts under the jurisdiction of the United States, etc."

11. Certain correspondence has recently passed between this Department and the Treasury Department in reference to survey work outside of the coast proper of the United States, particularly with reference to the duplication of work. It has been proposed by this Department that the Coast and Geodetic Survey should confine itself to the land or topographical work, and the Navy to the sea or hydrographic work of our newly acquired possessions. It is considered by this Department that seamen are best adapted for sea work. It is also considered that nautical men are best prepared to judge of nautical requirements and of the information necessary to be spread upon charts and maps for the information of the mariner. In addition, as has already been pointed out, ships of the Navy can combine surveying work with their regular duties so that the matter of cost is generally small.

12. As a result of the war with Spain the Navy is now in possession of a large number of small vessels suitable for surveying work; they are armed, and can therefore perform police work in addition, if necessary. Their presence in our new possessions will be required for an indefinite time, and the personnel of their crews is fully equipped to make hydrographic surveys. This work will be promptly executed by them, and the navigation of commercial and naval ships in these regions safeguarded. The Navy has no incentive to prolong surveying duty. The cost of the *Charleston*, the loss of which was due to defective charts, would pay for the entire survey of the Philippines by the naval vessels.

It will thus be seen that the necessary military expense would also cover the civil cost embraced in the appropriations for the Coast Survey establishment so far as our new possessions are concerned. The prompt execution of this work is all important, and in the opinion of this Department the work should be done by that branch of the public service best qualified, which is now, as in the past, the Navy. For more than sixty years the Navy has done all surveying outside of the limits of the United States, and its charts are of the best. With vessels already owned by the Navy, with trained officers and men, economy, prompt results, and good administration would seem to clearly indicate that this course should be continued. The navies of all other maritime nations have charge of their hydrographic work; there is no exception to this rule. It is the result of long years of experience, is sound in theory and practice, and constitutes in itself a safe guide for our Government.

13. The work on our own eastern and western coasts is not yet completed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, after an active existence of over seventy years, although aided in every way by the Navy. The coast line of the new possessions is longer and more difficult to survey. The Government also becomes a great gainer by the experience obtained by its officers in doing this work which would in time of war prove of untold value to the country.

14. In conclusion, I have the honor to state for your further information that the question of transfer of the hydrographic work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Navy Department has been under consideration at various periods heretofore. Reference is made to the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1882, volume 1, page 27, wherein this subject is discussed.

15. In 1894 the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Herbert, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle, after careful consideration, reached the conclusion that from every standpoint the interests of the Government demanded that the transfer should be made. A copy of a letter from Secretary Herbert to the Hon. B. A. Enloe, M. C., on the subject is appended.

Respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG,
Secretary.

Hon. J. G. CANNON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1894.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 12th, inclosing an amendment which you propose to offer to abolish the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and to provide for the transfer of the Coast Survey to the Navy Department, I have had a conference with the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury, and the amendment as he will send it to you, which is substantially that proposed, is approved by Secretary Carlisle and myself.

In my opinion the work of the Coast Survey now remaining to be done, so far as it appertains to the Coast Survey proper, can be accomplished by the Navy Department quite as thoroughly and very much more economically than it is now being done by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department is now making and engraving maps similar to those being made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the difference being that the Hydrographic Office is not permitted, by law, to make maps of the coast of the United States; its charts are of other portions of the seas, of which it publishes about 900, while the Coast Survey publishes only about 300 charts of the coasts of the United States.

This Hydrographic Office is well organized and does the work thoroughly and efficiently. About ten years since a joint commission composed of three members of the House of Representatives and three Senators made a very thorough investigation of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Hydrographic Office, the Geological Survey, and the Signal Service, and while there was a difference of opinion as to the manner in which each of these bureaus was performing the work allotted to it, the commission unanimously commended the methods of the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department.

An addition of one or more naval officers, already in the pay of the Government, by detail to the Hydrographic Office, would enable it to effectively supervise all the coast-survey work now being done by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Naval officers have heretofore done practically all the hydrographic work, the soundings, etc., for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The topography and triangulation of the shore, so far as it is necessary for the charts made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, have most of it been completed. This organization has been in existence for more than seventy years past, and it has triangulated and mapped all the coasts of the United States, except small portions of Florida on the Gulf and in Lower California.

Naval officers are fully competent to do such triangulation as is needed to complete this work, just as army officers have done the triangulation along the shores of our lakes. The charts made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey are primarily for the benefit of the mariner, and it would seem that naval officers ought to know quite as well as civilians the requisites of a good chart for the guidance of mariners. The work to be done in the future is, therefore, to be largely hydrographic, and this must be done by the Navy Department.

If this work were all intrusted to the Navy Department, which is now forbidden by law to do hydrographic work along our own shores, men-of-war, when not needed elsewhere, could make the needed soundings, and thus our sailing charts could be rapidly improved. This would greatly benefit our commerce. Naval officers now make sailing directions not only of foreign waters but they make all the sailing directions on charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

But few changes take place in the contour of the shores. Such changes there as time effects can be noted readily and at little expense. If the small amount of triangulation necessary to complete the mapping of the shores of the United States, heretofore alluded to, were completed, there would be, excluding from consideration Alaska and its coast, practically no field work along our coasts remaining to be done. It will always be necessary to take soundings over and over again by reason of the changes in the bottom of the ocean and of the streams caused by tides and currents. As this work is now being done by the Navy, though often credited to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, it would seem that the mapping and the charting of our own coasts might very well be left to the Hydrographic Office.

The passage of your amendment, and the transfer you propose would, in my opinion, result in a large saving of money to the Government.

I also suggest that, as the work and responsibility of the Hydrographic Office will be largely increased if the transfer be made, the amendment to be forwarded by the honorable Secretary of the Treasury have added to it the following: "The Chief of the Hydrographic Office shall be an officer not below the grade of commander, and he shall be entitled to the highest pay of his grade."

Very respectfully,

H. A. HERBERT,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. B. A. ENLOE,
House of Representatives.

DUPLICATION OF PUBLIC WORK IN THE OPERATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, NAVY DEPARTMENT, AND THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

THE TENDENCY TO DUPLICATION OF PUBLIC WORK IN THE OPERATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The act making appropriations for the naval service, approved March 3, 1899, authorizes the Navy to make "surveys of the imperfectly known parts of the coasts and harbors of the Philippine Archipelago, and the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, with their bordering keys and waters and minor outlying islands."

The act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government, approved March 3, 1899, provides the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Treasury Department with an appropriation "For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the survey of the coasts of the United States and of the coasts under the jurisdiction of the United States."

1. These enactments employ direct terms to authorize two separate Executive Departments of the Government to enter the same field of work. As to which of these Departments should be charged with the further prosecution of the marine hydrographic surveys of the coasts of the lately acquired insular possessions of the United States, or as to whether there should be a division of the field of work between the two, is a question of economics that Congress is called upon to decide.

2. As the undertaking is essentially ship work, its assignment to the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Treasury Department would necessitate the repair of the older vessels of the Survey, the building or purchase of new ones, and the appropriation of large sums to man them, unless the application of sections 4685, 4686, and 4687 be revived under the construction that the term "coasts of the United States," under Title LVI of the Revised Statutes, may include the coasts of Cuba and Porto Rico and their minor outlying islands, and of Guam and the Hawaiian and Philippine islands.

In House Doc. No. 12, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, "Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting estimates of appropriations required for the service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901," pages 286 and 287, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has submitted estimates of $80,000 for the repair and procurement of surveying vessels and of $182,745 for the personnel to man them, or $262,745 in all, for such purposes, above its current and annual appropriations; evidently upon the ground that the services of the Army and Navy, as provided for in the statutes just referred to, are not at present available, or else that the provisions of Title LVI of the Revised Statutes do not apply to the surveys to be executed under the appropriations that are sought.

3. On the other hand, there are strong natural and economic reasons why these coast surveys of the insular possessions should be assigned to the Navy:

(*a*) The work is mainly of a nautical character, and the Navy is a nautical body.

(*b*) The experience gained will diffuse through the naval service a knowledge of the waters surveyed, which will react as a measure of security in the navigation of the vessels of the Navy.

(*c*) The sum total of the experience of the nation in marine hydrographic surveying is lodged in the Navy, for, under the provisions of the statutes by which officers and enlisted men of the Navy have been detailed for service under the Coast Survey, practically all of the hydrographic surveys of the coasts of the United States have been executed by the Navy.

(*d*) This total of experience represents an investment on the part of the people of the United States which they are entitled to employ to their advantage.

(*e*) The Navy has ships ready to assign to the work and in sufficient number to carry the surveys forward with effective progress.

(*f*) If vessels of the naval service must continue to visit and remain at the insular possessions, upon what economic ground could they be excluded from necessary public work in these waters which may be performed by them at a small additional expense above the cost of their ordinary maintenance, but which would otherwise require relatively large expenditures from the public revenues?

4. Both of these Departments have entered upon the work of surveying the coasts of the new possessions. The Navy has two vessels engaged in making surveys in Cuba, one in the outlying islands eastward of Porto Rico, one in the Hawaiian Islands, and one at Guam, and orders have been issued for the preparation of six of the naval vessels in the Phillipine Islands to commence the surveys of these waters. The Coast and Geodetic Survey has one vessel engaged in making surveys on the south coast of Porto Rico and one in the Hawaiian Islands. Thus far no case has arisen in which vessels of the two Departments have surveyed the same ground, and there has been no actual duplication of the field work.

5. But in the construction of nautical charts by these two Departments a public evil has arisen in that the Government has been called upon to pay for duplicate sets of charts of Cuba, Porto Rico, Guam, and the Hawaiian Islands.

6. Under the provisions of sections 431 and 432 of the Revised Statutes, the Navy Department had years ago constructed and published, from the best information, charts of Cuba, Porto Rico, Guam, and the Hawaiian Islands, under the statutory authority "to cause to be prepared at the Hydrographic Office, * * * maps, charts, and nautical books relating to and required in navigation, and to publish and furnish them to navigators at the cost of printing and paper." * * *

7. It is doubtful whether the Coast and Geodetic Survey has any authority of law to construct or publish any charts excepting those resulting from its own surveys, and before March 3, 1899, its surveying operations were not authorized to be extended to the newly acquired possessions of the United States; yet in 1898 Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart No. 482, the island of Cuba, was published from Spanish surveys, which had already been made available to the Government and the people of the United States in Navy Department Chart No. 1550. In the same year, and before the Treasury Department had done any surveying in the West Indies, Coast and Geodetic Chart No. 910, the island of Porto Rico, was published in practical duplication of Navy Department Chart No. 1001, which has been on issue by the Hydrographic Office since 1887 and had the latest information incorporated into it. In the same year, and before the Treasury Department had done any surveying in the Hawaiian Islands, Coast and Geodetic Chart No. 4100, the Hawaiian Islands, was published, duplicating Navy Department Chart No. 1368 of the Hawaiian Islands, which had been issued by the Hydrographic Office since 1893; and again in 1900, and without ever having done any surveying at the island of Guam, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has republished in Chart No. 4202 the information that is represented in Navy Department Chart No. 1748, which the Hydrographic Office has been issuing since 1898.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING ALLEGED DUPLICATION OF WORK IN THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE, NAVY DEPARTMENT, IN ISSUING CHARTS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

MINNEAPOLIS, ST. PAUL AND BUFFALO STEAMSHIP CO.,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL AGENT,
Buffalo, N. Y, May 1, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 30th is received, with copies of correspondence attached, and in reply I do not hesitate to say that the work of the Hydrographic Office in preparing and publishing charts for lake use is of the greatest importance to the marine interests of the lakes, and generous appropriations should be made to continue the work.

Yours, truly,

J. C. MACLAY, *General Agent.*

Lieut. W. L. BURDICK,
1344 Prudential Building, Buffalo, N. Y.

LAKE CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 3, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Answering your favor of April 28, after consultation with the president of the Lake Carriers' Association and other prominent vessel owners who are members of the association, I would say that we should consider it a great misfortune if the surveys now made under authority of the Hydrographic Office and the charts issued by that office were discontinued. The charts heretofore issued have been valuable additions to knowledge of the lakes, and it is felt by all vessel owners and masters that the discontinuance of their issue would be a calamity.

Very respectfully, yours,

C. H. KEEP, *Secretary.*

Lieut. WILLIAM L. BURDICK,
Buffalo Hydrographic Office, Guaranty Building, Buffalo, N. Y.

The Hydrographic Office has 45 charts of the coasts and harbors of the United States and Canadian waters of the Great Lakes.

Eight of these are from original surveys made during the last ten years, under the direction of the Navy Department, by the officers of the U. S. S. *Michigan*. They represent the harbors of Erie, Cleveland, and Chicago, the Cuyahoga River, the Detroit River, Pelee Passage, and the Bass Islands, in Lake Erie.

Four are meteorological charts made from observations digested by the Hydrographic Office and representing conditions of storm, fog, and ice in their practical bearing upon navigation.

Eighteen are charts of harbors in the Canadian shores of Lake Huron, Georgian Bay, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario, made from recent surveys by the British Admiralty and the government of the Dominion of Canada. Such surveys are not published in Canada, but are sent to England for that purpose, and are thus not readily available for the benefit of American shipping unless they are published by the Navy Department.

Six are harbor charts of Milwaukee River entrance, Milwaukee harbor of refuge, Sturgeon Bay Canal entrance, Charlotte Harbor, N. Y., Grand Marais Harbor, Minn., and Grand Marais Harbor, Mich., constructed in a form suited to use in the navigation of ships, from surveys made by the engineers of the Army under the appropriations for river and harbor improvements. These results are not published by the War Department, except as illustrations in the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and they are not issued as charts for mariners by any other department of the Government besides the Hydrographic Office.

Of the remaining 9 of the 45 Hydrographic Office charts of the Great Lakes region, 6 are general charts of Lake Erie, of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, of Lake Huron, of Lake St. Clair and the St. Clair River, of Lake Michigan, and of Lake Superior. They are compiled from the results that were gathered from the operations of the United States survey of the northern and northwestern lakes in the United States waters of the Great Lakes and from the surveys carried on by the British Empire in the Canadian waters of the Great Lakes. These data have been supplemented by the data gathered by the U. S. S. *Michigan* in the investigation of reported obstructions to navigation in these waters.

Finally, there are three Hydrographic Office charts that have been made almost wholly from the publications of the office of the United States survey of the northern and northwestern lakes. They relate to the Strait of Mackinac, Green Bay, and Eagle Harbor. Those of the Strait of Mackinac and Green Bay are constructed upon the Mercator projection, which is better adapted for compass navigation than the polyconic chart of the lake survey office; and all three of them are of different limits and different scales from the lake survey charts.

The Hydrographic Office entered into the publication of navigational charts of the Great Lakes by reason of the fact that the lake survey of the United States Army Engineer Corps was completed prior to any proper survey of the Canadian shores. Their resulting charts were therefore good for navigational purposes on the American coasts only. As fast as the marine department of the Canadian government completed its surveys of the Canadian coasts of the Great Lakes, the results were utilized by the Hydrographic Office, the only office fully authorized to employ the same under the law.

Section 431, Revised Statutes, establishing the Hydrographic Office and defining its duties, states as follows:

"For the improvement of the means for navigating safely the vessels of the Navy and mercantile marine, by providing, under authority of the Secretary of the Navy, accurate and cheap nautical charts, sailing directions, navigators, and manuals of instruction for the use of all vessels of the United States, and for the benefit and use of mariners generally."

Hence it is that the publications of the Hydrograpic Office are the only complete navigating charts of these waters published by the United States, and that their use is absolutely necessary to the great and increasing commerce of the lakes is shown by the demand therefor.

On page 434 of the statement of Mr. Willis L. Moore, Chief of the Weather Bureau, before the subcommittee of the House of Representatives on the sundry civil appropriation bill, in discussing the alleged duplication of the work of the Weather Bureau by the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department, he refers to the last edition of the Pilot Chart of the Great Lakes, which was issued by the Hydrographic Office in 1897, with the essential object of presenting in a form for the convenient use of mariners of the Great Lakes the data relating to the occurrence and duration of fog that had been collected, under the direction of the Light-House Board of the Treasury Department, by the light-house keepers at the various stations on the borders of the Great Lakes, and which had remained up to that time in manuscript form in the archives of the office of the Light-House Board.

This Hydrographic Office chart showing the occurrence and duration of fog at the United States light-house stations on the Great Lakes is the last edition of the former Hydrographic Office Pilot Chart of the Great Lakes that has been issued. It was followed in October, 1897, by the first of the Weather Bureau series of Pilot Charts of the Great Lakes, which have since been issued monthly during the season of navigation by the Agricultural Department.

As regards Notices to Mariners for the Great Lakes of September, 1896, it is admitted that some of the data in the illustrations are taken from the daily weather maps, but the entire effort is directed toward imparting to the mariner on the Great Lakes such information regarding the laws of storms as relates especially to the handling of vessels, and to familiarize him with the nautical practice as it exists upon the oceans of the world.

Most of the illustrative work and all of the text is original; such data as were drawn from the Weather Bureau are duly acknowledged in the pamphlet itself.

An examination of the pamphlet must convince anyone that it is in no sense a duplication of the work performed by the Weather Bureau.

On page 436 of the testimony the Chief of the Weather Bureau takes exception to the collection of data concerning ice on the Great Lakes. The information

that the Hydrographic Office has sought to obtain in regard to ice on the Great Lakes is for use in the sailing directions for these waters, now undergoing revision in the Hydrographic Office, and for keeping up to date corresponding charts of the Great Lakes, showing on certain of them the average time of the opening and closing of navigation, these charts and sailing directions being for the use of mariners ship masters, and owners.

The weekly dissemination of such information is provided for in the weekly Notices to Mariners, which cover marine information from all parts of the world, including the Great Lakes. These notices are eagerly sought for by mariners, and in the case of the Great Lakes are mailed to all those whose names appear on the mailing lists, or are given to the mariners who call at the branch hydrographic offices. There is no publication of the Weather Bureau, so far as is known to the Navy Department, that gives the information contained in the sailing directions of the Hydrographic Office and in the charts showing the opening and closing of navigation.

Attention is called to section 431 of the Revised Statutes, establishing the Hydrographic Office and defining its duties, viz: "For the improvement of the means for navigating safely the vessels of the Navy and of the mercantile marine, by providing, under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, accurate and cheap nautical charts, sailing directions, navigators, and manuals of instruction for the use of all vessels of the United States, and for the benefit and use of mariners generally."

As regards the statement that "we felt we had secured about all the information from the data that was useful to commerce and navigation," etc., it must be remembered that the meteorology of the Pacific Ocean is very imperfectly known. The Weather Bureau has done very little in that field, and has recognized the work of the Hydrographic Office by quoting extracts from the Pilot Charts, as follows:

[From the Monthly Weather Review of March, 1899, page 114, published by the United States Weather Bureau.]

"STORM CENTERS IN THE PACIFIC.

"The Pilot Chart of the North Pacific Ocean for the month of May, 1899, contains a synoptic weather chart of the eastern portion of the North Pacific Ocean for Greenwich noon of March 7, 1898. This is one of the few cases in which a fairly satisfactory synoptic chart has been published showing the isobars and winds around a storm center in the North Pacific. The abundance of reports received by the United States Hydrographic Office will, we hope, encourage that important office to compile and publish such charts daily, for there could be no more important contribution to our knowledge of the meteorology of the ocean."

[From the Monthly Weather Review of April, 1899, page 154, published by the United States Weather Bureau.]

"PAMPEROS AND CYCLONIC STORMS.

"The Pilot Chart of the North Pacific Ocean for June, 1899, contains a short article on a cyclonic storm at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata, October 20, 1897. By collecting the reports from several vessels and land stations the author of this article has been able to draw a system of approximate isobars and winds for 10 a. m., October 20. This again illustrates the good work referred to in the Monthly Review for March, page 114, that can be done by the utilization of the great mass of material that is steadily accumulating in the archives of the national hydrographic and admiralty offices."

This is the only office in the world, so far as known, that is engaged in plotting daily synoptic charts of the North Pacific Ocean. Such data could not be drawn from the Weather Bureau nor from any other office, but is abundantly collected by the Hydrographic Office, both from the Atlantic and Pacific.

The assumption that we already know about all that can be useful of ocean meteorology is negatived by the continued activity in that field on the part of many of the government scientists of the foremost European nations.

MEMORANDUM AS TO LAKE SURVEYS.

Section 431 of the Revised Statutes requires the Hydrographic Office to publish accurate charts for the use of mariners generally. To this end, before the beginning of the publication of lake charts an examination of those published by the Army was made, and they were found to be not accurate for the use of navigators on the Great Lakes, by reason of a lack of soundings, especially along the northern shores, and certain other data that are deemed essential for purposes of navigation. It was also discovered that many obstacles and dangers to navigation existed that were not shown on these charts.

A series of lake charts were published by the Hydrographic Office, brought up to date by the development of shoals and other obstacles that had been discovered by vessels grounding thereon, and there being close communication with the Dominion of Canada hydrographic office the Navy Department was enabled to keep up to the soundings on the northern shores so far as the work had progressed. Other important changes were made rendering these charts more desirable for the use of the lake mariner. Evidence of their usefulness is shown from the fact that more than 1,000 charts are annually used on the lakes.

The matter of surveying on the part of the Navy Department has been confined almost exclusively to the development of reported dangers, and accomplishing this almost immediately after the information of such danger is reported. There being only one vessel on the lakes, the *Michigan*, she has been utilized for this purpose, at no additional expense to the Government other than the purchase of necessary material to drag for or remove bowlders or other obstructions. The Hydrographic Office has worked in conjunction with the Light-House Board to expedite all work of this character that has been reported from Ontario to Superior. There are now on file applications for the development and location of four different localities—one in Lake Ontario, two in Lake Michigan, and one in Lake Superior—with the probabilities of additional reports before the expiration of the fiscal year.

When the obstruction was reported in Ontario, instructions were issued to estimate the cost of developing the same in order that the Light-House Board might be notified and the danger buoyed. But it was found that the existing appropriation did not permit of the hiring of a tug, and therefore the Bureau of Equipment was compelled to fall back upon such work as the light-house tender could do at the convenience of the inspector of that district. This, of course, meant great delay, and as the danger lay directly in the path of vessels, it was deemed of great importance to quickly designate its position. But the appropriation not permitting it, the only thing that could be done was to notify mariners of the existence of the place.

One of the objects of the appropriation for the coming year was to be able to immediately hire a tug or small craft, with necessary help, to run out to the scene of reported trouble, definitely locate it, and report so that the Light-House Board could buoy it, and the Army remove the obstruction, if practicable—all of which was directed solely in the interest of safe navigation of the lakes. It was not intended to be a survey in the full meaning of the term, but a simple development for temporary use to safeguard passing shipping. In past years a great deal of this work has been done by the *Michigan* and the light-house tenders when they could be reached, and various sums have been expended for the purpose; but no attempt has ever been made, nor was it intended to be made, for a general survey of the lakes, or in any way conflict with the prerogative of the Engineer Corps as it now exists under the law.

But as the naval officer appreciates how important it is to quickly locate and let it be known where dangers are reported, this quick temporary work has been deemed very important, and should the present appropriations stand as acted on by the House all such efforts in the future must cease. From the information received from various points along the lakes these efforts have been greatly appreciated by the lake navigators, realizing as they did the utmost importance to them of prompt action in the premises. A casual examination of the charts published by the Navy Department and those by the Army will show any seafaring man the value of the former as compared to the latter. All the work that has been done on the lakes under the appropriation "Ocean and lake surveys" has been wholly in the interest of the mariner and in compliance with existing law. It will cost but a few thousand dollars, but may save hundreds of thousands.

CHART CONSTRUCTION IN THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE.

1. In his speech in the House of Representatives on the 19th instant, Representative CANNON stated that the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department had 1,182 charts, of which 958 were reprints of foreign charts, upon which the Hydrographic Office had simply put its stamp.

2. In general the function of this office, under sections 431 and 432 of the Revised Statutes providing for its establishment, has been the production of cheap and accurate charts of every part of the world, made especially with reference to the wants of a majority of the people who use them. The principles upon which the construction of charts has been carried forward with this object in view are as follows:

(*a*) The publication of the results of original surveys made by Americans.

(*b*) The republication, in whole or in part, on a scale to be determined by the office, of foreign surveys not republished by the British Admiralty, and which will be of service to American commerce. This republication has not generally been confined to the limits and scales of the originals, but the foreign publications have served only as data from which to compile and construct new charts suited to the needs of American navigators.

(*c*) New charts have also been compiled from those of the British Admiralty, which are always good repositories of data. These have been given proportions, scales, and a general comprehensiveness of detail suited to the peculiar needs of American commerce, of which it is the province of this office to keep informed.

(*d*) By adhering closely to the policy outlined in the preceding paragraphs the Hydrographic Office has now accumulated more than a million dollars' worth of chart plates, constituting about 1,200 nautical charts, which are kept constantly corrected from all sources of information for the issue of charts to naval and mercantile vessels. These chart plates represent the extent of progress in the operations, now about one-third completed, of constructing, for the naval and shipping interests of the United States, a complete set of navigational charts of the world.

3. Of the 1,222 charts at present issued by the Hydrographic Office 248 are constructed from marine hydrographic surveys made under the direction of the Navy Department, 294 are compiled from foreign surveys by different nationalties and from the geographical and cartographical data reported by the commanding officers of vessels in the general naval service and the information collected through the branch hydrographic offices from mariners of all nationalities, and 670 are charts that are taken from some foreign survey and made up to such an extent of the work on some individual German, French, Spanish, Italian, Austrian, Dutch, British, or Japanese chart to be characterized as a republication.

4. But of those that are characterized as republications, the originals of many of the most valuable and of nearly all of them, excepting those of British surveys, were expressed in units of measure not understood by our mariners and calculated from meridians to which they are not accustomed, and they were accompanied by sailing directions in foreign tongues not generally known to our people. It was therefore necessary to make such modifications of the charts as were requisite to reduce them to English measure and to relate them to the meridian of Greenwich, and also to translate the instructions into English, so as to adapt them to our service.

STATISTICS CONCERNING HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY WORK OF NAVAL OFFICERS.

From a list published in the Report of the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey for 1895 (pp. 461-516), giving the names of the hydrographers in charge of the survey work for 2,222 hydrographic sheets and various current and other sheets, from January, 1234, to December 31, 1895, the following information is compiled:

Naval officers in charge of parties	1,711
Civilian officers in charge of parties	823
Miscellaneous sheets	12

Of the 823 civilian parties 670 worked exclusively in rivers, bays, lakes, harbors, and generally in inland waters, leaving 153 outside surveys in all as against 1,711 in charge of naval officers.

In addition to the 1,711 sheets published by the Coast Survey, the hydrography of which is credited to naval officers, 250 of the charts issued by the Hydrographic Office are from original surveys made by naval officers, so that of the charts and sheets published by the United States (2,800), nearly 2,000 are the results of the work of the Navy and naval officers.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to request that you will have prepared and furnished me at your earliest convenience, for the information of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the legislative, etc., appropriation bill now in conference between the House and Senate, a statement showing the number of retired naval officers now employed in a civilian capacity, as clerks or otherwise, in the Hydrographic Office in Washington or in any of the branch Hydrographic offices in other cities, the salary that each of such officers receives on the retired list of the Navy, and the salary or compensation received in his civilian employment.

If retired naval officers are employed in any other offices or bureaus of the Navy Department at Washington or elsewhere in connection with the naval establishment, I respectfully request the same information as to each of such officers.

Very respectfully,
J. A. HEMENWAY,
Member of Conference Committee on part of House.

Hon. JOHN D. LONG,
Secretary of the Navy.

[First indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *April 7, 1900.*

Respectfully referred to the Bureau of Equipment and of Navigation for full report, so far as the within inquiries affect their respective bureaus, as soon as practicable.

CHAS. H. ALLEN, *Acting Secretary.*

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, *April 11, 1900.*

1. Respectfully returned to the Department via the Bureau of Navigation.

2. A report of the number of retired naval officers now employed in the capacity of civilians, as clerks or otherwise, in the Hydrographic Office and its branch offices, with the salary and retired pay of each, also other information requested, is forwarded herewith.

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1900.

SIR: 1. In compliance with the Department's first indorsement, No. 9736-2, of the 7th instant, the Bureau has the honor to report the following list of retired naval officers now employed in a civilian capacity in the Hydrographic Office in Washington and branch hydrographic offices in other cities, the salary each receives on the retired list of the Navy, and the salary received by virtue of their civilian employment.

2. The number of retired officers employed by the Hydrographic Office is 4, distributed as follows:

	Retired pay.	Salary as clerk.
Main office, Washington, D. C.:		
1 nautical expert	$1,950	$1,000
1 nautical expert	1,800	1,000
Branch office, New York, N. Y.:	1,950	
1 nautical expert		1,400
Branch office (in charge), Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.:	1,050	
1 nautical expert		1,000

The above-named officers are employed in accordance with section 1763, Revised Statutes.

3. All these nautical experts have passed the examination before the Civil Service Commission and were appointed upon its recommendation.

4. The difficulty of getting candidates to appear before the commission for this technical examination is shown by the following:

September 14, 1899, announcements were made by the Civil Service Commission, through all the leading papers of the United States, including trade and nautical or marine journals, and a copy of the notice was also given to the Associated Press and each newspaper correspondent in Washington, D. C., that an examination for nautical experts would be held by the commission on October 17, 1899.

On October 14, 4 candidates only having made application for examination under these advertisements, the examination was postponed to November 14, 1899, and the notice published throughout the United States as before. Seven applicants were received under this second notice, making 11 in all. Of these 11, 4 were retired officers, 2 graduates of the United States Naval Academy not in the service, 1 an ex-volunteer ensign, United States Navy, who served during the late Spanish-American war.

Of the 11 candidates, 7 passed the examination—4 retired officers, 2 graduates not in the service, 1 ex-officer who served in the Navy during the Spanish war.

Four civilians failed to pass the examination.

Four retired naval officers passed the technical examination, but two were rejected by the Bureau as physically disqualified for the work that would be required of them.

Two graduates of the Naval Academy, not now in the service, passed and were accepted. One, not a graduate of the Naval Academy, but had served as a volunteer officer during the Spanish war, passed and was accepted.

The other four civilians failed—all lacked the necessary technical knowledge.

Very respectfully,

R. B. BRADFORD, *Chief of Bureau.*

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE PROGRESS OF HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS OF PORTO RICO BY THE UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY; ALSO, AMOUNT OF WORK PERFORMED BY U. S. S. EAGLE AND U. S. S. YANKTON DURING THE WINTER OF 1898-99.

COMPARISON OF SURVEY WORK PERFORMED IN CUBAN AND PORTO RICAN WATERS BY THE COAST SURVEY AND BY NAVAL VESSELS, SEASON OF 1898-99.

Nautical miles involved in work on Coast Survey Chart No. 911, Ponce Harbor, Porto Rico:

Coast line of harbor	9½
Small islands	⅞
Plan of Muertos Island	4
Total	14⅛

Same for Coast Survey chart, Jobos Harbor, Porto Rico:

Coast line	26
Islands in harbor	17¾
Total	43¾

Grand total for both charts, Coast Survey coast line, 57⅞ miles.

NOTE.—If the Coast Survey has published anything regarding Porto Rico aside from the above, based on the work of that institution, the Hydrographic Office has not received it. The total amount of the coast line of the island is approximately 300 miles.

Nautical miles involved in work performed by naval surveying vessels: *Yankton* at Santiago, and *Eagle* at Guantanamo; total amount of coast line surveyed by both, 150 miles.

Comparison of number of square miles involved in above work: Square miles surveyed by naval vessels, 153; square miles surveyed by Coast Survey vessels, 92.

By actual count, the total number of soundings made by the U. S. S. *Yankton* in the survey of Santiago Harbor is 31,690.

In the report of the commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Eagle* the number of soundings made in Guantanamo Harbor is stated to be in excess of 25,000—total, 56,690.

REQUESTS FOR SURVEY OF THE COAST AND HARBORS OF CUBA.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, April 4, 1900.*

SIR: I have the honor to inclose copy of a communication from Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, commanding the United States forces in, and military governor of, the island of Cuba, who sets forth the desirablity of having the survey of the harbors of Cuba made with as little delay as possible, and, with this end in view, requesting that several more small vessels of the *Eagle* type be sent to the island for the purpose of pushing forward the work as rapidly as possible.

I beg to commend the request of General Wood to the early and favorable consideration of your Department.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of War.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

HEADQUARTERS DIVISION OF CUBA,
Habana, March 26, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to submit the following recommendation for the consideration of the Secretary of War, and, if possible, favorable action of the Secretary of the Navy.

It is extremely desirable that the survey of the harbors of Cuba should be made with as little delay as possible. With this end in view, I have the honor to request that several more small vessels of the *Eagle* type be sent to the island for the purpose of pushing forward the work as rapidly as possible.

The triangulation and general work done on the coast by these vessels will all serve to facilitate the work of the general survey of the island, which is now being arranged for.

We have very few good charts of the Cuban harbors, most of the Spanish charts being exceedingly defective and faulty. Aside from the necessity for and value of the work done by survey of the harbors, the presence of these small vessels in the different harbors has a remarkably good effect upon the people.

Very respectfully,

LEONARD WOOD,
Major-General, Military Governor.

The ADJUTANT-GENERAL U. S. A.,
Washington, D. C.

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1900.

1. Respectfully forwarded to the Bureau of Navigation.

2. In the opinion of this Bureau the recommendation of the military governor of Cuba and of the Secretary of War should be carried out.

3. There are ample funds under the appropriation "Ocean and lake surveys" to fit out for surveying purposes on the coast of Cuba as many as six small steamers of the *Eagle* type. There are laid up at navy-yards a number of vessels of about this size, well adapted for surveying purposes.

4. The *Eagle* carries about forty officers and men and has been, generally speaking, an effective surveying ship, quite as much so as the *Yankton*, with double her complement.

5. Thus far elaborate surveys of the ports of Santiago and Guantanamo have been made and charts of these ports are now practically completed. Before the season closes in Cuba surveys of the harbors of Gibara, Nuevitas, Banes, and Nipe will have been completed.

6. The statements of the military governor of Cuba in reference to the faulty charts of the Cuban coast are corroborated by information on file in the Hydrographic Office.

R. B. BRADFORD, *Chief of Bureau.*

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, April 11, 1900.*

SIR: Referring to Department's letter of the 4th instant, inclosing copy of a communication from Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, commanding the United States forces in, and military governor of, the island of Cuba, setting forth the desirability of having the survey of the harbors of Cuba made with as little delay as possible and requesting additional vessels for the purpose of pushing forward the work as rapidly as possible, I have now the honor to hand you herewith copy of a communication received from Major-General Wood on the 5th instant, embodying a memorandum on the subject from Lieut. Commander F. F. Fletcher, United States Navy, commanding the U. S. S. *Eagle*, at Habana.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT, *Secretary of War.*

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

[Memoranda for General Wood.]

U. S. EAGLE,
Habana, Cuba, March 27, 1900.

In reference to your intention of applying to Washington through the proper channels for additional force in the prosecution of the surveying work in Cuba, I have the honor to submit the following information bearing upon this subject, and to again express my belief that such an application will be of the greatest assistance to Rear-Admiral Bradford, who has charge of the work, and also has been earnestly endeavoring to get more men and more ships sent here on this duty.

Under the present law the Hydrographic Office in the Bureau of Equipment of the Navy Department has charge of the surveys of all coasts and harbors, except those of the United States coast, which is under the Coast Survey Office. At present there are three naval vessels at work: The *Yankton*, at Banes and Nipe; the *Eagle* at Nuevitas and Gibara; and the *Vixen*, recently sent to Port Padra at the request of some American capitalists who have invested here. As you are well aware, the old Spanish surveys are very incomplete and quite unsuited to the requirements of modern commerce, with large and fast steamers that must enter and leave a harbor with as little delay as possible.

I have learned that considerable capital is being invested along the northeast coast by Americans, and I have reason to believe that other capital is being held back owing to the lack of more definite information relative to the coast. I have a letter from the Munson Steamship Company who run a line of fine steamers from points along the north coast direct to New York, and are doing considerable business. The company wishes to build their own steamship wharves at Nuevitas, Gibara, and other points, and have written me for information. They also wish to establish additional lines of small vessels that will enter all the ports on the coast and connect with their larger steamers at the more important deep-water harbors.

The company is unwilling to invest their money in these wharves and improvements until more definite information is obtained as to depth of water, character of bottom, shore line, and other facts embodied in a modern plan, and hydrographic survey. This is but a single instance illustrating the importance of correct surveys of the coast in the commercial development of the country. The Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department, in recognizing this, has been endeavoring to obtain a number of converted yachts for the work, but has succeeded thus far in getting only three for Cuba. The Bureau of Personnel of the Navy Department naturally does not want to divert officers and men from duty on cruising ships to survey work unless the importance of the work is pointed out to the Secretary of the Navy by interested authority.

It is for this reason I think your request will receive the greatest consideration at the Navy Department, and give additional aid to those already working to the same end. In addition to your general request, in which attention would be called to the necessity of this work for Cuba, I would suggest that if you specified several particular localities as needing surveys, such as Manzanillo, Cardenas, Matanzas, etc., and approaches spoken of by you yesterday, it would assist those interested at the Navy Department in more readily securing prompt and definite action.

Very respectfully,

F. F. FLETCHER,
Lieutenant-Commander, U. S. N., Commanding.

Maj. Gen. LEONARD WOOD, U. S. A.,
Governor-General, Island of Cuba.

HABANA, CUBA, *March 28, 1900.*

Lieut. Commanding F. F. FLETCHER, *U. S. S. Eagle:*

Submits information showing the necessity for accurate surveys, etc., of Cuban ports and harbors.

[First indorsement.]

HEADQUARTERS DIVISION OF CUBA,
Habana, March 30, 1900.

Respectfully forwarded to the Adjutant-General of the Army, in connection with letter of March 28, 1900, on this subject.

LEONARD WOOD,
Major-General, Commanding.

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, *April 14, 1900.*

1. Respectfully forwarded to the Bureau of Navigation.
2. This Bureau has frequently represented to the Department the importance, in its opinion, of prosecuting the surveys of the Cuban coast with vigor and expedition. The Bureau believes the rapid completion of surveys of the Cuban coast to be of great political and commercial importance.
3. In this connection the Bureau desires to state that proof sheets of the new charts for Santiago and Guantanamo have already been printed.

R. B. BRADFORD,
Chief of Bureau.

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1900.

SIR: 1. Referring to the recent request of the governor of Cuba and the War Department for more rapid hydrographic surveys of the coasts of Cuba.

2. The Bureau begs to suggest the propriety of informing the War Department that the auxiliary ship *Vixen* has arrived on the coast of Cuba and commenced a survey of Port Padre Bay, Santiago district. This ship and the *Yankton* and *Eagle* will be able to accomplish a large amount of work during the winter season, and the Bureau predicts, unless the appropriations in Congress fail, that rapid progress will be made in the future.

3. Already engraved charts of Santiago Bay and Guantanamo Bay have been issued. The ports of Gibara and Banes, on the north coast, have been completed, and the data will soon be engraved. Nuevitas will be surveyed this winter, and a large part of Nipe Bay.

Very respectfully,

R. B. BRADFORD,
Chief of Bureau.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

REQUESTS FOR SURVEYS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE LIGHT-HOUSE BOARD,
Washington, February 6, 1900.

SIR: The board has the honor to inclose for your consideration, with a recommendation for favorable action, a copy of a letter from the inspector of the Ninth light-house district of 3d February, relative to a survey of Fox Island Shoal, Lake Michigan.

Respectfully,

THOS. R. PERRY,
Captain, United States Navy, Naval Secretary.

The HYDROGRAPHER OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

LIGHT-HOUSE ESTABLISHMENT,
OFFICE OF THE LIGHT-HOUSE INSPECTOR NINTH DISTRICT,
Chicago, Ill., February 3, 1900.

SIRS: I have the honor to recommend that the Navy Department be requested to survey, at as early a date as practicable after the opening of navigation, the foul ground which is to the southward of Fox Island, Lake Michigan, and called "Fox Island Shoal."

At present this shoal is marked by three buoys, two iron and one spar, and I am of the opinion that it can be more satisfactorily buoyed when accurately outlined and developed by a careful survey.

Respectfully,

F. M. SYMONDS,
Commander, United States Navy, Inspector Ninth Light-House District.

The LIGHT-HOUSE BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

BRANCH HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE,
Duluth, Minn., March 17, 1900.

SIR: 1. I have the honor to report, relating to passage between Bear and Sand islands, Apostle Group, called "Raspberry Island Passage:"

2. In 1897 shoal spots were found between these islands by the U. S. S. *Michigan*, Lieut. Commander Richard Rush, U. S. N., commanding. This survey was undertaken on account of reported shoals in the vicinity by masters of merchant vessels; the shoals were charted and the rest of this important highway considered clear of danger. In June, 1899, the steamer *Roumania* found an obstruction not far to the westward from Bear Island Shoal; again a survey was made, under the direction of Maj. C. B. Sears, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., the obstruction found and charted.

3. Reviewing the foregoing it is evident that no surveys in this vicinity have been made until a merchant vessel found an obstruction, sometimes at great expense to the owners. When this is reported the machinery of the Government is set in motion and a small spot in the vicinity is surveyed, the shoal is found and charted. Then everybody is lulled into security and things remain in statu quo till the next accident.

4. As no buoys or stakes mark the above-stated dangers, mariners are recommended to slow down while in this passage and frequently use the lead. Often the question is asked at this office, "Is the passage between Bear Island and Bear Island Shoal a safe one?" None of the charts on hand answer this question satisfactorily. From fishermen information has been received that gill nets are set in less than 4 fathoms of water between the island and shoal. It is therefore still an open question whether this passage is safe for deep-draft boats.

5. Considering the great traffic in this passage, averaging 40 to 50 boats daily (report of Light Keeper Eddy at Raspberry Island), it is of the greatest importance to marine and merchantile interests that the approaches to this passage from seaward be carefully resurveyed and charts issued on large scale showing the entire passage.

Very respectfully,

FRANK HENRICH,
Nautical Expert in Charge.

The HYDROGRAPHER,
Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

BRANCH HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE,
Duluth, Minn., March 17, 1900.

SIR: 1. I have the honor to report, referring to paragraph 4 of letter from this office, No. 21, dated the 17th instant:

2. Capt. Harry Ditzel, of the lake tug *Zenith*, informed this office, from actual experience, that continual foul ground existed between Bear Island and Bear Island Shoal.

Very respectfully,

FRANK HENRICH,
Nautical Expert in Charge.

The HYDROGRAPHER,
Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 13, 1900.

SIR: This Department has the honor to ask that the channel between Grays Reef and Vienna Shoal, northeasterly end of Lake Michigan, may be outlined by a survey to include the southern limits of Grays Reef.

This Department is informed that Grays Reef has extended to the southward by the formation of new shoals. Hence the Light-House Board has been asked to move Grays Reef light vessel to mark them, but has deferred action until the extent of the new formation has been determined.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

[First indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *April 14, 1900.*

Respectfully referred to the Bureau of Equipment for report and recommendation.

CHAS. H. ALLEN, *Acting Secretary.*

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, *April 18, 1900.*

Respectfully returned to the Department with the recommendation that the *Michigan* be directed at a convenient time to examine the locality herein referred to by the Secretary of the Treasury; the work to be done at the same time, or in connection with, the development of the South Fox Island Shoal, for which orders have already been issued to that vessel.

2. Grays Reef, being only 30 miles distant to the South Fox Island Shoal, and this channel being the highway for the large amount of shipping passing from Chicago, it is further recommended that this examination of Grays Reef be first accomplished by the *Michigan* before taking up the development of the South Fox Island Shoal and in accordance with the specifications forwarded herewith.

R. B. BRADFORD, *Chief of Bureau.*

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE, BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1900.

SIR: 1. The Hydrographic Office has in course of construction a chart of the northeastern part of Lake Ontario from Kingston to Deseronto, including the vicinity of the Charity Shoals.

2. From the information contained in the Sailing Directions, and in paragraphs 28 and 29 of Notice to Mariners, No. 1, of 1898, the accompanying diagram, showing the 15-foot shoal, the obstructions upon which the *Rosedale* grounded, and the East Charity Shoal, has been plotted with the aid of Lake Survey Chart, No. 60.

3. Evidently the discrepant character of the information referred to will not admit of assigning definite positions to these dangers, and it is desired that an examination be undertaken by the branch hydrographic office at Buffalo, with a view of reporting at an early date whether the engineers of the Army have made an investigation of the locality, and if not, what is the proper course to be taken in order to secure data for the reliable representation of these dangers upon the charts.

Respectfully,

C. C. TODD,
Commander, United States Navy, Hydrographer.

The OFFICER IN CHARGE BRANCH HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE,
Buffalo, N. Y.

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE, BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1900.

SIR: Referring to your No. 37, dated April 13, it is not necessary to confine the investigation to the triangle laid down on the chart should your information show conclusively that the 15-foot spot lies without; in fact, any figure that may be adopted that will cover all the space on existing shoals, such, for instance, as the one inclosed, either solid lines or dotted. The one point to be considered is the development of the latest danger and any others that may lie in the immediate vicinity, and the light-house inspector, in conjunction with yourself, will, I am sure, determine the best method of procedure to cover this particular locality.

Respectfully,

C. C. TODD,
Commander, United States Navy, Hydrographer.

The OFFICER IN CHARGE BRANCH HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE,
Buffalo, N. Y.

BRANCH HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE,
Buffalo, N. Y., March 9, 1900.

SIR: 1. In accordance with instructions contained in hydrographer's letter, No. 756, of February 16, 1900, received February 17, 1900, referring to the discrepant character of the information as to the location of East Charity Shoal, Lake Ontario, and directing this office to ascertain and report whether the engineers of the Army have made an investigation of the locality; and, if they have not, what is the proper course to be taken to secure data for the reliable representation of these dangers upon the charts, I have the honor to make the following report:

2. I first applied, on February 17, 1900, to the officer in charge of the United States engineer's office, Buffalo, N. Y., requesting him to "Please inform this office if there had been any recent survey or investigation of the Charity Shoals, eastern end of Lake Ontario, and to furnish this office with any data that he might have, later than that given on United States engineer's chart No. 60, corrected to January 15, 1897, relating to the Charity Shoals, especially to those known locally as East Charity Shoal and South Bar." In reply, he stated that he had no information on the matter.

On February 19, 1900, I wrote to the officer in charge, United States engineer's office, Oswego, N. Y., asking the same information; to which he replied, under date of February 20, 1900, that there was no record in that office of any survey of the neighborhood of Charity Shoals, and referred me to Lieut. Col. G. J. Lydecker, Corps of Engineers, Detroit, Mich., who, he said, has charge of the survey of the northen and northwestern lakes, and would have the latest information regarding the matter. I wrote to Lieutenant-Colonel Lydecker on February 24, 1900, requesting the same information, and, not having received a reply, again wrote him on the 5th instant. I received a reply from him on the 7th instant, dated the 6th instant, informing me that he knew of no recent survey of Charity Shoals, and that he has no later authentic information concerning them than is shown on the chart to which I referred. I inclose herewith copies of

the letters received from Lieutenant-Colonel Lydecker, and of that received from the United States engineer's office, Oswego, N. Y.

3. The inspector of the Tenth light-house district knew of the existence of East Charity Shoal, and at least one of the shoal spots has been seen from the light-house tender *Haze* on her visits to that locality, but owing to conditions of the weather and lack of time to remain in the vicinity, has never been able to obtain bearings to accurately locate the danger. His latest remarks on the subject for incorporation in the next issue of the List of Buoys, etc., of the northern lakes and rivers, are as follows: "A dangerous shoal, known locally as East Charity Shoal, is reported as lying about 1½ miles southeast of Charity Shoal. It has not been accurately located or examined, and its locality should be avoided, especially in rough weather. It is said to cover about 3 acres with 12½ feet as the least water."

4. There is, therefore, no further information as to the location of this shoal than that embodied in paragraphs 28 and 29 of Notice to Mariners for the Great Lakes, No. 1, of 1898. This information, while discrepant in character, shows that several dangerous spots probably exist.

5. In view of this danger to navigation being of considerable extent, several separate points of it being already approximately known, a survey of the locality is essential, in order that the shoal may be developed and the real dangers shown and located. As the engineers of the Army have not made this survey, and apparently have no immediate intention of doing so, it will be necessary, in order to secure the required data at an early day, that the survey should be undertaken by the Hydrographic Office.

6. The plan which I would suggest for making this survey is as follows: Upon the setting in of good weather—probably about May 15 next—a party consisting of two observers and two experienced leadsmen should be sent to Oswego or Cape Vincent, N. Y., with authority to hire a tug for the time necessary to make a survey of the locality of East Charity Shoal. I believe that in a few days of good weather a sufficient number of lines of soundings could be run to completely develop the shoal, and at a very moderate expense to the Hydrographic Office, the principal items of which would be the hire of a tug for several days and the expenses of sending a party of four to the vicinity, with probably that of building one signal, either at Bear Point, Wolfe Island, or on Grenadier Island.

7. I would gladly take charge of the work if the Hydrographic Office should so desire, and at least, this office could furnish one observer.

Very respectfully,

W. L. BURDICK,
Lieutenant, United States Navy, in Charge.

The HYDROGRAPHER,
Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

REQUESTS FOR SURVEY OF THE HARBOR OF PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

UNITED STATES NAVY-YARD, PENSACOLA,
Warrington, Fla., March 26, 1900.

SIR: 1. I respectfully request that a new survey of the entrance to Pensacola Harbor be made, so that the official charts of the locality will show the correct depth of water.

2. Chart Coast and Geodetic Survey No. 490 shows but 4 fathoms of water (24 feet), when an examination of the channel and approaches made by Lieut. Commander M. L. Wood, U. S. N., by my direction, on the 25th instant, in consequence of a telegram from Rear-Admiral N. H. Farquhar, U. S. N., commanding North Atlantic Squadron, gave a least depth of 31 feet in the entrance and approaches to Pensacola Harbor.

3. I respectfully suggest that these important changes in the hydrography would warrant the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in making a hydrographic examination of the entrance and approaches immediately, and, as soon as practicable, a complete resurvey of the entrance and harbor.

Very respectfully,

WM. W. REISINGER,
Commander, United States Navy, Commandant.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C.

[First indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *March 28, 1900.*

Respectfully referred to the Bureau of Equipment for comment and recommendation.

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, *March 29, 1900.*

1. Respectfully returned to the Department.

2. It is recommended that this request be referred by the Department to the Treasury Department, the survey of the coast of the United States being by law assigned to the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

3. The Chief of Bureau, while in command of the *Montgomery*, during the summer of 1897, was very familiar with the harbor at Pensacola. The aids to navigation and the charts were then defective for purposes of navigation. In order to be independent of pilots, the commanding officer himself made a running survey with the steam launch in order to pilot the ship safely to sea. From his experience the Chief of Bureau confirms the statements made by the commandant of the Pensacola Navy-Yard and coincides with his recommendation.

R. B. BRADFORD, *Chief of Bureau.*

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of a letter from the commandant of the navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla., with the indorsement thereon by the Chief of Bureau of Equipment of this Department relating to the desirability of making a hydrographic examination of the entrance and approaches of the Pensacola Harbor immediately, and, as soon as practicable, a complete resurvey of the entrance and harbor.

In view of the statements of the commandant and the Chief of the Bureau of Equipment, I have the honor to request that the superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey may be instructed to make hydrographic examination and resurvey recommended.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 30, requesting the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to make a hydrographic examination of the entrance and approaches to Pensacola Harbor, as well as a complete resurvey of the entrance.

You are doubtless aware that for some years dredging has been going on at Pensacola for the purpose of increasing the depth of the channel, and the difference between the showing on the chart and the actual condition of affairs is, of course, due to that fact, as well as to the natural changes which have taken place. In consequence of the artificial channel changes the Superintendent has placed himself in communication with the Chief of Engineers, and will be prepared to act in accordance with your request as soon as the circumstances connected with the dredging have been communicated to him.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

U. S. FLAGSHIP NEW YORK, FIRST RATE,
Lat. 30° 04′ N.; Long. 87° 10′ W. At Sea, April 4, 1900.

SIR: 1. I have the honor herewith to inform the Department that I arrived with the squadron under my command at the anchorage off naval station, Warrington, Fla., on the 30th ultimo and remained there until the morning of this date, when departure was taken for Bermuda.

2. Official calls were exchanged with the commandant of the station, with the commanding officer of the army post, and with the Italian consular agent.

3. When not engaged in coaling, the vessels of the squadron were open to the visiting public, many hundreds of whom availed themselves of the opportunity.

4. Now that the channel across the bar at the entrance to Pensacola Bay has been deepened, so as to permit deep-draft vessels crossing without risk, this fine, large bay becomes admirably adapted as a drill ground for the North Atlantic Squadron during the spring months of March and April, when the average temperature is suitable for open-air drills and exercises.

5. I desire to call the attention of the Department to the fact that, although the work of dredging Caucas Channel and its approaches to a depth of 31 feet was finished in December, 1899, no notification has been furnished the squadron of this important change; all the latest aids to navigation provided refer to conditions as they existed previous to the dredging operations.

6. Myself and officers of the squadron, during the stay in port, were very hospitably entertained by the commandant of the station and by citizens of Pensacola.

7. The navy-yard is in most excellent order, showing ceaseless energy and careful supervision of its commandant. Coal was supplied to the vessels of the squadron most expeditiously, although the means furnished are limited.

Very respectfully,

N. H. FARQUHAR,
Rear-Admiral, Commander in Chief U. S. Naval Force on North Atlantic Station.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

[First indorsement.]

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION, *April 19, 1900.*

Respectfully referred to the Bureau of Equipment for its information and return.

A. S. CROWNINSHIELD, *Chief of Bureau.*

[Second indorsement.]

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, *April 21, 1900.*

1. Respectfully returned to the Bureau of Navigation.

2. Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart No. 490, entrance to Pensacola Bay, published January 17, 1900, and marked in the Coast Survey Office corrected to February 10, 1900, shows the same depth of water in Caucas Channel as the chart issued by the Coast Survey May 7, 1898, and marked as having been corrected May 12, 1898. The least depth of water as shown on both these charts in the channel is 4 fathoms. The information relative to the deepening of Caucas Channel was received from Lieut. Commander C. C. Rogers, U. S. N., navigator of the *New York*, on the 11th instant and published in the first succeeding Notice to Mariners, No. 16, which was issued on the 20th instant.

3. No information in regard to an increased depth of water in this channel has been received by the Bureau or the Hydrographic Office from either the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

4. The Bureau has suggested to the Department that a request be made on the Treasury Department for a resurvey of this locality.

R. B. BRADFORD, *Chief of Bureau.*

U. S. FLAGSHIP NEW YORK,
At Sea, Lat. 30° 04′ N., Long. 87° 10′ W., April 4, 1900.

SIR: 1. I respectfully submit, for the information of the Hydrographic Office, the following report of depths found to-day in leaving Pensacola Harbor. This report is additional to that of yesterday about changes in the entrance to that harbor.

2. When the rear light of the Barrancas range was open to the westward of the front one, the ship was heading S. by W. ¼ W. magnetic. On this course depths of 7 to 7½ fathoms were obtained. In rounding to bring the ship on the Caucus range, course SSE., magnetic, the depths were still found. While on this range, black can buoy No. 5, opposite the middle ground, was kept nearly ahead and was passed close aboard, because of the current which was setting across the channel to the eastward. Depths of 7, 6, and 5 fathoms were found, shallowing as the buoy was approached. Soundings of 5 fathoms were obtained outside of Caucus Channel also. At that time the axis of the ship was virtually in that of the channel, and 31 feet was probably the depth under the keel, for the soundings appear to confirm the statements of Mr. Turtle, the supervising engineer.

3. The deepest water is now on the Fort McKee side of the channel. Lieut. Commander M. L. Wood confirms the statements of the engineer and of the pilots in this respect; he made an examination of the channel prior to the arrival of the squadron to ascertain personally the depths. He says that the 7½-fathom areas, opposite the Middle Ground, have shallowed very much, and that deep-draft vessels would go aground if, after passing upper black can buoy No. 5, the courses given in the sailing directions were steered. A new survey is needed very much.

Very respectfully,

CHARLES C. ROGERS,
Lieutenant-Commander, Navigator.

The COMMANDING OFFICER.

[First indorsement.]

U. S. FLAGSHIP NEW YORK.
At Sea, Lat. 30° 04′ N., Long. 87° 10′ W., April 4, 1900.

1. Approved and respectfully forwarded to the Bureau of Equipment, Hydrographic Office.

A. S. SNOW,
Captain, United States Navy, Commanding.

[Second indorsement.]

U. S. FLAGSHIP NEW YORK,
At Sea, Lat. 30° 04′ N., Long. 87° 10′ W., April 4, 1900.

Forwarded by direction of commander in chief.

W. A. MARSHALL,
Lieutenant-Commander, United States Navy, Aid.

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1900.

SIR: 1. In a letter from the navigating officer of the flagship *New York*, dated April 4, 1900, duly approved and forwarded by the commanding officer and the commander in chief, North Atlantic Station, occurs the statement that a new survey of the entrance to the harbor of Pensacola, Fla., is very much needed.

2. The Bureau, therefore, recommends that the Department request of the Treasury Department that this survey may be made by the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which, by law, is charged with the survey of the coast of the United States.

Very respectfully,

R. B. BRADFORD,
Chief of Bureau.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

FOREIGN SURVEY SYSTEMS.

[Extracts from the Government publication Facts Regarding the Principal Government Surveys of the World, by Capt. George M. Wheeler, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, 1885.]

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE BRITISH SERVICE FOR HELPING NAVIGATION—FOREIGN SURVEY SYSTEMS.

Great Britain (hydrographic).—The hydrographic office of Great Britain is attached to the Admiralty, being under the direction of its first lord, and presided over by the hydrographer of the navy, who was (1882) Capt. F. J. O. Evans, royal navy. This officer is aided by ten assistants (naval officers), two others (civilians), and six draftsmen.

The jurisdiction of this service covers colonial and foreign coasts. The foreign surveys are carried out exclusively by vessels especially assigned and receiving instructions from the hydrographer.

The ruling idea is to publish accurate charts best suited for the use of the navigator.

The functions of the hydrographic department are various as well as numerous. The most important are to execute accurate surveys of all parts of the world which are visited by British ships, whether of war or commerce, and to prepare and publish these surveys in the form of charts; to write and publish nautical directions to accompany the charts; to compute, prepare, and publish annually tide tables and light lists for all parts of the world; to receive and take charge of all remark books from the captains and navigating officers of Her Majesty's ships, as well as information from all other nautical sources, home or foreign; to compile such information and publish it promptly in the form of hydrographic notices, of warnings of danger, in order that all charts and other nautical documents may be kept corrected up to the latest period.

All charts issued refer to the meridian of Greenwich and are on the Mercator projection.

Germany.—Accurate and detailed surveys of the entire German seacoast are made wholly by the hydrographic bureau. The chief of the admiralty has supreme direction and can arrange the interior organization of the service as he deems best.

There is no special class of officers for survey work. They are taken from the general-duty officers of the line of the navy.

France.—The central and only office for hydrographic surveys is at Paris, and is known as the general direction of hydrographic services. It is in charge of an admiral who has the title of directeur-general des services hydrographiques de la marine.

In the French navy there is no separate service for the survey of the coast.

Italy.—The hydrographic office of the royal navy was founded by a royal decree in 1874. It is established in Genoa, is in charge of a captain in the navy, under the immediate direction of the minister of marine in regard to everything relating to the hydrographic service and the other functions of the office.

The duty of making surveys of the coast of the Kingdom of Italy is the exclusive function of this establishment.

Sweden.—The hydrographic office of Sweden is under the navy department. Its duties are as follows: Hydrographic surveys of the coast, the lakes open to navigation, soundings, and general exploration of the waters surrounding the country, the publication of charts and descriptions of coast, channels, etc.

The office is wholly naval, the work of surveying being done by naval officers. The men for surveying work are taken from the general duty officers of the line, there being no special class for navigating and surveying purposes.

Denmark.—The hydrographic work in Denmark is wholly naval. Two vessels were employed in 1882 on surveying duty on the adjacent coasts, the work being carried on by officers taken from the general line of the service. There is no special surveying class in the Danish navy.

The present operations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey were founded upon a reorganization plan formulated and approved in 1843 by a board composed of a superintendent and two assistants, with two naval officers and four army officers. The functions of this organization are set forth in sections 4681–4684, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes. Section 4684 contains these words: "The officers of the Navy to be employed on the hydrographic parts and the officers of the Army on the topographical parts of the work."

Section 4681 is "The President is authorized to cause a survey to be taken of the coasts of the United States in which shall be designated the islands and shoals, with roads or places of anchorage within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States; and also the respective courses and distances between the principal capes and headlands, together with such other matters as he may deem proper for completing an accurate chart of every part of the coast."

The subsequent extension of the temporary jurisdiction of this work through the appropriation acts may be briefly summarized as follows:

Investigations into the characteristics of the Gulf Stream, involving temperatures, deep-sea soundings, and sea-current observations, were authorized and appropriated for March 3, 1853. The effect of the above was to authorize the publication of "sailing" or offshore charts.

The survey of Lake Champlain was appropriated for July 15, 1870.

In an appropriation act approved March 3, 1871, authority was granted to make a geodetic connection between the belts of triangulation of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and the vicinity of the thirty-ninth parallel north latitude was selected for that purpose, while the use of the word "Geodetic" as a part of the title of the Survey first appears in the appropriation act of 1878.

The above act also granted, pursuant to appropriation, the authority to "determine points in each State of the Union which shall make requisite provision for its own topographic and geologic surveys," and also authorized a "development of dangers of ocean navigation" between San Diego, Cal., and Panama.

Deep-sea operations throughout the Gulf of Mexico and to an indefinite extent in the Pacific Ocean were appropriated for March 3, 1875.

The survey of rivers to the head of ship navigation or tidal influences appears in the appropriation act of June 20, 1878. This act also extended the work to include deep-sea dredging for animal forms, and widened the field of operations to include a part of the Caribbean Sea.

In the appropriation act of March 3, 1879, the title "Coast and Geodetic Survey" first appears, which is also borne on the annual report for 1878. This act embraces a still wider field of operations for all classes of deep-sea works, including the whole Carribean Sea, and also the whole Sargossa Sea, in mid-Atlantic Ocean.

That up to the year 1858, at least, this work had been looked upon as temporary is evidenced by the following from a letter of December 28, 1857, by the Superintendent to the Secretary of the Treasury (see Senate Ex. Doc. No. 6, Thirty-fifth Congress, second session), wherein Professor Bache says:

"17. In determining the scale and mode of executing the coast survey, it should be considered that the work is a temporary one, having a limited object, the surveying of a definite extent of coast."

The following appears in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury in the Senate (1851):

"Nor is this increase like that of an appropriation for a branch of service which must always have an existence, since it decreases the time during which the survey will last."

As above stated, however, other objects have been added in the appropriation bills.

The yearly progress is noted in each annual report of operations. Special reference to a summarized progress is as follows (see Senate Ex. Doc. No. 6, Thirty-fifth Congres, third session, December 28, 1858):

2. "Taking all the operations into consideration, the Atlantic sections are more than half done, the Gulf sections are more than one-third done, and both can, at present rate of appropriation, be completed in from ten to twelve years by close economy and thorough efficiency of arrangements." Since then the survey of the Pacific and Alaskan coasts has been taken up, and also the transcontinental triangulation.

On December 15, 1884, the superintendent testified to the condition of progress of the survey of the coasts before the Joint Congressional Commission as follows (see pages 135–137 and 140): "On the Atlantic and Gulf coasts the survey is about nine-tenths completed." "The changes which take place in the shores and channels, mainly from natural and partly from artificial causes, render resurveys necessary from time to time in different places in order to keep the charts and sailing directions up to date." "The work of the coast survey proper on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts requires four years to make the surveys continuous at the present (last year's) rate of appropriations."

"The survey of the Pacific coast between San Diego (the Mexican boundary) and Fuca Straits, with Puget Sound, is about three-fifths done, and the publication of charts, sailing directions, and tide tables is proportionately advanced. The same considerations in regard to future resurveys obtain here equally as on the Atlantic coast. I estimate the time required (for completion) to be about nine years at present (last year's) rate of appropriation."

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE BRITISH SERVICE FOR HELPING NAVIGATION.

In the National Geographic Magazine for April, 1900, there is a short article entitled "Helping navigation," in which the surveying service of the British Admiralty is referred to in such a manner as to convey the impression that it is a civil service. Since the magazine is widely read as the publication of a numerous society composed of members distinguished for accuracy of mind and for a desire to be correctly informed, a further reference to this eminently successful branch of the royal navy of Great Britain is assured of welcome, especially as its stupendous activities have contributed for generations past to the guidance not only of our commerce, but, in a preponderating degree, to to the oversea commerce of the whole world. It is true that this surveying service, like all other institutions of Anglo-Saxon government, is under civil administration in the same degree as all other branches of the British naval service.

The British Admiralty is an institution for the civil administration of the British navy just as the Navy Department of the United States is an executive department of the Government organized for the civil administration of the United States Navy. The hydrographic office of the Admiralty, like all its other departments, is a civil office, whose director and principal subordinates are civil-salaried officials; but the marine hydrographic surveying which Great Britain conducts on the coasts of the United Kingdom and of the colonies of the Empire and in many other parts of the world, and which is administered by this hydrographic office, is a part of the naval service and is carried on almost altogether by officers and seamen of the royal navy borne upon the pay rolls of those of Her Majesty's naval vessels that are fitted and set apart for this sole duty.

The organization of the surveying force at the present time will be clearly comprehended from the following transcripts from the British naval list for 1899:

Waterwitch (late *Lancashire Witch*); surveying vessel; 620 tons; I. H. P., 450; surveying service on China station; commander, Willoughby P. Dawson; lieutenants, Stewart C. Weigall (N.) Hugh G. C. Somerville, Bishop O. M. Davy, Hugh B. Meiklejohn; surgeon, Edward C, Cridland, M. B.; assistant paymaster in charge, Philip Le H. de la Garde; boatswain, Samuel Baker. Recommissioned at Sydney, April 21, 1897.

Dart; screw surveying vessel; 470 tons: I. H. P., 250; employed on surveying service; lieutenant and commander, John F. Parry; lieutenants, Harold W. H. Helby, N. Francis May, Courtenay E. Stainer; surgeon, Albert O. Bobardt, M. B.; assistant paymaster in charge, Beauchamp U. Colclough; engineer, Arthur Oliver; boatswain, Frederick G. Beabey. Recommissioned at Sydney, April 30, 1898.

Penguin, screw surveying vessel, 1,130 tons, I. H. P. 700; commander, James W. Combe; lieutenant, Frederick C. C. Pasco, (N) Robert W. Glennie, Charles R. W. Brewis, Irving B. Miles; staff surgeon, Edward C. Ward, M. D.; paymaster, ——; sublieutenants, Leonard R. Greene, John D. Nares; engineer, Edward J. Weeks; boatswain, William J. Manicom. Recommissioned at Sydney, April 1, 1899.

Research P., surveying vessel, 520 tons, I. H. P. 450; Portsmouth, surveying service; captain, William U. Moore; (N) Ernest C. Hardy, Claude P. Buckle, Gathorne Cookson; sublieutenant, Harold D. Warburg; surgeon, Walter H. O. Garde (lent from *Victory*); assistant paymaster in charge, Harry G. Ley; engineer, Frederick Pring; clerk. The following officers are borne as additional for charge of west coast of England survey: Staff captain, William F. Maxwell; staff commander, Thomas C. Pascoe. Recommissioned at Portsmouth January 1, 1895.

Stork, screw surveying vessel, 465 tons, I. H. P. 360; surveying service; commander. Herbert J. Gedge (in lieu of a lieutenant in command); lieutenant, Alfred E. H. Marescaux, Ernest A. Constable, John R. Lay, Henry P. Douglas; paymaster, Ernest St. G. Alton; surgeon, John A. L. Campbell; engineer, Charles V. Eyre; boatswain, James Riley. Recommissioned at Malta March 2, 1897.

Rambler 2, screw surveying vessel, 835 tons, I. H. P. 650; surveying service; commander, Herbert E. P. Cust; lieutenant, Charles E. Monro; (N) Edwin A. Day, Lewis D. Penfold; lieutenant, William J. G. O'Farrell; sublieutenant, Henry J. G. Lawrence, Richard Horne; paymaster, Gerald L. Clarke; surgeon, Henry E. Tomlinson; engineer, Gilbert Nicolson; boatswain, Charles Cook. Recommissioned at Bermuda December 3, 1897.

Egeria 4, screw surveying vessel, 940 tons, I. H. P. 700; surveying service; commander, Morris H. Smyth; lieutenant, Henry B. T. Somerville; (N) Frederick C. Learmonth, Frederick H. Walter, Ferris N. Grant, Geoffrey B. S. Simson, Horace C. Watson; paymaster, Robert F. C. Eames; surgeon, James Bradley, M. D.; engineer, Edward J. Campbell; boatswain, James McGeachy. Commissioned at Sheerness January 14, 1897.

Triton P., surveying vessel, 410 tons, I. H. P. 350; surveying service; captain, George R. Richards; lieutenants, William O. Lyne, William F. Thorp, William T. P. Wilson; staff commander, Lucas G. Stovin; surgeon, James G. Watt; boatswain (lent from *Wildfire*). The following officer is borne as additional for survey of Plymouth Sound, staff commander, Frank Haslewood. Recommissioned at Sheerness January 1, 1898.

The number of royal navy officers of all ranks employed in the several vessels named amounts to 74, of whom 52 are surveying officers and the remaining 22 staff officers, such as surgeons, paymasters and engineers. The number of seamen of the royal navy serving in these vessels is about 640.

The yearly grants of money for the prosecution of the British marine hydrographic surveys include provision for the hire of vessels, other than those borne upon the navy list, for surveying purposes; and during recent years 3 hired steam vessels have been engaged in the examination and charting of the seas and coasts in various parts of the globe, in addition to H. M. surveying vessels. Of late the surveys made in the hired surveying vessels have been carried on by experienced master mariners.

MEMORANDUM OF THE PERSONNEL OF THE COAST SURVEY—ROSTER OF OFFICERS ATTACHED THERETO.

President Cleveland's first annual message to Congress December 8, 1885 (Forty-eighth Congress, first session), contained the following:

"This service (the Coast and Geodetic Survey) has never been regulated by anything but the most indefinite legal enactments and the most unsatisfactory rules. It was many years ago sanctioned, apparently for a purpose regarded as temporary and related to a survey of our coast. Having gained a place in the appropriations made by Congress, it has gradually taken to itself powers and objects not contemplated in its creation and extending its operations until it sadly needs legislative attention."

In the fourteen years which have passed since the above was written the legal enactments affecting the Coast Survey have been even more indefinite than before, and have served as a cover for the extension of operations and enlargements of its powers far beyond the limits existing at the time of President Cleveland's denunciation of its methods.

No legislative enactment whatever gave authority to the Coast Survey to issue a chart of the island of Porto Rico in October, 1898, months before the signing of the treaty of peace with Spain.

This chart was an exact reproduction of the Hydrographic Office chart No. 1001, and its issue could serve no other purpose than an unlawful extension of the operation of the Coast Survey.

The extensive programme of operations laid down in the special report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, contained in Senate Doc. No. 120 of the present Congress, has already been inaugurated without further legislative warrant than that contained in a subtitle of the sundry civil bill of 1899. No limitation of operation or powers is expressed or implied; no estimate of the ultimate cost was submitted or considered, and no consultation with other branches of the Government was sought or permitted.

The full commitment of the Government to the completion of the entire programme awaits only the authorization of the establishment of a suboffice of the Coast Survey in Manila, which authorization is to be secured by "a small addition to the present estimate" recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury in his letter transmitting the above-mentioned report of the Secretary. (Since established.)

An item of the same sundry civil bill contained in four lines of the Congressional Record has been sufficient authority for this service to set aside the existing laws, and

(1) To organize a graded corps of officers for service in the vessels of the Coast Survey and clothe it in a military uniform. The solecism of prescribing shoulder knots and omitting the sword with dress uniform does not disprove the fact that the uniform prescribed for these civilian employees and "professional seamen" is a military uniform.

(2) And to attempt to place these civil officers without authority in military command over petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy.

(3) And to assign as commanding officers of these vessels landsmen not qualified or licensed to have charge of vessels at sea.

The following is a list of the employes of the Coast and Geodetic Servey termed "officers" by the Superintendent thereof:

Roster of officers of United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Henry S. Pritchett, Superintendent.

ASSISTANTS.

Baur, L. A.	Granger, F. D.	Preston, F. D.
Baylor, J. B.	Hayford, J. F.	Rodgers, A. F.
Bradford, G.	Hodgkins, W. C.	Schott, C. A.
Braid, A.	Marindin, H. L.	Sinclair, C. H.
Dickens, E. F.	Morse, F.	Tittmann, O. H.
Duffield, W. W.	Mosman, A. T.	Wainwright, D. B.
Eimbeck, W.	Nelson, J.	Welker, P. A.
Ferguson, O. W.	Odgen, H. G.	Winston, L.
Forney, S.	Perkins, F. W.	
Gilbert, J. J.	Pratt, J. F.	

JUNIOR ASSISTANTS.

Boutelle, J. B.	Flynn, H. F.	Ritter, H. P.
Bowie, W.	French, O. B.	Smith, E.
Edmonds, F. W.	Lathan, E. B.	Vinal, W. I.
Fairfield, W. B.	Little, F. M.	Westdahl, F.
Faris, R. L.	McCrath, J. E.	Yates, C. C.
Flower, G. L.	Putnam, G. R.	Young, F. A.

AIDS.

Denson, H. C.	Frisby, E. R.	Tilton, B. E.
Derrickson, R. B.	Rhodes, H. W.	Weld, F. F.

JUNIOR AIDS.

Brundage, F. H.	Mitchell, H. C.	Severs, R.
Burger, W. H.	Noble, C. W.	Sourinne, V.
Fleming, J. A.	Phelps, G. S.	

ACTING AIDS.

Crist, F. G.	Sanger, W.	Vieth, E.

ACTING JUNIOR AIDS.

Deichman, C. F.	Roeth, A. C. L.	Westdahl, L. H.
Earle, S.	Wainwright, D. B., jr.	

FIRST WATCH OFFICERS.

Ainsworth, F. H.	Glover, W. P.	O'Malley, W. A.
Crowley, B. J.	Green, C. L.	Thomas, G. F.
Dow, J. C.	Lyle, V. R.	

OTHER WATCH OFFICERS.

Appleton, W. G.	Fitzgerald, C. W.	Moser, R. McD.
Atkinson, W. M.	Furman, L. M.	Olsen, G.
Dunn, J. L.	Lewis, G. S.	Proctor, W. B.
Dutton, A. H.	McGrath, J. H.	Thompson, C. A.

ENGINEERS.

Ely, H.	Goldsborough, J. T.	Sullivan, J.
Flannery, M. F.	Hopkins, L. McG.	

SURGEONS.

Diggins, E. A.	Markoe, W. W.	Shepherd, J. E.
Hawkes, R. H.	Murphy, J. J.	Ulrich, J. H.
Marchand, G. E.		

DRAFTSMEN.

Bauman, W.	Nespital, W. C. F.	Pfau, J. S.

RECORDERS.

Barron, C. D.	Giacomini, A. F.	McGregor, J. A.

Among the names of the 20 watch officers contained in this "Roster" 17 appear upon the records of the Navy Department.

Nine of these held volunteer commissions during the war with Spain. Nothing in their letters of application, examinations, or reports of fitness indicate that they are qualified for the position of hydrographic surveyors, and their ages, averaging over 37 years, militate against their usefulness as such. It is safe to say that if they were in the Navy now they would not be regarded as qualified for the duty of hydrographic surveying.

The eight other names appear on the muster rolls of the Navy, and most of these men are well known to officers of the Navy who have served on the Coast Survey vessels in the last ten years. These men, whose average age is 35 years, were recorders, draftsmen, and clerks, and borne on the Navy rolls as petty officers. Their work, which was done under the direct supervision of naval officers, never included any duty pertaining to taking charge of the deck or of boat surveys, or to the command of seamen.

Notwithstanding an item of the last sundry civil bill reads "for the pay and subsistence of professional seamen acting as executive officers and mate," six of these "first watch officers" and "other watch officers," as they are designated on the roster of officers of the Coast Survey, are borne on the rolls of the Navy as enlisted men and paid from the "pay of the Navy."

Upon these twenty "professional seamen" devolves the execution of the hydrographic surveys which are outlined in the report of the Superintendent as extending from Porto Rico to the Philippines and from Tutuila to Cape Nome.

Previous to the Spanish-American war the accuracy of all charts issued by the Coast and Geodetic Survey for maritime purposes was vouched for by the Hydrographic Inspector of the Coast Survey, an officer of the Navy. These charts also bore the names of the surveyors, which, in most instances, were naval officers. Recently, however, the charts issued by the Coast and Geodetic Survey bear the name only of the Superintendent, who is neither a seaman nor surveyor.

The value of a chart depends upon the reliability of the survey from which it is made. Under the present régime of the Coast Survey the surveys for charts issued are made by employees who are without experience in the performance of their duties, and who hold their positions by the favor of a bureau. The average length of service of the chief of this bureau is about four years. Such charts can never command the confidence of naval officers or the maritime world.

Comparative statement of salaries in the Hydrographic Office, Navy Department, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Treasury Department, 1899.

Hydrographic Office	$110,785
Coast and Geodetic Survey	243,435

BRIEF COMPARISON OF WORK DONE BY THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE AND THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY SINCE JANUARY 1, 1900.

The Hydrographic Office has published 35 new charts.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has published 5 new charts, 3 of which are not considered suitable to furnish United States vessels, namely, one of Guam, and two covering the Pacific coast of the United States between San Diego and Puget Sound.

Comparative statement of salaries paid in the Hydrographic Office and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Hydrographic Office	$110,785
Coast and Geodetic Survey	243,435

Salaries in Hydrographic Office, Navy Department, including all allowances.

Commander C. C. Todd, U. S. N	$3,900
Commander J. D. Adams, U. S. N	3,900
Lieut. Commander C. Thomas, U. S. N	3,551
Lieut. Commander C. Laird, U. S. N	3,551
Lieut. F. W. Kellogg, U. S. N	2,574
G. W. Littlehales	2,500
Boynton Leach	2,000
G. Herrle	2,000
C. E. Birch	2,000
R. L. Lerch	1,800
J. A. Waddey	1,800
V. L. Ourdan	1,700
J. S. Stodder	1,600
Jas. Page	1,600
J. T. McMillan	1,600
W. M. Whiting	1,600
H. G. Brewer	1,600
E. E. Court	1,600
W. M. Dougal	1,600
A. C. Ruebsan	1,600
Max Franke	1,600
C. P. Bolles	1,500
Gregor Noetzel	1,500
W. Klakring	1,500
W. P. Sefton	1,500
R. F. Barnes	1,440
L. F. von Wimpffen	1,400
H. P. Simpson	1,400
J. L. Hazzard	1,400
S. Olive Jones	1,400
J. S. Latimer	1,300
Thomas Devine	1,300
C. O. Paullin	1,200
J. W. Stearns	1,200
W. E. Greave	1,200
L. S. Doten	1,200
J. D. Cleary	1,200
—— Howd	1,200
—— Roberts	1,200
R. E. Gray	1,200
R. A. Daniel	1,200
A. Cleeves	1,200
Annie C. Vogel	1,200
E. O. Cresap	1,200
Mrs. N. H. Crocker	1,200
C. C. Wells	1,200
C. M. McCarteney	1,000
H. L. Peckham	1,000

Salaries in Hydrographic Office, etc.—Continued.

A. B. McManus	$1,000
E. S. Jacob	1,000
H. L. Palmer	1,000
J. H. Carnes	1,000
Willett Lehew	1,000
H. H. McKeever	1,000
R. W. Johnson	1,000
M. W. Fernandez	1,000
J. W. Froley	1,000
J. B. Altman	960
H. D. Ruddiman	900
R. F. O'Donoghue	900
Eliza A. Scott	900
Martha M. Smith	900
D. P. Swope	800
J. C. Forrest	800
T. S. Parham	800
C. G. Dougherty	800
Frederic Ely	800
Walter Scott	800
F. H. Baltimore	720
A. L. Brown	720
W. H. Wilson	720
Anthony Twynan	720
L. B. Diggins	700
J. H. Jacobs	700
W. R. Johnson	700
J. N. Mayne	660
John Dixon	660
J. H. Williamson	660
N. M. Snowden	660
H. D. Alder	660
Mrs. E. V. Smith	626
Smith Thompson	500
Cornelius Jenkins	500
Frank Scott	480
W. L. Cunningham	480
George Markward	470
E. H. Schofield	360
J. E. Boyle	313
A. P. Blair	300
Total	110,785

Salaries in Coast and Geodetic Survey, Treasury Department, not including allowances for subsistence.

H. S. Pritchett	$5,000
C. A. Schott	4,000
A. F. Rodgers	4,000
O. H. Tittmann	3,200
Andrew Braid	3,000
A. T. Masman	3,000
G. G. Ogden	3,000
W. W. Duffield	3,000
W. Eimbeck	2,500
E. D. Preston	2,500
C. H. Sinclair	2,500
F. D. Granger	2,500
L. A. Bauer	2,500
E. H. Fowler	2,400
J. F. Hayford	2,400
J. J. Gilbert	2,200
H. L. Marindin	2,200
F. W. Perkins	2,200
J. F. Pratt	2,200
E. F. Dickins	2,200
D. B. Wainwright	2,200
Isaac Winston	2,200
W. C. Hodgkins	2,200
H. Lindenkohl	2,200
Scott Nesbit	2,200
J. B. Baylor	2,000
J. A. Flemer	2,000
S. Forney	2,000
P. A. Welker	2,000
John Nelson	2,000
Fremont Morse	2,000
Gershom Bradford	2,000
A. Lindenkohl	2,000
W. C. Willenbucher	2,000
E. H. Courtenay	2,000
M. H. Doolittle	2,000
W. A. Thompson	2,000
H. M. Knight	2,000
T. Wasserbach	2,000
O. W. Ferguson	2,000
E. L. Burchard	1,800
E. J. Sommer	1,800
F. C. Donn	1,800
D. M. Hildreth	1,800
L. P. Shidy	1,800
W. H. Davis	1,800
E. H. Sipe	1,800
E. G. Fischer	1,800
L. P. Keyer	1,800
W. B. Fairfield	1,800
W. I. Vinal	1,800
G. R. Putnam	1,800
W. B. Chilton	1,650
N. G. Henry	1,650
Ferdinand Westdahl	1,600
F. A. Young	1,600
H. P. Ritter	1,600
J. B. Boutelle	1,600
F. M. Little	1,600
D. L. Hazzard	1,600
R. A. Harris	1,600
A. L. Baldwin	1,600
W. F. Peabody	1,600
H. L. Thompson	1,600
D. N. Hoover	1,600

Salaries in Coast and Geodetic Survey, etc.—Continued.

L. A. Fischer	$1,500
F. A. Wolff	1,500
E. B. Latham	1,400
R. L. Faris	1,400
C. C. Yates	1,400
J. H. Smoot	1,400
W. C. Maupin	1,400
F. R. Green	1,400
A. B. Simons	1,400
C. H. Deetz	1,400
E. P. Ellis	1,400
A. Martin	1,400
W. A. Van Dorn	1,400
Otto Storm	1,250
F. W. Edmonds	1,200
G. L. Flower	1,200
H. F. Flynn	1,200
O. B. French	1,200
E. Smith	1,200
J. A. McGrath	1,200
W. Bowie	1,200
E. B. Wills	1,200
J. H. Roeth	1,200
S. S. Hein	1,200
Ida M. Peck	1,200
H. M. Fitch	1,200
J. A. Fairfield	1,200
E. H. Wyvil	1,200
H. R. Garland	1,200
Lilian Pike	1,200
A. H. Sefton	1,200
P. H. Geddes	1,200
C. Jacomini	1,200
H. O. French	1,200
J. T. Watkins	1,200
Jennie H. Fitch	1,000
Alice Reveille	1,000
P. V. Dolan	1,000
H. Bacon	1,000
P. Erickson	1,000
W. Welch	1,000
W. H. Dennis	1,000
D. S. Bliss	1,000
W. Mackenzie	1,000
F. Fordan	1,000
N. Bryant	1,000
J. L. Smith	1,000
C. J. Harlow	1,000
C. F. Locraft	1,000
W. R. Whitman	1,000
M. Lauxmann	1,000
G. W. Clarvoe	1,000
C. N. Darnall	1,000
H. C. Denson	900
E. R. Frisby	900
B. E. Tilton	900
H. W. Rhodes	900
R. B. Derickson	900
Lily A. Mapes	900
May E. Campbell	900
Kate Lawn	900
J. P. Kelecher	900
E. M. Sunderland	900
G. Hergesheimer	900
F. G. Wurdeman	900
W. H. Holmes	900
H. Franke	900
T. A. Gibson	900
J. A. Clark	900
D. Parker	880
J. W. Drum	880
T. McGoines	880
C. Over	820
C. H. Jones	820
W. R. McLane	820
W. H. Butler	820
A. F. Zust	800
G. S. Phelps	720
H. C. Mitchell	720
R. J. Mansfield	720
A. Upperman	720
Mary Handlan	720
E. Belford	720
J. B. Quinlan	720
H. C. Allen	720
R. D. Chase	720
E. W. Ford	720
J. A. McDowell	720
G. Newmann	720
Charles Mahon	700
W. M. Conn	700
R. H. Ford	700
C. Buckingham	700
R. J. Fondrem	700
R. Thomas	700
A. Richardson	700
W. J. Diercks	700
J. W. Hunter	640
O. E. McNeill	630
J. H. Brown	630
F. Thomas	630
Mary A. Grant	600
H. Bowdwin	550
J. H. Mason	550
Mrs. V. McGlincy	365
Total	243,435

Deducting the salaries of the naval officers, who would be paid anyhow, the final totals would be:

Hydrographic Office	$93,309
Coast and Geodetic Survey	243,435

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can simply say in reply to the gentlemen that a civilian would get $1,000, and the pay that a retired naval officer gets for his civilian service is $1,000, but he gets in addition to that his pay as a retired naval officer.

Mr. CANNON. Now, does my friend refer to the service of the Hydrographic Office? He is talking not of the Coast Survey, but the Hydrographic Office. I will answer what the gentleman says in my time—that the $1,000 paid for a thousand-dollar clerk in the Hydrographic Office in these branch offices is quite sufficient to perform the services equally as well as they are performed by the retired naval officers or anybody else, because it is a mere question confined under the law to the sale of charts and handing out of maritime information.

Mr. SHATTUC. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DAYTON. I will incorporate that, Mr. Chairman, in my remarks. Just one moment——

Mr. CANNON. My friend has full power to incorporate it into his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHATTUC. Do not the retired officers get paid whether they work or not?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and this $1,000 goes to them in addition.

Mr. SHATTUC. The Army officer would get the other pay if he did not do any work?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SHATTUC. Then what relevancy had the remark of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The only statement I make is that being Army officers and receiving this pay they ought not to be employed in a place that civilians ought to be employed in. I think they ought to retire on their honor. I think that as they receive $1,950 of retired pay they ought to retire on their honor, because there is no one who honors them any more than I do, and I think they ought not to take the place of a civilian who could be employed for a thousand dollars a year.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want in the few minutes that I shall occupy, and I shall not take all my time, to talk directly to the question before the committee. Divorce the Hydrographic Office and this service from this discussion. They do not belong to it. They do not pertain to it. It is a question of coast surveys pure and simple. It does not affect the Hydrographic Office in any shape or form, and there is no proposition to affect it.

What is now the law? This office and its duties are fixed by law, and its duties, as was explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts, are defined by the Revised Statutes; and let the action be whatever it may touching the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia, to strike out the words of this bill, or whether his motion prevails or fails, the Hydrographic Office of the Navy is entirely divorced from this matter and will remain just as it is. The Hydrographic Office is appropriated for in the legislative bill, and not in the naval bill.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Ninety-five thousand four hundred dollars.

Mr. CANNON. Ninety-five thousand four hundred dollars. They do not belong together in the discussion at all. In the Hydrographic Office, where the retired officers of the Navy in some instances are serving and receiving civil pay in addition to their retired pay, I want simply and merely to clear up the contest and put before the minds of the committee exactly what is in this contest. I hold in my hand the Revised Statutes, Title LVI, "The Coast Survey." Then it provides for the Coast Survey; then it provides that it shall survey the coasts, etc., and 20 marine leagues at sea of the United States; then it provides further that the President—

Shall cause to be employed as many officers of the Army and Navy of the United States as will be compatible with the successful prosecution of the work, the officers of the Navy to be employed on hydrographic parts and the officers of the Army on the topographical parts of the work; and no officer of the Army or Navy shall receive any extra pay out of any appropriations for surveys.

That is the law creating the Coast Survey, providing for a Director, putting it under the Treasury Department. Still further:

Officers of the Army and Navy shall, as far as practicable, be employed in the work of surveying the coasts of the United States, wherever and in the manner required by the Department having charge thereof.

The Treasury Department—that is the law—"shall have charge thereof."

Still further:

The President is authorized, for any of the purposes of surveying the coasts of the United States, to cause to be employed such of the public vessels in actual service as he deems it expedient to employ, and to give such instructions for regulating their conduct as he deems proper, according to the tenor of this title.

Now, then, we have got the law. It has been the law substantially since 1803—substantially. It is the law to-day. Now, as to the situation from time to time. This law has been so construed that when the naval officers are required to do their work proper in connection with the Navy they have not been detailed to do work in these surveys, notably for about ten years, including the years of the civil war, when they were busy; and the Coast Survey never did so much work and such good work as from 1861 to 1868. The Navy officers on ships under the flag fought their ships in the service where they were needed. Then, about 1870, they commenced to detail naval officers. There never were any Army officers detailed to any considerable extent, because they were needed in the public service, and they continued to detail naval officers to this coast-survey work up to the breaking out of the Spanish war, and the length of service of the Navy officers when they were detailed was a little over two years.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Two years and two months.

Mr. CANNON. And in the matter of detail they go from one kind of duty to another in the Navy, but in the Coast Survey, after they had been in there a year, and about the time they "got up to snuff," if you will allow the expression, becoming experts, practically, in matters of the Coast Survey, why they are ordered away and there come in new men; and I say this in no way disparagingly of the naval officers; but that is the fact. When the Spanish war broke out every naval officer was taken from the Coast Survey, as he ought to have been, and from the breaking out of the Spanish war to the present time there has been no naval officer on duty in the Coast Survey. When the Spanish war closed, the Coast Survey went to the Secretary of the Navy and said, "Can not you, under the provisions of the law, give us some naval officers?" He said, "I can not; we have none to spare;" and there have been none detailed since.

Now, right there, before I forget it, if there are not officers to spare under the law as existing for sixty years, which says that they shall be detailed when practicable, how, in the name of all that is good, will there be any to spare if you make some new law and put the Coast Survey on the Navy? I wish some man could figure that out.

Now, let me go a step further. Vessels may be transferred by the President. Why, do you know that when the Spanish war closed, under the lead of my committee, we applied to the Navy Department, in view of the great number of ships that had been bought, yachts of all kinds, and ships that it was supposed we did not need in the maintenance of the naval service, for the Secretary to inform Congress which ones of these ships, instead of being sold or abandoned, could be transferred to the Revenue-Cutter Service, to the Light-House Service, to the Coast Survey Service, and the reply came back that there was not one single ship that could be transferred.

Mr. DAYTON. When was that?

Mr. CANNON. That was at the close of the Spanish war, at the last session of Congress.

Mr. DAYTON. That might have been the condition at that time. That condition does not pertain to-day.

Mr. CANNON. If at the last session of Congress there were no ships to detail, how can there be any used now in the Coast Survey? Let me say another thing——

Mr. DAYTON. I will answer that question. We have bought twelve new vessels and they are in the Philippines now and are ready to do this work.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says that existing ships in the Navy can be used in the coast survey. I say that the gentleman is mistaken or my information from the Navy Department is wrong. What is the fact? You put in authority for this year to the Navy Department by inserting the proper words to survey the coasts of Cuba—and that runs for twelve months—Porto Rico, Guam and the Philippines. Did you use the ships now in the Navy that you have so many of? Oh, no. The first thing you did was to take two ships and fit them up new to make coast-survey vessels of them, and they are now down in Cuba making the surveys, and I gave you their names the other day. I have talked with the people in the Navy about it, and they said: "Of course, if we survey the coast, we have got to have ships of smaller tonnage that is adapted to that service."

Now, they say we have got people to make these surveys. I say no, because I have here before me the official statement of the Secretary of the Navy that if all the ships in commission to-day and that can be put in commission in thirty days were officered it would require all the officers now aboard the ship, and in round numbers, if I recollect right, 1,119 more. That is more officers than you have got in the Navy if you would take them all away from Washington; take them all away from everywhere, who are on shore duty, you would not have enough to fully man the ships in commission or that can be put in commission in thirty days, without reference to that great fleet of ships that has been authorized and is now being built.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; if it is a question.

Mr. DAYTON. Does not the gentleman know that in time of peace we do not require all of our ships to be in commission; that we have been expending millions and millions of dollars in building up a reserve basin over at League Island in which we can store away ships?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly I know that, but I know that in the Navy Department and generally throughout the country there is a call for more naval officers, and to cut down the length of time for the education of the naval cadets, graduate more people, take in more from civil life because of the lack of officers, and because this is to be one of the greatest sea powers on earth.

While I am as proud of this Republic and of the Army and Navy of the United States as any man, and as ready to accord them great honor, for they are the peers of any army and navy that has existed in the tide of time, yet I will not with my vote do anything further than to keep it as an Army and Navy. I do not believe in bringing the Navy into the everyday affairs of civil life. Such action is militarism, and I am against militarism. [Applause.] I say it respectfully.

Mr. DAYTON. You regard it as militarism to provide the means by which it can navigate the sea.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman state to the House who is the best fitted to know about what the Navy needs, the Navy Department or the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. I will take the statement, if you desire, of the Secretary of the Navy under Jackson——

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. He is dead. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON (continuing). Where the Coast Survey had been transferred to the Navy, and he advised that it go back to the Treasury, because he said, and said truly, that the Navy could not make the surveys as they ought to be made, because they had other duties to perform.

Now, then, I will close with a simple remark: Gentlemen hold up this bill as a specter and say that under it this service is expensive as compared with the service under the Navy Department. Behold how plain a tale shall put that down! I have before me the naval appropriation bill as it passed the House. The current law for the current year provided "for pay of the Navy, including men of the engineer force and the coast-survey service." But in the recent bill as it passed the House the words "and the coast-survey service" were stricken out. So that neither officers nor men employed in this service are appropriated for in the pay of the Navy to be used in the coast-survey service, notwithstanding that the law provides for detailing to that service naval officers when the Department has them to spare.

It is said that this service is so expensive. Let us see about that. I happen to have taken evidence on this subject; I happen to have made some examination. Let me tell you how expensive it is. The last year that officers from the Navy were detailed to the coast-survey service they cost, in round numbers, from the pay of the Navy, for salary, allowances, transportation, etc., when it was all figured up, $89,000. Now, last year the pay of civilians for for doing the same duty was $27,000.

Mr. DAYTON rose.

Mr. CANNON. My friend will doubtless say that we increase the appropriation here. Of course we do; and I will show you why—because you cut off the supply from the naval bill.

Gentlemen talk about this bill appropriating so much and the sundry civil bill appropriating so much. What do your constituents and mine care about that? What they want to know is, How much does it cost and how good is the work? And you can not answer them by saying "We pay in one instance from the navy bill and in the other from the sundry civil bill." They care nothing about that. The country only wants the best service for the least cost without regard to which bill carries the appropriation.

Now I am willing to submit this matter, though I might go further and state it more fully. Touching the men, we find great disproportion between the men employed in the Coast Survey and those in the naval service. We find that this service as performed under the direction of the Coast Survey costs far less than what it would under the Navy Department. I am now ready for a vote.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, the question presented to us for our consideration is, first, whether more efficient service can be had under one or the other of these bureaus or departments, and second, whether the service can be more economically performed by the one or the other. If it is shown that the service is more efficient under one department than another, that consideration ought to control, even if the service were not more economical; but if it be shown that under a particular one of these departments the service is not only more efficient, but also more economical, there is no question as to the position we ought to take concerning this matter.

What is the nature of the service performed by these different departments in these surveys? The Coast and Geodetic Survey makes not only a hydrographic survey, but also a topographic survey; and such surveys are essential not only for the Navy, but also for the military branch of our Government. The Navy Department makes only the hydrographic survey.

Under the Coast and Geodetic Survey a ship is sent to a certain coast and begins its operations by sending a certain number of men on shore and retaining a certain number on the vessel. These bodies of men move concurrently around the shore, making the topographic survey and the soundings at the same time.

Mr. DINSMORE. Will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. SHAFROTH. I can not; I have only five minutes.

Mr. DINSMORE. Does the gentleman think it increases the efficiency of the survey to have it made concurrently on land and sea?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly it does.

Mr. DINSMORE. Will the gentleman explain how?

Mr. SHAFROTH. In the first place, we have a set of men continually doing this particular work year after year. It is their life business, and they naturally become more proficient in it than naval officers can who are assigned to such service, which they do not want and in which they remain as little time as possible.

Mr. DINSMORE. Does not my friend know that many of the most efficient people engaged in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are people who failed in their examinations at the Naval Academy, who did not receive sufficient education to discharge the duty of a naval officer, and that this force includes also discharged warrant officers from the United States Navy?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. And retired officers of the Navy.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am satisfied that the Coast and Geodetic Survey is an efficient department. I do not know the particular history of each particular man in it; but I know that their work has been efficiently performed and has been of highest order. Why, Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that Admiral Porter bombarded Fort Jackson without being able even to see the fort, a dense forest intervening. How? He had the plats and charts of the Coast and Geodetic Survey before him, and they were so accurate that he could adjust the angle of his guns in such a way that every shot would take effect in the fort. That is a historical fact that nobody can deny.

Mr. DINSMORE. Do you think one of his men could have done it?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Navy surveys could not have answered, because the Navy does not make topographical surveys. It was the knowledge of the height and width of the forest that intervened that made it of such value, and consequently it was very important to have topographical and hydrographical surveys.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these surveys go together. They ought to go together. It is necessary from a military standpoint that they should go together. The Army and Navy ought to know whether a marsh is beyond the bordering hill; they ought to know where there are gulleys and deep ravines that might materially interfere with military operations.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me read a single line from a lecture before the War College by Admiral Belknap in 1897, in which he says:

> Topographical features of coasts and harbors are as necessary to know as hydrographic conditions of their waters.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Assuredly.

Mr. DINSMORE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to get in a word or two of my own. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I think is clear, and that is that the system which is adopted by the Coast and Geodetic Survey is unquestionably superior to that used by the Navy, not only for the Navy, but for the whole nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. If we may have five minutes on this side, I have no objection.

Mr. SHAFROTH. You can have five minutes on your side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, one thing that has been lost sight of in this discussion is this: These hydrographic surveys are not made ouly for the Navy, but they are absolutely essential to the merchant marine, and when we consider that we have got over 3,000 vessels in our merchant marine we must realize that these surveys must be made with reference to them as well as to the Navy. The Navy has only 225 vessels, and the majority of them are scattered all over the world—at Hongkong, the ports of Europe, and various other places.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey would make more efficient surveys for the merchant marine for the reason that they take an entire coast. For instance, they survey around the island of Porto Rico completely without stopping. They take the coast line along the United States and run from one end of it to the other, making their surveys consecutive. The Navy Department never does that, for the reason that the naval ships only enter big harbors, and it is human nature for them to attach more importance to the big ports. The natural tendency of the Navy Department would be to survey the route between important ports and leave the smaller ports, that are to be entered by the merchant marine, neglected.

I do not say that as a disparagement upon the Navy. It is not. It is natural to think that that thing in which we are engaged is of the most importance. Consequently, when we take into consideration the fact that commerce is interested in this matter, when we take into consideration the fact that the ships of the merchant marine must have charts with which to sail, there can be no question that this ought to be confined to one bureau and not have one bureau doing work in one part of the country and another bureau doing it in another.

So, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that from the standpoint of efficiency there is no doubt but what the surveys of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are superior.

Now, I want to come to the question of economy and to show from an economical standpoint that it is clearly in the interest of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Mr. Chairman, we find that in the last year there has been a contest between these two Departments. Two ships of the Navy Department have been doing duty in coast-survey work upon the coast of Cuba, and one ship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been doing duty upon the coast of Porto Rico. The *Eagle* and the *Yankton* are the two ships that surveyed the coast of Cuba under the Navy Department, and the *Blake* has performed the same duty on the coast of Porto Rico for the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The coasts of these two islands are similar, the soundings are similar, and yet when we take the work of the civilians as compared with the work of the naval officers we find that the total average cost for the surveys for each vessel of the Navy was $46,000, and that the total cost for the survey of the *Blake*, engaged in the same work on the Porto Rican coast for the same length of time, was $25,000. When we come to contrast the amount of work, the comparison is still more in favor of the civilian. We find that the soundings made by each of those vessels, the *Eagle* and the *Yankton*, were only 25,000 apiece, whereas the soundings made by the *Blake* upon the Porto Rican coast numbered 70,480.

Consequently, when you divide the total cost by the total number of soundings you find that the soundings made by the Navy Department cost a dollar and eight cents each, whereas the soundings made by the *Blake* cost only 35 cents each. Those are the figures that tell a story which can not be denied. They are unquestionably correct. They show that when a man is engaged in a life work, and has his ambition in that one thing, he is going to become more proficient and to do better service in that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations one question.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. BURTON. What provision has been made in this bill for surveys upon the Great Lakes and connecting waters?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that the provision for the surveys of the Great Lakes has always been under the War Department, and that those surveys have been made by the Engineer Corps, for the reason that they are engaged in river and harbor work and can best make them. That has been so since 1841. This year we increased the appropriation for studying lake levels and lake work surveys, and all that is included in that, from $25,000 to $75,000.

Mr. BURTON. It is intended, as I understand, that this amount shall be expended upon the Great Lakes.

Mr. CANNON. The whole $75,000, this increase from $25,000 to $75,000, is for lake surveys and for studying the question of lake levels and kindred questions, all of which the Army Engineer Corps have been engaged in since 1841.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to make one statement in that connection. The Army engineers make these surveys, but they are only published in the report of the engineers.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, why, my friend——

Mr. DAYTON. Not for the maritime interest. You have no authority to sell them. The Hydrographic Office has used those, and there never has been any contest between the two.

Mr. CANNON. I will show my friend now how plain a tale will put that down. The Army engineers from this $75,000 appropriation make their charts and have since 1841, and they are on sale at cost, and made from time to time. It is true the Hydrographic Office violated the substance of the law, in my judgment, and without sufficient authority or use they practically reproduced these charts, so that that work is being duplicated, and I hope that matter will cease.

Mr. DAYTON. I simply challenge that statement, and will incorporate in my remarks absolute proof that the War Department does not make these charts and does not sell them for the purposes of navigation. The Navy officers and the *Michigan* are used for the purpose of locating additional dangerous shoals and they are located on the Army surveys and published by the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. BURTON. I will say to the gentleman from West Virginia that I am quite familiar with the system in regard to that. I find an item on page 100, so that the question that I asked has been answered.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Then read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For field expenses: For surveys and necessary resurveys of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, including the coasts of outlying islands under the jurisdiction of the United States, to be immediately available, and to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $25,000 of this amount shall be expended on the coasts of the before-mentioned outlying islands, $70,000.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to raise the point of order against that proviso that it is new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Not at all.

Mr. DAYTON. I did not hear it distinctly, but I understood the proviso was left out entirely; and I will ask the Clerk to read it. I want to reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I hope it will be made now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman raise the point of order that the language contained in lines 7, 8, 9, and 10 is new legislation?

Mr. DAYTON. As I understand it. I ask that it may be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read.

The proviso was again read.

Mr. DAYTON. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing magnetic observations and to establish meridian lines in connection therewith in all parts of the United States, and for making magnetic observations in other regions under the jurisdiction of the United States, including the purchase of additional magnetic instruments; for continuing the line of exact levels between the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts; for furnishing points to State surveys, to be applied as far as practicable in States where points have not been furnished; for determinations of geographical positions and for continuing gravity observations, $50,000.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois the reason of that increase in this item from $25,000 to $50,000, and the necessity of the purchase of additional magnetic instruments, and where they are to be used, and in what work?

Mr. CANNON (reading):

The increase of the item providing for magnetic surveys is made in order to make it possible to complete a permanent magnetic survey of the whole country and of the water adjacent within a reasonable time. No work prosecuted by the Government serves a more utilitarian purpose than this. The magnetic survey as now conducted includes the determination of the magnetic variations at the county seats and the establishment of meridian lines, so that the county surveyors may test their compasses at any time and may have the necessary change of the variation to rerun old lines and boundaries, a work of the utmost importance and constantly becoming more necessary in the fixing of titles and boundary lines of counties and States. The magnetic variation will also be determined at sea by instruments only recently perfected, and the accuracy of navigation greatly increased thereby. The sum here appropriated covers all magnetic and all geodetic work performed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Now, then, the gentleman understands that when the surveys of the public lands which fixed the boundaries of the States and counties were made, twenty-five, fifty, and seventy-five years ago, that the variation of the magnetic needle has been very considerable, and unless the variation is known, and placed definitely for the various local surveying officers, they can not make correct resurveys. I believe that answers his question.

Mr. DAYTON. Is this increase made necessary over last year and the year before by reason of additional work?

Mr. CANNON. It is necessary to prosecute this work both on the land and sea, for the reason I have just stated, and we believe the amount should be so appropriated, and so recommend.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rebuilding and refitting the steamer *Bache*, to be immediately available, $60,000.

For purchase or construction of one small steamer, to be immediately available, $20,000.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to raise the point of order upon that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. What is the item?

Mr. DAYTON. For rebuilding and refitting the steamer *Bache*.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. DAYTON. I will state it in connection with the next item. There is no authority of law of any kind or character that authorizes the Coast and Geodetic Survey to build, repair, or refit any vessels for this service. I have the statutes here before me. The President alone is authorized to call upon the Navy Department for these vessels. The naval establishment alone can build them; and therefore it is new legislation and contrary to existing law.

I will send up to the Chairman the statute authorizing the President to call upon the Navy Department for these vessels, and it is the only authority there is. I send up the different statutes relating to the authority for this Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Chair. I have had them compiled from the statutes; but there is a reference to each one, and the Chair can see if they are correct. There is no authority of any kind or character for this class of work to be done by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The CHAIRMAN. Lines 14 and 15 contain the pending paragraph.

Mr. DAYTON. Yes; against both of them I make the point of order. They have no authority to repair, nor build, nor buy, and the only authority, I insist, as shown by the statutes, exists in the President of the United States to call upon the Navy Department for these vessels.

Mr. CANNON. Now, if the Chair desires to hear anything further, I would like to be heard for a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. The only statute in the shape of a permanent law which I have any recollection of is as follows. I read sections 4685 and 4686 of the Revised Statutes, under the title of "Coast Survey:"

SEC. 4685. The President is authorized, in executing the provisions of this title, to use all maps, charts, books, instruments, and apparatus belonging to the United States, and to direct where the same shall be deposited, and to employ all persons in the land or naval service of the United States, and such astronomers and other persons, as he shall deem proper.

SEC. 4686. The President is authorized, for any of the purposes of surveying the coast of the United States, to cause to be employed such of the public vessels in actual service as he deems it expedient to employ, and to give such instructions for regulating their conduct as he deems proper, according to the tenor of this title.

That is authorization. Now, what is the fact? There are 14 vessels in the Coast Survey—9 of them steamers, small vessels from 120 to 200 tons, if I recollect right—and time out of mind this preceding paragraph has been enacted for repairs and the maintenance of vessels used in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and so on. Now, this is for repairing and refitting the steamer *Bache*, to be immediately available, $60,000. That is an old Coast Survey steamer that absolutely needs to be rebuilt. It is in the public service and has been until it has become impaired as a Coast Survey vessel for further use, and it is necessary for the service that it should be repaired. It is a public object in the process of being performed.

The law authorizes the President of the United States to detail vessels in the public service to the coast-survey work. We have tried to get them. The Navy Department reports that there are none that they can spare for detail. It is true that there has been in the last year two Coast Survey vessels fitted out for the use of the Navy Department, but they hold on to them like grim death to a sick African. [Laughter.] Now, this item for the purchase and construction of one small vessel to be immediately available for use is for a public object in progress. It seems to me these items and kindred items are not subject to a point of order; they have been in appropriation bills for more years than you and I have left behind us, and it is perfectly patent, it seems to me, that the two items are within the rule.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Were the vessels now in the Coast and Geodetic Survey built by the Coast and Geodetic Survey?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; by appropriation on the sundry civil bill. The *Pathfinder* was the last one built.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly, if it is a question.

Mr. BUTLER. The only authority for the construction of these vessels is found in an appropriation bill?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. It was an existing public work and in pursuance of a public object in progress of construction.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there anything in the act of Congress establishing that branch of the service which would authorize it to construct or build a vessel?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. The bare creation of a coast-survey service to survey the United States and 20 marine leagues at sea would imply the authority to construct vessels and to maintain vessels and to use vessels, because you can not go to sea 20 marine leagues in your rubbers. [Laughter.] You can not wade out. Now, then, that is a necessary incident. It is true that under the law the President is authorized to detail vessels in the public service; but he has not done it. There are none for him to detail.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman a further question.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there not some act of Congress which authorizes the Coast and Geodetic Survey to rent vessels and procure them in that way?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman point out that act of Congress?

Mr. CANNON. Just as much as there is for authority to build a battle ship. I will ask the gentleman where there is anything in permanent law that authorizes the construction of a battle ship. Why, they abound in appropriations. Authorizations are made on the naval bill, not subject to a point of order, but you can not find, if you will turn to the statute creating a navy, anything in the shape of permanent legislation to authorize these things. There is just as much authority to appropriate for the Coast Survey vessel upon a general appropriation bill as there is to construct a battle ship.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take issue with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in regard to that. There is a special act establishing the Navy Department. That act is under Title X of the Revised Statutes. That act provides how it shall be divided up and the duties performed, and it authorizes the construction of the Navy. A statute authorizes the Coast and Geodetic Survey; but it qualifies it, provides how the vessels for this Survey shall be gotten, where they shall come from, and it is mandatory, as my colleague says.

It has not the right to build vessels; it has not the right to repair ships. These officers are not in the Navy Department. They simply have a right to appeal to the President of the United States to use vessels that are in the public service; that is the language of the statute. If in the past they have edged in and gotten the right to build vessels here and there, those vessels having no name and no existence under the navigation laws or under the public laws in any way, that is no reason why they can do it here now.

Here is a bald proposition to change their authority, their right, their privilege to call upon the President to detail these vessels. Under the existing law this matter is left with the President to decide; and the fact that the President does not detail these vessels may be the strongest reason why the work should not be done by them. But be that as it may, the point here is that there is no provision of law authorizing them to do this work. The Navy Department has that authority clean cut, under the law establishing this service.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If the Chair is ready to rule, I will not trespass upon the time of the committee by further discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but will gladly hear the gentleman.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If the Chair is ready to rule, I will not occupy any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The law in respect to this matter seems to be in section 4686 of the Revised Statutes, which reads:

The President is authorized, for any of the purposes of surveying the coast of the United States, to cause to be employed such of the public vessels in actual service as he deems it expedient to employ, and to give such instructions for regulating their conduct as he deems proper, according to the tenor of this title.

The Chair assumes that the steamer *Bache*, referred to in lines 14 and 15, is a public vessel in actual service, which the President has detailed for the purposes of this survey. If that assumption be correct, then it seems to the Chair the point of order is not well taken, as the rebuilding and refitting of the steamer is simply the continuance of a public work already begun.

There is not, however, so far as the Chair is advised, any existing law which would authorize the purchase or construction of a steamer by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Nor does it seem to the Chair that this Survey stands upon the same basis as the Navy, or that the same argument which would authorize an appropriation for the building of a battle ship applies to a department such as the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which has no navy of its own, which has no vessels at all except those which are detailed by the President under section 4686. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order so far as lines 14 and 15 are concerned, but sustains the point of order so far as lines 16 and 17 are concerned.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay and subsistence of enlisted men: For pay and subsistence of engineers, surgeons, captains' clerks, ships' draftsmen, cadets, and enlisted petty officers and seamen of all classes, including the advance purchase of clothing and small stores for issue, to be reimbursed from the wages of the person to whom issued, in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of the Treasury, $182,745.

Mr. DAYTON. I make a point of order on this paragraph, that it is entirely new legislation, that there is no authority of any kind by law authorizing the Coast and Geodetic Survey to employ engineers, surgeons, captains' clerks, ship's draftsmen, etc., and

to purchase clothing for these men, which is practically the establishment of another Navy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the Chair in deciding whether this provision is in order on a general appropriation bill will take notice of such public affairs as concern the whole people. The Chair has before him the section of the Revised Statutes providing for the Coast Survey, giving authority, when practicable, if I recollect the language, for the President to detail Army and Navy officers to do this work under the Coast Survey. Now, what is the fact in regard to the public service? Here is a public service established by law. Now, as at various times heretofore, the President or the Secretary of the Navy refuses to detail officers or enlisted men from the Navy to this service.

Why, Mr. Chairman, they refused for ten years, from the commencement up to the close of the civil war in this country, to do it. They refused to do the same during the Spanish war. There is no question about that. Now, with a public service in progress and the failure to detail the officers, surgeons, and the employees, and the men ordinarily necessary to comprise the complement of officials and working crew to these ships, if it is not performed, there is nothing left if the law is to be executed and we are to have the public service carried on—a public service in progress, to be maintained by public administration—there is nothing left, I repeat, except to provide for the maintenance of that service, and that is all that the pending clause in the bill does. I ask the gentleman to attend to this language to provide:

Pay and subsistence of enlisted men: For pay and subsistence of engineers, surgeons, captains' clerks, ships' draftsmen, cadets, and enlisted petty officers and seamen of all classes, including the advance purchase of clothing and small stores for issue, to be reimbursed from the wages of the person to whom issued, in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of the Treasury, $182,745.

That is all that it does, and it is strictly in accordance with the rules in pursuance of a service already in progress.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a rather peculiar position which we find now taken by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in charge of this bill with reference to the point of order on this amendment—that is to say, that a court of justice in the consideration of this important question must be governed by existing conditions that confront the people and the court rather than by the principles of law which are supposed to control such a body. It is hardly necessary, therefore, to reply to that part of the argument against the point of order which I have raised. I shall call the attention of the Chair, however, to other conditions which seem to me have not been touched upon by the gentleman in his argument just submitted.

Here is a provision for the employment of men that are not now authorized by any existing law. How, then, can that provision escape the point of order when it is made against it? I undertake to say, sir, that in the naval establishment and in the general law providing for its maintenance it would be impossible for us to get a provision as broad as that which was incorporated in the pending bill and escape the point of order, if there raised against it.

Here is an open, bald proposition to provide pay for the subsistence of the parties named here:

Engineers, surgeons, captains' clerks, ships' draftsmen, cadets, and enlisted petty officers and seamen of all classes.

And it also includes "the advance purchase of clothing and small stores," to be reimbursed from the wages of these persons, and involves an expenditure out of the Treasury of $182,745.

I suppose this is intended to provide, incidentally perhaps, for the "becoming uniforms" which were referred to by my friend from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] so eloquently a day or two ago in discussing another proposition.

But this provision goes on to say that these purchases and these payments shall be made—

In accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no law authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to "establish" any such regulations as are sought to be established by the provisions of this bill. There are no such regulations, because the statutes to which I wish to call the attention of the Chair leave the whole matter distinctly, definitely, and unquestionably in the hands of the President of the United States if he deems it necessary to detail these parties mentioned in this provision of the bill from the naval service.

In other words, that these people can not get their pay or be employed except by the President of the United States, who has charge of the matter, as I have shown, in the discharge of his duty. But he has not done so in the past, and the gentleman himself admits that it has not been done for a very long period in our history. But it is presumed by the provision of the bill that we can override the precedents in the matter, and that we may provide for this service in accordance with the idea of gentlemen who present this bill for our consideration and action. I claim that there is nothing in the law to warrant this appropriation, but that, on the contrary, the law is distinctly and absolutely against it, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I raise this point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of supplementing what the gentleman from West Virginia has so well presented, I hope I may have the attention of the Chair for two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will listen to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. BUTLER. The only authority, it seems to me, which bears directly on the subject is the section of the Revised Statutes which may be invoked in this connection—section 4684—and if the Chair is familiar with the section and agrees with me it will be unnecessary to read it.

Several MEMBERS. Let us hear it.

Mr. BUTLER. It provides as follows:

SEC. 4684. That the President shall carry into effect the plan of the board as agreed upon by a majority of its members; and shall cause to be employed as many officers of the Army and Navy of the United States as will be compatible with the successful prosecution of the work; the officers of the Navy to be employed on the hydrographical parts, and the officers of the Army on the topographical parts of the work; and no officer of the Army or Navy shall receive any extra pay out of any appropriations for surveys.

It was clearly the intention of Congress at the time that that act was adopted that all of this work should be under the direction of the President of the United States; and under the section which I have just read to the Chairman I think he will have no trouble whatever in concluding that the only authority for the employment of any of the persons designated in the section of the act now under consideration must be in that section. Therefore the proposed section is clearly in conflict with the section of the act which I have read, and changes existing law. I submit, the proposed law is in violation of the rule of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Let me ask a single question. I suppose that there is no contention but what this provision would be according to law and authorized if it was upon the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Of course it would, for the Navy Department has authority by statute to enlist men.

Mr. DAYTON. You could not do it under such a clause as this.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I suppose the question arising upon this point of order is whether the provision in the bill changes existing law or is not an appropriation for a public work and object in progress. I submit that it is an appropriation for the support of a public work and object in progress, and that it does not change existing law, but that the general law of the land remains just the same after this appropriation is made as it exists to-day.

There can be no question but what the maintenance of the Coast Survey is a public work and object in progress. Gentlemen have laid a great deal of stress upon the fact that this work is conducted under the direction of the President. So it is; but it is conducted under the direction of the President through appropriations made by Congress. I will ask the attention of the Chair to Title X, with regard to the Navy, which has already been alluded to, section 417 of the Revised Statutes, as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy shall execute such orders as he shall receive from the President relative to the procurement of naval stores and materials and the construction, armament, equipment, and employment of vessels of war, as well as all other matters connected with the naval establishment.

That places the President, acting through the Secretary of the Navy, in exactly the same position with regard to the Navy as the law regarding the Coast Survey places him with reference to that institution, and yet it has been held that, although the Secretary of the Navy executes the orders of the President relative to the construction of vessels of war, it is in order upon a general appropriation bill to make an appropriation for the construction of a battle ship or any other naval vessel. Now, what is the situation here? We have a Coast Survey in existence. It is already organized; it has ten or a dozen vessels that have been built by order of Congress. They are now in service. Is it possible that Congress has not the authority to man those vessels? Is it possible that the appropriation for the pay of the men who man those vessels is not an appropriation for a public work and object in progress? I submit that it is such an appropriation.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman allow me to make a statement right there?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. DAYTON. It is proper to pay them, but they have to be paid out of the naval appropriation, because the statute expressly creating the Coast and Geodetic Survey provides that that is the only way in which they shall be paid.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said that the appropriation for the pay of the men who man those vessels engaged in this public work was an appropriation for a public work or object already in progress. If there is any public work in progress, it is the work of the Coast Survey. It is a distinct and describable work. If there is any public work and object in progress, to be more specific, it is the management and manning of the vessels that are engaged in the Coast Survey.

If the Chair was right in saying that it was in order upon this bill to repair a Coast Survey vessel, and I think no one has any doubt about that, it is in order to man that vessel under this bill, because both appropriations stand upon the same ground, namely, the support of a public work and object in progress. I put it not only upon the broad ground that the coast survey itself is a public work and object in progress, but I put it specifically upon the ground that each vessel is a distinct and describable public work and object in progress, and upon a general appropriation bill we can just as well appropriate to pay for the men who man her as we can for the repairs to her or as we can for the coal that goes into her bunkers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether or not heretofore engineers, surgeons, captains, clerks, ships' draftsmen, etc., have been furnished, and by whom?

Mr. DAYTON. By the Navy Department.

Mr. CANNON. I can answer that question, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will allow me.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Illinois has the exact facts, I shall be glad to have him state them.

Mr. CANNON. I have it right here in the naval bill for the current year, if the Chair will give me his attention.

In the naval appropriation act for the current year is the following:

Pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and warrant officers for the Coast-Survey Service.

Mr. DAYTON. That is in the naval bill.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; it is in the naval bill, but it is under the law.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the situation?

The CHAIRMAN. One moment——

Mr. DAYTON. As a part of the naval establishment, provided for by the naval appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The pay and subsistence of professional seamen is already provided for by a paragraph which has been passed.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly, as executive officers.

The CHAIRMAN. As executive officers. What the Chair would like to know is where do you provide pay for the seamen in connection with the Coast and Geodetic Survey prescribed in the paragraph?

Mr. DAYTON. The Navy Department only, and the Navy has already provided for them, and has already paid them under an appropriation bill.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Congress pays them, and Congress, by an appropriation in a general appropriation bill—in the naval appropriation bill, a general appropriation bill—the money sustaining the life of that service came only from an appropriation made in a general appropriation bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, what are the exact facts about it? It is not a question of jurisdiction between two committees. No question of that kind is made. It is a question of whether this appropriation is in order upon any general appropriation bill. For years the naval appropriation bill carried specifically pay for seamen in the coast survey. To be accurate:

Pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice boys, including men of the engineer's force and for the coast survey service.

Now, then, the Naval Committee, for reasons which seemed wise to them, saw fit not to insert an appropriation in their naval appropriation bill, because they saw fit—according to a letter of the chairman of the committee to the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—to turn over that subject to another committee, and that change was made. It is not a question of jurisdiction. They dropped it, and we take it up. They have provided for it for years upon a general appropriation bill. They turned it over to us, and we take it up on a general appropriation bill; so that if it has ever been in order to do it, it is in order now to do it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me to give him an illustration?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. This House authorizes the improvement of a river and harbor, and in making the improvement a certain amount of money is appropriated on the river and harbor bill; and it is provided by a general provision that contracts may be made. Afterwards the appropriation is carried in the sundry civil bill, probably because there is an existing law to improve the rivers and harbors in that way.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Undoubtedly. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me use another illustration. Take the Hydrographic Office, that has been referred to. The law establishing it has been read: "There shall be a Hydrographic Office attached to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department," which has certain duties described in the statute. There is nothing about the men that shall be employed in that Hydrographic Office; but Congress has always supposed that after the office was established it was the right and duty of Congress to make appropriations for people to carry on this work. Now, then, that principle runs all through the public service.

Congress has established a Coast Survey; it has defined its duties. One of the essential things of the Coast Survey is the ships. Nobody doubts that. They are there. Each one of them is a public work and object in progress; each one of them requires coal; each one of them requires provisions; each one of them requires men; and the appropriation for the coal, the provisions, and the men of each one of these specific public works and objects in progress is in order on a general appropriation bill, and has heretofore been appropriated for on a general appropriation bill. We are simply repeating here what has been done for so many years that we can not count them. I submit to the Chair, then, that upon the plainest principles this is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts recollect the paragraph relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey that was stricken out by the House in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I recollect it in a general way.

The CHAIRMAN. Did that paragraph cover the same subject-matter now being discussed?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Does the Chair refer to the paragraph stricken out of the naval bill that recently passed the House?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the title of "Ocean and lake surveys."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The point of order was not made against that. The question was fought on its merits. I reserved the point of order and then abandoned it, so that we reached the question upon the merits; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL] also reserved the point of order, and, having the same view, abandoned it; so that the point of order was not passed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that, but the point the Chair wants to be advised about is whether the paragraph covered the same subject-matter.

Mr. CANNON. No; it did not.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It did not cover that at all.

Mr. CANNON. I will send to the Chair the general naval appropriation bill for the current year, which covered this exact matter, and which is left out of the naval bill that passed the House. It was in order there and it is in order here.

The CHAIRMAN. Why was it left out?

Mr. CANNON. Because the Naval Committee elected not to report it; because the chairman of the Naval Committee wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations saying that the Naval Committee would not recommend anything for it. Now, it has been appropriated for heretofore in a general appropriation bill, last year and the current year, and it is in order upon general appropriation bills.

Mr. DAYTON. I hope I may have a chance to make a statement in regard to that when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] is through, because the gentleman from Illinois misunderstands it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I understand, Mr. Chairman, the situation is this. Perhaps it is clear to the Chair and has been better explained than I can explain it: We had this coast survey in progress; it had been maintained from 1870, or thereabouts, largely but not entirely by the officers and men of the Navy. There was authority to detail officers and use the men. The President exercised that authority so as to conduct the work in part but not in whole. The Spanish war came, and the men and officers were taken away, and, upon application to the Secretary of the Navy, it was learned that the officers could no longer be spared for that work.

That was the situation when the Naval Committee reached this subject. Heretofore they had appropriated in general appropriation bills for these people now under discussion without dispute, without question. After the officers of the Navy had gone the men of the Navy were needed for some other purpose, and they could not be detailed. Therefore the Naval Committee, having lost jurisdiction, or having lost practical contact with the whole coast survey, said they did not want anything to do with the coast survey in the continental United States, and turned the matter over to the Appropriation Committee. The Appropriation Committee stepped into their shoes, and did nothing else and nothing more than the Naval Committee had done.

They simply sustained these ships which were public works in progress. They did it in precisely the same manner that, without dispute, the Naval Committee had done it for many years on a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman say that heretofore these engineers and surgeons and others, since the beginning of the Spanish war, have been employed outside of the Navy?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I understand there has not been an officer since the beginning of the Spanish war, not a single officer of the Navy, in the coast-survey service. That was the testimony before our committee. Of course, if the appropriation

can not be made, the service will be crippled. That does not alter the question of law. I do not state it to the Chair for that purpose, but only to show that some committee should have jurisdiction over this matter.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is a very strange misunderstanding on the part of the gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations as to the exact status of this matter. The law itself gives the President full authority to call upon the Navy for these seamen and for the officers necessary to do the Coast and Geodetic Survey work.

It is true that under the general provision of pay and subsistence of the Navy in the naval appropriation bill there was a clause providing for all seamen of every kind and character, and words were used, including those for Coast and Geodetic Survey, and those words were left out simply because it was mere verbiage and surplusage. The Navy Department did think that the Coast and Geodetic Survey was calling upon it for entirely too many men in proportion to the work they were doing, and were seeking to make the Navy pay out of the general pay and subsistence for a good many more men than it ought.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend yield?

Mr. DAYTON. Not just now.

Mr. CANNON. It is right upon that point.

Mr. DAYTON. Very well.

Mr. CANNON. Why did you not leave out the Fish Commission which I called the Chair's attention to?

Mr. DAYTON. It could have been left out just as well. The President's authority would have been just as complete to call on the Navy as if you had 5,000 words describing the different branches, which under the law he had the authority to detail seamen and sailors for. The appropriation was not diminished one cent.

Now, here is where the thing comes. I hope reference will be made to Title XV of the general statutes which provide for the organization of the Navy Department.

And among others, if the Chair please, it provides for the surgeons who are mentioned here. First, it provides for the engineers; it prescribes how they shall be enlisted in the Navy; how they shall be prepared and fitted for the naval service and that only a certain class of men shall be so enlisted in the service of the Navy. Then it goes on and provides how the surgeons shall be employed and how the cadets shall be educated and employed. That is the only provision anywhere for any of these officers in the United States service except in connection with the Army organization, where similar provisions are made.

In the organization of this Coast and Geodetic Survey the President's power is distinctly limited to his right to call upon these two branches of the service for the officers he may require. He can not go outside. Why? Simply because with reference to no other branch of the Government is provision made for the examination, the entrance, the admittance into the service of these peculiarly scientific employees.

The engineers can only be employed under certain conditions prescribed by statute; the cadets can only be employed under certain conditions provided by statute. Therefore you can not transfer these officers to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, because there are no regulations of law providing for their entrance through proper examination and in accordance with proper requirements except through those two channels—the Navy and Army organizations.

Now, the fact that in the naval appropriation bill the words to which the gentleman from Illinois has called attention were left out does not leave out the appropriation at all. The appropriation is dollar for dollar and cent for cent as large as it was.

The number of seamen and other subordinates to be employed in the Navy of the United States under chapter 15 is limited. I refer to section 1417:

> The number of persons who may at one time be enlisted into the Navy of the United States, including seamen, ordinary seamen, landsmen, mechanics, firemen, coal heavers, apprentices, and boys, shall not exceed 8,500.

Section 1422 prescribes the duty of the commanding officers of the fleet; and provisions are made with reference to boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, etc., that they shall be entered upon the Naval Register and be known as warrant officers. And professors of mathematics and other officers are provided for. All these provisions constitute the naval establishment; and you can only draw from it under the language of the statutes which provide for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The mere fact that in the verbiage used in making the appropriation the words "including the Coast Survey" have been omitted does not affect the matter in the least.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend claim that if the President of the United States does not exercise his discretion to detail officers and men to the Coast Survey service in time of war or at any other time, the Coast Survey service must stop?

Mr. DAYTON. I say unquestionably so, because if it were otherwise there would be a change of the law. It was the very object of the law that the President of the United States should not be restricted in the exercise of his discretion as to where it was best that our seamen, our surgeons, our soldiers, etc., should be used.

I know that my friend, in his zeal for this Coast and Geodetic Survey, thinks that the seamen of the country ought to be used in this survey though we might be in the midst of war. But the framers of the statute expressly intended that the President of the United States should have the discretion to use these officers in time of war or in the Coast and Geodetic Survey. But the statute expressly provides that if used in either way they shall come from the Navy and shall not have entrance into the service except by proper examination, as prescribed by the law.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to continue this discussion, but the Chair asked me a question which I have already answered in a general way, but will now answer more particularly by referring to certain testimony given by Dr. Pritchett, the head of the Coast Survey, before the Committee on Appropriations. He first stated that no naval officers had been engaged in this service since 1898, the beginning of the Spanish war. Then he said that recently he had asked the Secretary of the Navy whether he expected to detail officers again to the Coast Survey. Then he continues:

> The Secretary of the Navy assured me that he would not be able to detail officers for some time to come.

This answers the question of the Chair.

> And thereupon we filled their places with civilian officers. We have got men who are skilled navigators and who are also capable of survey work.

Mr. DAYTON. Does the gentleman think that they have any authority of any kind to do that?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I think so.

Mr. DAYTON. The authority they had was to appeal from the decision of the Secretary of the Navy to the President of the United States and ask that a detail might be made from either the Army or the Navy.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. There has never been a time since the beginning of the Coast Survey when the civilians did not take a large part in this work. If we can not appropriate for these men, we can not appropriate for clerks.

Mr. DAYTON. That is the very point. During all this time there has never been a day or an hour when the Coast and Geodetic Survey has not, with a high handedness that has no parallel, sought to run its business contrary to law and everything else. It has not a right to any assignment unless upon application to the Department.

Mr. CANNON. I will call the attention of the Chair to the fact that we can not spend a dollar or a cent that does not pass through the vigilant eyes and under the careful supervision of the accounting officers of the Treasury Department; and so I will state in response to the gentleman from West Virginia that it takes two to play that kind of a game, or a "high hand," as he expresses it.

Mr. DAYTON. That may be, Mr. Chairman, but if no attention is called to a matter of this kind the assumption would necessarily be that authority could be exercised which was not intended to be allowed by the legislative body.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to address the Chair for a moment, I would like to call the attention of the Chair, in support of the point of order, to section 4685 of the Revised Statutes, regulating this service.

That statute provides as follows:

> SEC. 4685. The President is authorized, in executing the provisions of this title, to use all maps, charts, books, instruments, and apparatus belonging to the United States, and to direct where the same shall be deposited, and to employ all persons in the land or naval service of the United States, and such astronomers and other persons, as he shall deem proper.

It seems to me to be perfectly clear as language can be written that the only authority to employ anyone for the purpose contemplated by the pending bill is in the President. The act cited confers such authority. If that act means anything at all it means to establish in the Secretary of the Navy directly, and in the naval establishment generally, a permanent control over this particular branch of the public service.

The provision which authorizes the purchase of clothing and provides other details mentioned in the section of the pending bill against which the point of order is made changes existing legislation. It also permits the Secretary of the Treasury to designate any person as an officer in that establishment for this particular purpose, if he sees proper to do so.

Now, what does the Committee on Appropriations mean when they use this language, which appears in the paragraph in question?

> In accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I ask what authority there is for the establishment of such regulations by the Secretary of the Treasury? I have asked this question of gentlemen who have served twenty years on the floor, and I have been unable to receive a satisfactory answer from any of them up to the present time. If it is right that this should be done I will make no opposition. But it has not been shown to be lawful under the rule of the House. The powers which the President may exercise are conferred by the statutes enacted by Congress, and I submit that the Secretary of the Treasury under existing law has no such power, and the proposed legislation here is clearly in conflict with the law enacted by Congress in 1807.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is another feature in connection with this matter to which I desire to call the attention of the Chair. I refer to that provision of the law which reads specifically as follows—and I quote it in connection with the legislation proposed here, as showing the authority of the committee to submit such a proposition and the right of the House to adopt it. We have on our statute books to-day a provision substantially in terms as follows:

That the President is authorized to detail officers of the Army to act as Indian agents.

Now, he does this frequently; it is a part of the functions of his office; no complaint has been made of the exercise of that authority by him, and yet it has been invariably the practice of Congress to appropriate for the payment of Indian agents who have been appointed from civil life. I ask the attention of the Chair especially to that practice, which has been unquestioned for years.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will give me its attention for a minute or two, I desire to be heard on the point of order which has been presented.

It seems to me that the principal objection which has been urged against this proposition and in support of the point of order is that there is no necessity for such legislation. Now, the paragraph in question is or is not obnoxious to the rules of the House. Let us see for a moment what is the purpose of it. It is placed in the bill for some particular reason. If it had not been for a purpose, it would not appear before us at all.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations could have easily made a provision for the necessary money to employ civilians in this department in the public service in some other way; but for some reason the committee have chosen to adopt this plan. The paragraph is then put in here evidently to create new offices and to employ other persons in the public service and to create new liabilities upon the part of the Government.

Where, for instance, are the cadets for which provision is made here to be graduated? Where are their studies to be pursued? There is no academy for them. And in the same paragraph regulations also are made for the issuance of clothing for these persons. It is a regulation to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury upon this law established in this appropriation bill, and it seems to me that this paragraph is obnoxious to the rule and is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has very grave doubts about this question, and would like to have the consent of the committee to reserve his decision until he has an opportunity to examine it further.

Mr. DAYTON. Very well.

Mr. CANNON. I am quite willing to do that, but I should like to have unanimous consent that the Chair might consider an amendment that would answer every purpose, and that I would move, if the Chair was to sustain the point of order, to have read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read it.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. The point of order is reserved on it, of course.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly; it is only read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 15 insert:
"For all necessary employees to man and equip the vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to execute the work of the survey herein provided for and authorized by law, $182,745."

Mr. DAYTON. Of course, I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. CANNON. If the Chair should believe that this matter is subject to a point of order, I want to say to the Chair and to the gentleman that I should then offer that amendment.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Do you not consider it offered now?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; it is merely read for information, because I want, in all fairness to gentlemen, to place them in full possession of the facts.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. We want to reserve a point of order on that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, perhaps, had better dispose of the matter on present impressions.

Section 4686 provides that—

The President is authorized, for any of the purposes of surveying the coasts of the United States, to cause to be employed such of the public vessels in actual service as he deems it expedient to employ, and to give such instructions for regulating their conduct as he deems proper, according to the tenor of this title.

And section 4684 provides:

The President shall carry into effect the plan of the board, as agreed upon by a majority of its members, and shall cause to be employed as many officers of the Army and Navy of the United States as will be compatible with the successful prosecution of the work.

And so on.

Now, it seems very apparent that it was the intent of the law that the President should detail the vessels and their crews from the Navy Department. It was not contemplated that the President should detail public vessels in service unless they were provided with crews. It is impossible to separate the vessel and the crew, so far as any purposes of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are concerned, and therefore the Chair thinks that the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. CANNON. I will offer the following amendment.

Mr. DAYTON. I want to make the point of order on that also.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 15 insert:
"For all necessary employees to man and equip the vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to execute the work of the survey herein provided for and authorized by law, $182,745."

Mr. DAYTON. Now, for the very reason that the Chair has stated, that the law contemplates that the vessels and their crews should go together from the Navy Department, I insist that that is subject to the same point of order, although a very adroit effort is made to accomplish the same purpose by using the words "employees necessary to carry on the work." The work is to be carried on by those officers, those men, those vessels, and those crews detailed from the Navy Department and from the Army.

Mr. CANNON. Just a word and I will have said all I want to say.

There are in esse fourteen vessels belonging to the Coast Survey Service that never had any connection with the Navy. They were built from year to year by appropriations made upon the sundry civil bill and are now in the service. This bill and the law for the current year provide for their maintenance and their repair. Now, the law establishes the Coast Survey. They have these fourteen vessels. It is idle and useless to say that they may not be operated.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the simple answer to that is this: If Congress in the past, without attention being called to it, has authorized the building of these vessels without authorization of law, that does not authorize you, and it does not authorize this House, to rule that that violation of the law in the past will justify it in the present case.

The seamen can be detailed. The power is in the hands of the President of the United States; but if you want to discuss this, there are many reasons why these seamen should be trained under the Navy Department. That is the object of it, and this duty ought not to be taken away from us and given to the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to suggest, as I catch the reading of the amendment, the words "authorized by law" applies solely to works authorized by law, and not to employees authorized by law. The bill has the same effect to authorize additional employees as if those words were not in it.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that there are now in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and have been vessels and seamen, the Chair assumes, outside of those detailed by the Navy Department; and in view of the fact that if the Chair be wrong the committee can correct it by its vote upon this amendment, the Chair overrules the point of order on the amendment; and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAYTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 61, noes 11.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask how much is substituted by this amendment adopted by this committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question the gentleman can answer as well as the Chair.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not catch it. I could not catch it.

Mr. CANNON. It comes in after line 15, on page 29. The part stricken out was the last three lines of page 29 and the first five on page 30.

Mr. BUTLER. I am much obliged for the information.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of assistants, to be employed in the field or office, as the Superintendent may direct:
For two assistants, at $4,000 each.
For one assistant, 3,200.

Mr. DAYTON. I make the point of order that that is increase of the salary for two employees here, as I understand it.

Mr. CANNON. No. This is for two entirely new employees.
Mr. DAYTON. I make the point of order against it.
Mr. CANNON. Let the Chair rule.
The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman say?
Mr. DAYTON. This is for two entirely new employees, not authorized by law in any way.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois, is there any law authorizing the increase of these salaries?
Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman desires, I will confess the point of order, and move the following amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.
Mr. CANNON. I move the following amendment after the lines read, to take the place of the matter stricken out, insert for two clerks of class 3, at $1,600 each.
The Clerk read as follows:

Insert: "For two clerks of class 3, at $1,600 each."

Mr. DAYTON. I want to reserve the point of order.
Mr. CANNON. Well, that is not subject to a point of order. That is, the amendment is not.
Mr. DAYTON. The amendment is not?
Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is under the civil service.
Mr. CANNON. I call the Chair's attention, if the gentleman desires to make the point of order, to the Revised Statutes. On page 27 of the Revised Statutes, under the head of "Provisions applicable to all the Executive Departments," section 169:

Each head of a Department is authorized to employ in his Department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

Now, if the Chair will glance upward, to section 167, he will find—

The annual salary of clerks and employees in the Departments, whose compensation is not otherwise prescribed, shall be as follows:
First. To clerks of the fourth class, $1,800.
Second. To clerks of the third class, $1,600.

That is the general law. The Coast and Geodetic Survey is a part of the Treasury Department, and we have, so far as the point of order is concerned, power to appropriate for a thousand clerks of class 3, if such should be the sense of Congress.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.
The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.
The CHAIRMAN. Where does the amendment come in?
Mr. CANNON. In lieu of the one that was stricken out on the point of order.
The CHAIRMAN. Which was that? The Clerk is in doubt.
Mr. CANNON. For two at $1,600 each, line 2, page 32.
The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For 9, at $1,200 each.

Mr. DAYTON. A point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. CANNON. There are now 2 clerks at $1,200, and this item provides for 9. As they are not called clerks in class 1, I will confess the point of order as to 7 if the gentleman wants it, but I suppose the point of order is not good as to the 2, because there are now 2 at $1,200 each.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, upon the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, would sustain the point of order as to 7, but the Chair thinks it can be better reached by an amendment.
Mr. CANNON. I will move to strike out the provision and insert "2 at $1,200 each, and 7 clerks of class 1, at $1,200 each."
The amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For 3, at $550 each.

Mr. DAYTON. I raise the point of order on line 17.
Mr. CANNON. The law for the current year reads "for 2 at $540 each." In fact, they are laborers. Now, then, I am willing to move to strike out, if the gentleman will withdraw the point of order, and let it read "for 2 at $550 each," and then I will offer an amendment for 1 laborer at $550. I move to strike out, in line 17, the word "three" and insert "two."
The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. CANNON. Now, I move to insert the words "one laborer at $550."
Mr. DAYTON. I make the point of order that that is an increase of force not authorized.
Mr. CANNON. I will read the statute:

SEC. 169. Each head of a Department is authorized to employ in his Department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

The amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For purchase of automatic engraving machines, as follows: One machine for engraving soundings, 1 machine for engraving and lettering compasses, and 1 border ruling and tinting machine; in all, $6,000.

Mr. DAYTON. I would like to ask the gentleman, chairman of the committee, What is the necessity for this appropriation?
Mr. CANNON. Under the law the Coast Survey has to employ engravers. They engrave the plates upon which the charts are printed. Under the law it is competent to provide for the purchase of automatic engraving machines to make more efficient the engraver's work. It is for the purchase of machines that save labor; it saves the cost, and it is just as much in order and just as necessary as it is to buy ink and paper.
The Clerk read as follows, under the heading "National Zoological Park:"

For construction of a bridge across Rock Creek on the line of the roadway from Quarry road entrance, under the direction of the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, $22,000, one-half of which sum shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make a point of order upon the paragraph just read that there is no law authorizing the construction of this bridge.
The CHAIRMAN. Is not this work inside the park?
Mr. BANKHEAD. But the point I make is that there is no law authorizing it.
Mr. CANNON. What is the point?
Mr. BANKHEAD. I make a point of order upon the paragraph beginning line 14, page 37. My point is that there is no law authorizing the construction of this bridge.
Mr. CANNON. Of course there is no law in specific words, letters, and punctuation authorizing the construction of this bridge; but there is a law creating the Zoological Park; and the Lord has put a stream of water through the park; and the park is thrown open to the public; and there has been a bridge there, but it has rotted down. There is no law to authorize the buying of an elephant or of a boa constrictor or a white bear or a bull pup. [Laughter.] But as we have created the Zoological Park by law and as it is now in esse, we can without express law improve the roads, build fences and bridges, and do anything necessary to carry on this magnificent park for the amusement of the boys and girls on Sunday. [Laughter.]
Mr. BANKHEAD. It is very obvious to my mind, and I think to the mind of the House and of the Chair, that the gentleman from Illinois knows perfectly well that this item is subject to the point of order.
Mr. CANNON. I do not think so.
Mr. BANKHEAD. I am satisfied from the speech the gentleman has made, which did not touch the point of order at all, that everybody here agrees with me on this question.
Mr. CANNON. I am willing to leave the matter to the Chair without another word.
Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman undertook to mislead the House by telling a few jokes with reference to bull pups and such things at the Zoological Park. I do not care to argue the question further.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no doubt that this appropriation is in continuation of a public work already begun and is not subject to a point of order.
The Clerk read as follows:

Northville (Mich.) Station: Superintendent, $1,500; foreman, $960; fish-culturist, $600; skilled laborer, $480; 3 laborers, at $480 each; in all, $4,980.

Mr. CANNON. I offer an amendment to the paragraph just read.
The Clerk read as follows:

On page 41, in line 18, strike out "six hundred" and insert "seven hundred and twenty."
In line 19 strike out "four hundred and eighty" and insert "six hundred."
In lines 19 and 20 strike out "four hundred and eighty" and insert "five hundred and forty."
In lines 20 and 21 strike out "four thousand nine hundred and eighty" and insert "five thousand four hundred."

The Clerk read as follows:

For salary of the resident commissioner from Porto Rico to the United States, authorized by the act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, approved April 12, 1900, $5,000.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word of the paragraph just read, which provides that the salary of the resident commissioner from Porto Rico to the United States shall be $5,000.
I hold in my hand the Official Directory of the Fifty-sixth Congress, in which, on page 268, I find a list of the governors of the several States and Territories of this Union, with their salaries. I find that the governor of Alabama receives $3,000; the governor of Arkansas, $3,000; the governor of Delaware, $2,500, and so on.
It appears from an examination of this list that 47 per cent of the governors of our States and Territories receive about that sum. I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the complete list from which I have given these figures.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.
There was no objection.
The table referred to by Mr. GAINES is as follows.

Governors of the several States and Territories.

States and Territories.	Capitals.	Governors.	Term of service.	Expiration of term.	Salary.
STATES.			Years.		
Alabama	Montgomery	Joseph F. Johnston	2	Dec. 1, 1900	$3,000
Arkansas	Little Rock	Daniel W. Jones	2	Jan., 1901	3,000
California	Sacramento	Henry T. Gage	4	Jan., 1903	6,000
Colorado	Denver	Charles S. Thomas	2	Jan., 1901	5,000
Connecticut	Hartford	George E. Lounsbury	2	do	4,000
Delaware	Dover	Ebe W. Tunnell	4	do	2,500
Florida	Tallahassee	Wm. D. Bloxham	4	do	3,500
Georgia	Atlanta	Allen D. Candler	2	Nov. 1, 1900	2,000
Idaho	Boise	F. Steunenberg	2	Jan., 1901	3,000
Illinois	Springfield	John R. Tanner	4	do	6,000
Indiana	Indianapolis	James A. Mount	4	do	5,000
Iowa	Des Moines	L. M. Shaw	2	Jan., 1902	3,000
Kansas	Topeka	W. E. Stanley	2	Jan., 1901	3,000
Kentucky	Frankfort	W. S. Taylor	4	Dec. 10, 1903	5,000
Louisiana	Baton Rouge	Murphy J. Foster	4	Apr., 1900	4,000
Maine	Augusta	Llewellyn Powers	2	Jan., 1901	2,000
Maryland	Annapolis	John Walter Smith	4	Jan., 1904	4,500
Massachusetts	Boston	W. Murray Crane	1	Jan., 1901 (first Wednesday)	8,000
Michigan	Lansing	Hazen S. Pingree	2	Jan., 1901	4,000
Minnesota	St. Paul	John Lind	2	do	5,000
Mississippi	Jackson	A. H. Longino	4	Jan., 1904	3,500
Missouri	Jefferson City	Lon. V. Stephens	4	Jan., 1901	5,000
Montana	Helena	Robert B. Smith	4	do	5,000
Nebraska	Lincoln	W. J. Poynter	2	do	2,500
Nevada	Carson City	Reinhold Sadler	4	Jan. 6, 1903	4,000
New Hampshire	Concord	Frank W. Rollins	2	Jan., 1901	2,000
New Jersey	Trenton	Foster M. Voorhees	3	Jan. 20, 1902	10,000
New York	Albany	Theodore Roosevelt	2	Jan. 1, 1901	10,000
North Carolina	Raleigh	Daniel L. Russell	4	do	3,000
North Dakota	Bismarck	F. B. Fancher	2	do	3,000
Ohio	Columbus	George K. Nash	2	Jan., 1902 (second Monday)	8,000
Oregon	Salem	Theo. T. Geer	4	Jan., 1903	1,500
Pennsylvania	Harrisburg	William A. Stone	4	Jan., 1903 (third Monday)	10,000
Rhode Island	Providence	Elisha Dyer	1	May 25, 1900	3,000
South Carolina	Columbia	W. H. Ellerbe	2	Dec., 1900	3,500
South Dakota	Pierre	Andrew E. Lee	2	Jan. 5, 1901	2,500
Tennessee	Nashville	Benton McMillin	2	Jan., 1901	4,000
Texas	Austin	Joseph D. Sayers	2	do	4,000
Utah	Salt Lake City	Heber M. Wells	4	do	2,000
Vermont	Montpelier	Edwin C. Smith	2	Oct. 7, 1900	1,500
Virginia	Richmond	J. Hoge Tyler	4	Dec. 31, 1901	5,000
Washington	Olympia	John R. Rogers	4	Jan., 1901	4,000
West Virginia	Charleston	G. W. Atkinson	4	Mar., 1901	2,000
Wisconsin	Madison	Edward Scofield	2	Jan., 1901	5,000
Wyoming	Cheyenne	De Forest Richards	4	Jan. 7, 1903	2,500
Total					188,000
Average					4,055
TERRITORIES.*					
Alaska	Sitka	John G. Brady	4	June 23, 1901	3,000
Arizona	Phœnix	Myron H. McCord	4	July 19, 1901	2,600
New Mexico	Santa Fe	Miguel A. Otero	4	June 7, 1901	2,600
Oklahoma	Guthrie	Cassius M. Barnes	4	May 12, 1901	2,600
Total					10,800
Average					2,700

*Governors nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, while I was out of the Hall a few moments ago, a paragraph to which I intended to offer an amendment was passed. I ask unanimous consent to return to that paragraph for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. What is the amendment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The amendment applies to the paragraph on page 42 in relation to the Leadville (Colo.) Station. It is to provide, according to the recommendation of the Fish Commissioner, for an increase of the salary of the superintendent from $1,500 to $1,800 and to provide for two laborers at a salary of $600 each. I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the necessity for this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to my friend from Colorado that I have no objection to his submitting the request for unanimous consent, and shall not object to turning back to the provision of the bill to which he refers, but I should be compelled, if he offers an amendment to increase the salary of the superintendent of that station, to make the point of order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we turn back to this provision providing for the salary of the superintendent of the station at Leadville, Colo.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask that the provision to which I have referred be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Leadville (Colo.) Station: Superintendent, $1,500; foreman, $1,200; 2 fish-culturists, at $900 each; skilled laborer, $720; laborer, $540; cook, $480; in all, $6,240.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this paragraph by striking out the words "five hundred," in line 12, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "eight hundred," so as to make the salary $1,800.

Mr. CANNON. I shall be obliged, Mr. Chairman, to make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order for a moment so as to allow me to call his attention to the proposed amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; I will withhold the point of order for that purpose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, this official was appointed in 1889 and the salary of the office was fixed at $1,800 a year. In accordance with that appointment he went to work and continued at this salary until 1895, when the salary was reduced to $1,500, a most unjustifiable reduction, as I propose to show by some figures which I will quote in this connection.

I submit a table showing the work of that hatchery during the last few years:

First year, July 1, 1889, to June 30, 1890	568,000
Second year, July 1, 1890, to June 30, 1891	536,700
Third year, July 1, 1891, to June 30, 1892	635,000
Fourth year, July 1, 1892, to June 30, 1893	520,800
Fifth year, July 1, 1893, to June 30, 1894	528,700
Sixth year, July 1, 1894, to June 30, 1895	1,867,300
Seventh year, July 1, 1895, to June 30, 1896	1,363,200
Eighth year, July 1, 1896, to June 30, 1897	2,793,000
Ninth year, July 1, 1897, to June 30, 1898	3,354,300
Tenth year, July 1, 1898, to June 30, 1899	5,488,800

Mr. Tulian was appointed when the compensation of the office was $1,800 a year, but shortly afterwards this was reduced to $1,500.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is manifestly unfair, as shown by the table I have printed, that this official should be paid only $1,500 a year at the present time when the business at that station has increased, as I have shown, from 568,000 fish hatched the first year to over 5,000,000 hatched in 1899. The work has grown immensely; and not only is this official required to do more work, but as the correspondence which I will lay before the committee shows, he

will be compelled to have assistants to help him. He has written to me that he can not retain the position without an increase of salary; that it would be an injustice to himself.

I wish now, Mr. Chairman, to call your attention, and the attention of the committee, to a letter written to Senator TELLER in January, 1900, on this subject:

UNITED STATES COMMISSION OF FISH AND FISHERIES,
January 27, 1900.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 26, concerning increase in the salary of Mr. E. A. Tulian, superintendent of the Fish Commission station at Leadville, Colo. In my estimates submitted October 1 last to the Secretary of the Treasury and forwarded by him to Congress, I recommended that the salary of Mr. Tulian be increased from $1,500 to $1,800. The work at the Leadville station has been satisfactory in every respect, and the superintendent is entitled to an increase in salary, and to accomplish this I shall aid you in every way possible.

Very truly, yours,

GEO. M. BOWERS.

Hon. H. M. TELLER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION OF FISH AND FISHERIES,
March 29, 1900.

DEAR SIR: In my estimates submitted through the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress for the coming fiscal year I have asked for two laborers for the Leadville, Colo., Station, at an annual salary of $600 each, and for an increase of the salary of the superintendent of the station from $1,500 to $1,800. Your assistance in getting these recommendations adopted by Congress is earnestly requested when the sundry civil bill comes up for action.

Very respectfully,

GEO. M. BOWERS, *Commissioner.*

Hon. H. M. TELLER,
United States Senate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that this is not much of an increase and that it is justified by the increased number of eggs that are hatched there, an increase from 500,000 to 5,000,000. If we paid the superintendent eighteen hundred dollars when this small amount of work was done, it is doubly just that he should receive the increase now.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order. If there was only one superintendent, it would be a different thing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Have any others asked for an increase?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; all along the line.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I have one that accomplishes four times as much as yours does.

Mr. CANNON. If we increased one, we could not live unless we increased them all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How about the increase of two laborers?

Mr. CANNON. There were two asked for and we gave one. It seemed to us sufficient, especially as the general appropriation is available, if they are short, for additional men.

Mr. THROPP. Many of the other fisheries hatch more eggs than this one, at less expense.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mine does; three or four times as many.

The Clerk read as follows:

Punishment for violations of internal-revenue laws: For detecting and bringing to trial and punishment persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws or conniving at the same, including payments for information and detection of such violations, $75,000; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall make a detailed statement to Congress once in each year as to how he has expended this sum, and also a detailed statement of all miscellaneous expenditures in the Bureau of Internal Revenue for which appropriation is made in this act: *Provided*, That necessary books of reference and periodicals for the chemical laboratory and law library, at a cost not to exceed $500, may be purchased out of the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1901, for salaries and expenses of agents and surveyors, fees and expenses of gaugers, salaries of storekeepers, and for miscellaneous expenses.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section just read. I believe during the last Congress, when this appropriation was up for discussion, if my recollection is right, we had a debate upon this section in the committee, and afterwards in the House. During that discussion the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER] stated that none of the money carried in this section was paid to men who were not officers. I see the gentleman in his seat now, and I call the attention of the committee to the fact that when this fraud fund was up for discussion in the last Congress the gentleman from New York was under the impression that this money was not paid to people who were not officers, but was paid only to revenue officers.

The gentleman will perhaps remember that at that time I stated that he was mistaken. I have now two letters from the Internal-Revenue Department that I will ask to have read from the Clerk's desk, one dated February 6, 1899, and the other January 23, 1900.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1899.

SIR: Replying to your inquiry of the 4th instant, you are advised that the "fraud fund" is expended as provided for in the appropriation, viz: "For detecting and bringing to trial and punishment persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws, or conniving at the same, including payments for information and detection of such violations."

It will be observed that this covers all classes of violations of internal-revenue laws, such as evading special taxes and doing business without paying for same, evading the tax upon distilled spirits and fermented liquors, manufactured tobacco, oleomargarine, and filled cheese, taxes collected under Schedules A and B of the war-revenue act, and all other taxes provided for in said act.

You are advised that all of the $75,000 appropriated last year for this purpose was paid to persons who were not officers, and were in nowise connected with the internal-revenue service except in a temporary capacity.

The greater portion of this fund was expended in the States of North and South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Arkansas, and the mountainous portions of Kentucky, in the discovery and location of illicit stills and guiding posses to them for their destruction and the arrest of the owners and operators. Men thus employed receive a compensation of three and four dollars per day and their expenses while employed.

A considerable portion of this fund has been employed for the purpose of locating and assisting in the destruction of illicit stills in New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other large centers of population, where illicit distilling prevails to a greater or less extent.

Respectfully, yours,

N. B. SCOTT, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. W. KITCHIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1900.

SIR: Replying to your letter of the 19th instant, asking me to inform you how the "fraud fund" was expended during the last fiscal year, I would respectfully refer you to pages 23 to 27 of my report for the year 1899, copy of which has been sent to your address.

Deputy United States marshals are often employed as possemen to accompany the raiding officers, but are paid only for such days as the marshal certifies that they have not received and are not entitled to receive any fees or other emoluments as deputy marshals.

No other officers are employed and paid from the "fraud fund."

Respectfully,

G. W. WILSON, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. W. KITCHIN,
Member of Congress, National Hotel, Washington, D. C.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, it appears from these letters that this money is paid to people who are not officers, though sometimes, the letter says, a deputy marshal, when he is not receiving pay as a marshal, goes with the posse. The ordinary way in which that money is expended is by paying it out to private persons, altogether disconnected with the revenue service, for informing upon their neighbors. It is paid out for this purpose in the mountain regions described in that letter. In other words, it acts in this way: If a man knows where there is an illicit distillery in operation, he goes, nearly always secretly, as I understand, and informs a revenue officer.

That revenue officer finally gets a posse together, and hunts down this illicit still and destroys it, perhaps. Afterwards this informer, whose name is probably never made public and who frequently gives a wrong or fictitious name, is paid $10 by the officer, who is generally true to him, the money coming from this appropriation. That is the usual method in my section. Now, in my opinion, that is a wrong principle upon which to run this business of the Government.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. What do you mean is wrong—the breaking up of these distilleries? [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not object to breaking up illicit distilleries, as suggested by my friend from Mississippi, but——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ask for five minutes more. I have no disposition to detain the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will allow the gentleman from New York to interrupt.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am willing to be interrupted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I was going to suggest that this letter states that these men were in no way connected with the internal-revenue service except in a temporary capacity. These men are appointed only temporarily to investigate certain cases, as I understand.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman is mistaken. This man, who informs in the detection of illicit distilleries, is not an officer; he is temporarily connected only because he has a claim on the Government then for $10 for informing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not understand, if the gentleman will allow me, that this $75,000 is used for the purpose of paying informers. Informers get a certain part of the money collected upon the strength of their information; but they do not get any part of this $75,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman is altogether mistaken. These informers are paid out of this fraud fund. Now, what I say is, this money should not be appropriated for this use. If they want to employ detectives to go into the blockade country, and travel up the creeks and over the mountains and to locate distilleries by the smoke seen from the hilltops, let them do it; but it is wrong in principle to pay a man to betray a friend, no matter what that business is, even if it is an unlawful business. I say it is wrong in principle to hold out a standing temptation to treachery; and

I think the position taken by the gentleman from New York had something to do with the House retaining this fraud fund in this bill two years ago. I have therefore developed these facts to the House, and upon them I move to strike out this fraud fund.

Mr. THROPP. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. THROPP. Have we not in connection with our revenue law some provision that allows a man who informs in connection with the smuggling of goods and evading the revenue laws a certain amount of what the Government receives on the sale of the goods?

Mr. KITCHIN. Perhaps that is true. I can not say.

Mr. THROPP. He has betrayed his friend.

Mr. ALEXANDER. These men I am referring to are not paid out of the $75,000.

Mr. KITCHIN. The informers that I am speaking of, with all due deference to the gentleman's seniority in the House, are paid out of the $75,000, unless I have been most sadly misinformed.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I understand that is the only question on which all parties in North Carolina are agreed. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Practically.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of alien contract-labor laws: For the enforcement of the alien contract-labor laws and to prevent the immigration of convicts, lunatics, idiots, and persons liable to become a public charge, from foreign contiguous territory, $150,000: *Provided*, That one special inspector, whose compensation shall be paid from this appropriation, may be detailed for duty in the Bureau at Washington.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 59, at the end of line 2, insert:

"And hereafter the Commissioner-General of Immigration, in addition to his other duties, shall have charge of the Chinese-exclusion law and of the various acts regulating immigration into the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia."

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. STEELE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 2947. An act to indemnify the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in 1864 for militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863;

S. 2776. An act granting an increase of pension to Pinnie L. Carr;

S. 2729. An act granting a pension to Eliza L. Reese;

S. 3356. An act granting a pension to Mary J. Quinn;

S. 3642. An act to restore to the pension roll the name of Rhenault A. Rollins;

S. 4086. An act granting an increase of pension to T. L. Turnipseed;

S. 3457. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura Ann Smith;

S. 2557. An act granting a pension to Josie Brown;

S. 1455. An act restoring the pension of Alexander W. Browning;

S. 410. An act granting a pension to Harriet V. Gridley;

S. 4276. An act granting an increase of pension to Joel Bowling;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of George H. Morton;

S. 1282. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Huff;

S. 1413. An act granting a pension to Erie E. Farmer;

S. 539. An act granting a pension to Fielding L. Rutherford;

S. 1456. An act granting an increase of pension to Fordyce M. Keith;

S. 1984. An act granting a pension to Rebecca Harvey;

S. 2486. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan Daniels;

S. 2985. An act granting a pension to John Erb;

S. 3879. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Gause;

S. 2827. An act granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Shroder;

S. 4421. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Brown;

S. 2774. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Wilcox;

S. 4077. An act granting a pension to Frances Horton Force;

S. 2111. An act granting a pension to Mary R. Dean;

S. 1781. An act granting a pension to Julia MacV. Henry;

S. 3277. An act granting an increase of pension to Solon Cooper;

S. 2830. An act granting a pension to Aslsie Bennett;

S. 3234. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Yowell;

S. 2831. An act granting an increase of pension to Adolph Cabbell;

S. 3235. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ferguson, of Louisville, Ky.;

S. 1876. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Wilson;

S. 4269. An act granting an increase of pension to James Longstreet;

S. 3107. An act granting a pension to Arthur I. Nicklin;

S. 1006. An act granting a pension to Margaret M. Badger;

S. 2190. An act granting a pension to Emma J. Bidwell;

S. 1348. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Stillman;

S. 4256. An act granting a pension to James H. Thomas;

S. 4087. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Mansur;

S. 4184. An act granting an increase of pension to Evelyn Neale Murray;

S. 1599. An act granting an increase of pension to Cornwell M. Brill;

S. 2152. An act granting a pension to Olive W. Lay;

S. 3527. An act granting a pension to Edwin M. Farnham;

S. 218. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Tate;

S. 262. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Irvin;

S. 476. An act granting a pension to Franklin Cooley;

S. 823. An act granting an increase of pension to Brice Davis;

S. 1069. An act granting a pension to Flora Hollifield;

S. 1280. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred Hering;

S. 1924. An act granting a pension to Emma R. Rusling;

S. 2218. An act granting a pension to Mary R. Dean;

S. 2333. An act granting an increase of pension to James Osborn;

S. 2462. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Du Bois;

S. 3047. An act granting an increase of pension to William Mullevy;

S. 3134. An act granting a pension to Martha Agnew;

S. 3356. An act granting a pension to Mary J. Quinn;

S. 3466. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Hutchison;

S. 3642. An act restoring the pension of Augustus R. Rollins, alias Rhenault A. Rollins;

S. 3746. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Bodurtha;

S. 3880. An act granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Colbath;

S. 4040. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Gage;

S. 4054. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Eldridge; and

S. 4039. An act to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at or near Denver, Arapahoe County, Col.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2729) granting a pension to Eliza L. Reese.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1127) granting an increase of pension to Hannah G. Strong.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 5181. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Smith;

H. R. 9202. An act granting a pension to Alvin Seagraves;

H. R. 2125. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Harris;

H. R. 9574. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine A. Brown;

H. R. 8830. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Boyakin;

H. R. 9944. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Rudiger;

H. R. 1454. An act for the relief of William L. Orr;

H. R. 4138. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Hyatt;

H. R. 9457. An act granting an increase of pension to Roger Fenton;

H. R. 9180. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Colson;

H. R. 1751. An act granting a pension to Cordelia Sessions;

H. R. 3307. An act granting a pension to Matilda Hennessy;

H. R. 4789. An act granting a pension to Mary M. Young;

H. R. 10310. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Back Bay at Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 528. An act granting an increase of pension to Isabel B. Hamilton;

H. R. 5718. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Whitmore;
H. R. 6285. An act granting an increase of pension to James R. Green;
H. R. 3224. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah B. Moore;
H. R. 1943. An act granting an increase of pension to Simon Price.
H. R. 359. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Walker;
H. R. 192. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna H. Tupper;
H. R. 3655. An act granting a pension to Margaret Burns;
H. R. 7391. An act granting a pension to Mira B. Woolson;
H. R. 8655. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar H. Stevens;
H. R. 7614. An act granting an increase of pension to David P. Stewart;
H. R. 4037. An act granting a pension to Annie M. Churchward;
H. R. 6554. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Carlton;
H. R. 2409. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Stevens;
H. R. 741. An act granting an increase of pension to Zedock C. Andrews;
H. R. 8682. An act granting a pension to Louisa C. Germain;
H. R. 2734. An act granting an increase of pension to Dolly L. Harrell;
H. R. 8378. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Steffens;
H. R. 3642. An act granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Lavine;
H. R. 8926. An act granting an increase of pension to Chill W. Hazzard;
H. R. 8422. An act granting a pension to John B. Wetherbee;
H. R. 9714. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander N. Shipley;
H. R. 6159. An act granting an increase of pension to Arnold Bloom;
H. R. 6785. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria Egan;
H. R. 7767. An act granting a pension to Alice D. Roatch;
H. R. 4675. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Jones;
H. R. 8669. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Lake;
H. R. 3481. An act granting a pension to Josephine A. Haley;
H. R. 642. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Doolittle;
H. R. 6195. An act granting a pension to Livingston B. Gregory;
H. R. 7596. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wight;
H. R. 8083. An act granting an increase of pension to James Winnie;
H. R. 4658. An act granting a pension to Anna Hering;
H. R. 8800. An act granting an increase of pension to Bell Fries;
H. R. 7177. An act granting an increase of pension to John N. Breed;
H. R. 8112. An act granting a pension to John Vogler;
H. R. 3131. An act granting a pension to Matilda O'Connor;
H. R. 5088. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Willoughby;
H. R. 3693. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sanford;
H. R. 7624. An act granting an increase of pension to Pleasant H. McBride;
H. R. 4520. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. French;
H. R. 2728. An act granting a pension to Thomas T. Garrison;
H. R. 5435. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Baugher;
H. R. 4832. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Graves;
H. R. 4791. An act granting a pension to Catharine A. Schwunger;
H. R. 4180. An act granting an increase of pension to Austin J. Packett;
H. R. 6375. An act granting an increase of pension to Chester Willis;
H. R. 3563. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Floyd;
H. R. 4247. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis S. Wolfe;
H. R. 857. An act granting an increase of pension to James Chapman;
H. R. 7535. An act granting an increase of pension to Clare H. Burleigh;
H. R. 2076. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace N. Brackett;
H. R. 2748. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Schnetberg; and
H. R. 4805. An act granting a pension to Isaac Price.

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

H. R. 1737. An act granting a pension to Cora I. Cromwell;
H. R. 7022. An act granting a pension to Rhoda A. Patman;
H. R. 1381. An act granting an increase of pension to J. J. Angel;
H. R. 8405. An act granting a pension to Sophronia Seely;
H. R. 4030. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Coleman;
H. R. 4276. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Eggeman;
H. R. 8079. An act granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan;
H. R. 6784. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Neff;
H. R. 4368. An act granting a pension to Flora B. Hinds; and
H. R. 8582. An act making appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURVEYING THE PUBLIC LANDS.

For surveys and resurveys of public lands, $325,000, at rates not exceeding $9 per linear mile for standard and meander lines, $7 for township, and $5 for section lines: *Provided*, That in expending this appropriation preference shall be given, first, in favor of surveying townships occupied, in whole or in part, by actual settlers and of lands granted to the States by the act approved February 22, 1889, and the acts approved July 3 and July 10, 1890, and, second, to surveying under such other acts as provide for land grants to the several States, except railroad land grants and such indemnity lands as the several States may be entitled to in lieu of the lands granted them for educational and other purposes which may have been sold or included in some reservation or otherwise disposed of, and other surveys shall be confined to lands adapted to agriculture and lands within boundaries of forest reservations, except that the Commissioner of the General Land Office may allow, for the survey and resurvey of lands heavily timbered, mountainous, or covered with dense undergrowth, rates not exceeding $13 per linear mile for standard and meander lines, $11 for township, and $7 for section lines, and in cases of exceptional difficulties in the surveys, where the work can not be contracted for at these rates, compensation for surveys and resurveys may be allowed by the said Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, at rates not exceeding $18 per linear mile for standard and meander lines, $15 for township, and $12 for section lines: *Provided further*, That in the States of California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, the Territory of Arizona, and the district of Alaska there may be allowed, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the survey and resurvey of lands heavily timbered, mountainous, or covered with dense undergrowth, rates not exceeding $25 per linear mile for standard and meander lines, $23 for township, and $20 for section lines: And of the sum hereby appropriated there may be expended such an amount as the Commissioner of the General Land Office may deem necessary for examination of public surveys in the several surveying districts, by such competent surveyors as the Secretary of the Interior may select, in order to test the accuracy of the work in the field and to prevent payment for fraudulent and imperfect surveys returned by deputy surveyors, and for examinations of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, and inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, and for making fragmentary surveys and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this section, on line 10 of page 66, by inserting after the word "Montana" the word "Nevada."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 66, line 10, after the word "Montana," insert the word "Nevada."

Mr. NEWLANDS. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that this appropriation, providing for a larger sum for the survey of land difficult of survey in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, applies to all the Pacific coast States and all the intermountain States and Territories, and it will be observed that Nevada is excluded. Nevada has always been included in this appropriation until last year, and then it seems to have been left out by inadvertence. I made inquiry of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and he stated that there was no reason why Nevada should be left out.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman there seems to be no reason why Nevada should be left out, and no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For survey of private land claims in the States of Colorado, Nevada, Wyoming, and Utah, and in the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, confirmed under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a court of private land claims, and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891, and for the resurvey of such private land claims heretofore confirmed as may be deemed necessary, $10,000, said sum to be also available for office work on such surveys and for the examination of the surveys in the field: *Provided*, That

hereafter the notices of survey required by section 10 of said act shall be published in one newspaper only, except where specifically directed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 21, page 67, the words "for completion and classification of the mineral lands in Idaho and Montana, $52,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I make the point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, there was a provision made in the law for the classification and segregation of mineral lands from lands granted to the Northern Pacific Railroad, and this work has all been done with the exception of perhaps six or eight months' work. The amount proposed to be appropriated by this amendment would be sufficient to run for a year. I presume the whole amount would not be needed. The Secretary of the Interior has sent in an estimate for a year of $52,000 which has not been embraced in the bill, and I think ought to be embraced in the bill. The time in which this work was to be done was limited to a certain date, which date has now expired; but there is a general provision of law for the work, and the limitation was merely as to the time in which it should be done.

Now, it was not done within the time, but it was a work in progress. The work that has already been done will be substantially lost unless it is completed, because to go into an area and segregate certain lands and say certain ones are mineral lands and some are not mineral, leaving doubtful tracts of land in the same region, in the same immediate survey, renders practically useless the classification of the remainder, and it ought to be completed. I hope my friend will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this classification was conducted by a commission appointed for that purpose, and the term of service of that commission has expired. This amendment would recreate it, and I suppose is clearly subject to a point of order; and it is practically so admitted by the gentleman from Iowa.

It would be useless for me to attempt to discuss the merits of this proposition with the gentleman from Iowa, because he is thoroughly familiar with it and I do not understand the subject. I am sorry that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] is not here. He was a member of our subcommittee who considered it, and for some reason it was not reported. I do not feel justified in withdrawing the point of order under these circumstances, but possibly something might be done later. At the present time I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For the preparation of the report of the mineral resources of the United States, $50,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Clerk is reading on page 70, line 3. I move to amend by inserting after the words "United States," line 4, page 70, the words "including phosphates."

Now, this item is "for the preparation of the report of the mineral resources of the United States, $50,000." I want the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for one moment. I want to call his attention to the fact that in the preparation of these maps about mineral resources of the United States I was informed by Director Walcott that in the estimate he made for the maps of these resources maps of the phosphate lands of our country would be included.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no new industry sprung up in the United States for the last ten years that is equivalent to this phosphate industry. Millions and millions of tons are going out of the United States to foreign countries, and it is principally all located in my district. Now, what I call attention of the chairman of the committee to and what I want is that this item should include maps of these phosphate lands. This is just as much an industry and a larger industry than some others that he has reported.

Mr. CANNON. I will say that the original estimate, I am informed, was $40,000, and the revised estimate was $50,000, every cent of which was given.

Mr. COX. That is not my trouble. I followed the estimates all the way through, and, with the exception of a small matter on another subject, the estimates have been recommended, but what I want to include is the phosphates of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. They are already included.

Mr. COX. That is my trouble. Every time I try to get the map, they say they have not made them.

Mr. KING. The Secretary of the Interior has recently held that phosphates are included in the term "mineral resources" and phosphate lands in mineral lands, and it has been so adjudicated, notably one case in Florida and one in Utah.

Mr. COX. I understand that, but when they come to make the maps we do not get any.

Mr. CANNON. Why not insert every mineral? If you include one by name, you might exclude others, and I think my friend will find that it is merely a matter of administration. We have recommended in the bill all that has been asked.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman listen a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. COX. This is a matter of construction, and that is all there is in it. All I ask is that this phosphate interest which, in my district alone now employs over 10,000 men, be included specifically in this appropriation. I speak from personal conversation, though I do not like to refer to a matter of that kind, when I say that this amendment would be perfectly agreeable to the Department, as it has already rough maps of the phosphates in my district, which is said to be the largest industry we have. Why should there be any objection to inserting the words "and the phosphates of the United States?"

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CANNON. Let us understand what the gentleman proposes. The language of the bill is "for preparation of the report on the mineral deposits of the United States." Does the gentleman propose to add the words "including phosphates?"

Mr. COX. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I can not see that the amendment would do any harm; and although I think phosphates would be included under the general language already used, I am ready, out of my great respect to the gentleman, to say that so far as I am concerned I have no objection to the insertion of the clause "including phosphates."

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman very much. That is all I ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to inserting after the words "United States," line 4, page 70, the words "including phosphates?"

There was no objection, and the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Supreme Court Reports: To pay the reporter of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States for 76 copies each of volumes 177 to 181, inclusive, of the United States Reports, at a rate not exceeding $2 per volume, under the provisions of section 2 of the act of February 12, 1889, $760.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what is the necessity for these 76 additional copies of certain volumes of the reports of the Supreme Court of the United States? I do not understand why this paragraph has been inserted.

Mr. CANNON. It is in pursuance of special and permanent law, which provides where these reports shall go.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it the object to supply reports that are out of print?

Mr. CANNON. No, sir; current reports.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. They are for distribution to officers named in the statute.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now I understand.

The Clerk read as follows, under the heading "Government Hospital for the Insane:"

For the purchase, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, at a total cost not exceeding $210,000, of not less than 140 acres of land adjoining the present building site, $210,000: *Provided*, That if said amount of land can not be purchased for said amount or for a less sum, the amount herein appropriated shall be applied to the construction of buildings for special classes of patients on the present grounds of the hospital, suitable for the extension as herein proposed.

Mr. MUDD. I make a point of order on the paragraph just read. My point is a familiar one under the second clause of Rule XXI, that this is an appropriation not previously authorized by law. I suppose it will not be contended that the appropriation is in order under the clause of the rule which authorizes appropriations "in continuation of such public works or objects as are already in progress." There is no statute authorizing the purchase of land for this purpose, and I apprehend there can be no question that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have a statute establishing the Government Hospital for the Insane in this District. That statute provides for the reception of insane persons belonging to the Volunteer or the Regular Army and to the Navy. It has been extended also so as to include persons belonging to the Volunteer Army in the war with Spain.

The present buildings are huddled close together, without protection from fire, so that if one of those buildings should burn it would be absolutely impossible to get the patients out.

Not having been over there for a quarter of a century, I went there recently and examined the institution and grounds with some care. After doing so I felt that, as one member of this House of Representatives, I was culpable on account of the condition now existing there. Patients are constantly coming there from among the great number of people who were engaged as part of our Army or Navy in the war for the Union. All the rooms for the reception of patients are occupied, and newcomers are now put in the halls or corridors. It may be said that the institution is absolutely running over. I found the condition there to be such that it absolutely alarmed me, and the subcommitte found a similar condition.

So much for the necessity of this appropriation. Now as to the law. It is provided in the Revised Statutes that—

That there shall be in the District of Columbia a Government Hospital for the Insane, and its objects shall be the most humane care and enlightened curative treatment of the insane of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

After other provisions the statute describes the classes of persons for whom the institution is designed:

The superintendent, upon the order of the Secretary of War, of the Secretary of the Navy, and of the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively, shall receive, and keep in custody until they are cured, or removed by the same authority which ordered their reception, insane persons of the following descriptions:

First. Insane persons belonging to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Revenue-Cutter Service.

Second. Civilians employed in the Quartermaster's and Subsistence Departments of the Army who may be, or may hereafter become, insane while in such employment.

Third. Men who, while in the service of the United States, in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, have been admitted to the hospital, and have been thereafter discharged from it on the supposition that they have recovered their reason, and have, within three years after such discharge, become again insane from causes existing at the time of such discharge, and have no adequate means of support.

Fourth. Indigent insane persons who have been in either of the said services and been discharged therefrom on account of disability arising from such insanity.

Fifth. Indigent insane persons who have become insane within three years after their discharge from such service, from causes which arose during and were produced by said service.

SEC. 4844. All indigent insane persons residing in the District of Columbia at the time they became insane shall be entitled to the benefits of the Hospital for the Insane and shall be admitted on the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, which he may grant after due process of law showing the person to be insane and unable to support himself and family, or himself, if he has no family, under the visitation of insanity.

I will not take the time of the Chair to read further.

Now, here is the establishment of an insane hospital. Here is an absolute necessity for an enlargement of that hospital, at least for a thousand additional patients, and your committee believe, or the majority of the committee believe, that the best interests of this hospital require that the extension of this building should be upon ground adjacent to it, not now owned by the Government, and therefore we thought, under the law, that we had the right, for this service thus established by the law, to recommend the purchase of the additional ground upon which to make this extension. I think it is clearly authorized by the law and clearly in order. We had yesterday a decision by the Chair, on the provision for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which was not so strong a case as this, where it was held to be in order to build new buildings, make additions, etc. It seems to me that I need not multiply words to show that this is both within the letter and spirit of the rule.

Mr. COX. How much is the appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. We appropriate, to buy the land, not exceeding $210,000, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, and in addition to that we authorize the construction of an addition to the hospital upon the land when bought, at not to exceed, in round numbers, a million dollars, and that it shall be completed within this limit, and we authorize a contract.

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

Mr. CANNON. Yes. This law which I have read to the Chair, I will say, imposes no limit upon the cost of this hospital for the insane.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the gentleman from Illinois, in his investigation of the subject, to say that there is a necessity for this increase on account of a large increase in the insanity in the Army recently.

Mr. CANNON. Well, as men grow older, with over 2,500,000 enlistments during the civil war, as their age increases, insanity increases among them. In other words, they become disabled mentally and physically, faster than they die, on an average, and in addition to that——

Mr. BARTLETT. That was not the question I asked. I notice from the papers that there are a large number of men who were not in the civil war, but in the recent war in the Philippines, who have been returned here because they were insane.

Mr. STEELE. If the gentleman will allow me, I notice in the paper a statement of the Surgeon-General that that is not true; that there is no unusual number of insane among the troops in the Philippines.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not opposed to this appropriation. I think it is our duty to provide for these unfortunate insane. I simply stated that I had seen that statement in the papers.

Mr. CANNON. I will answer the gentleman's question. Dr. Richardson stated that there was not an undue number of insane people from the ranks of those now in service in the Army.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understood that the papers stated the other day that there were a large number of cases of soldiers from the Philippines who had become insane.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I asked Dr. Richardson touching that matter because I wanted to know, and his reply was that there was not an unusual number of insane from the ranks of those now in the Army.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to state to the gentleman that I am ready to vote for any increase that is necessary.

Mr. SIMS. And, as a matter of fact, I understand they are crowded in this institution; and we either have to do this or build a new asylum.

Mr. CANNON. This is the building of a new asylum adjacent to the old one; and there is a very great overcrowding in the present institution.

Mr. SIMS. Something will have to be done.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; you are right.

Mr. PEARRE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. PEARRE. Could not this land be secured by condemnation, and would not that perhaps be the better way than to appropriate $210,000 flat, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CANNON. As soon as we get the point of order disposed of, then I will be ready to discuss the merits of the matter.

Mr. PEARRE. I understood the gentleman to open his remarks with a discussion of the merits of the question.

Mr. CANNON. That was incidental to the discussion of the point of order, but as soon as the point of order is disposed of I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that, following the precedents in the West Point case and the Annapolis case, he is compelled to overrule the point of order.

Mr. PEARRE. Now I put the question again: Is there no provision of law now by which this property might be condemned according to the usual method without giving to the Secretary of the Interior or anybody else the discretion to expend $210,000 for a purpose like this?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that I am satisfied, as far as I am concerned, that this is an apt provision; but, possibly not according with me fully in all respects, my colleague on the subcommittee [Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts] desires to submit a word, and I will answer the question of the gentleman from Maryland a little later, first yielding to my colleague.

Mr. PEARRE. I was going to suggest, if the gentleman will permit me, that this makes the price about $1,500 an acre for this land, the amount of land being 140 acres.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] does not answer the gentleman fully about that matter to his satisfaction, I will do so later on.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. CANNON. A little later I will answer it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is a question that is very pertinent at this time. I should like to ask the gentleman how much longer he is going to ask the House to sit this evening?

Mr. CANNON. I should like the House to continue the consideration of this bill until 6 o'clock. I am very anxious to finish it to-morrow, and it is very important to us all, in the interest of getting away in due season, that we should do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There will be no other business transacted this evening except this bill?

Mr. CANNON. I presume not. I think I can assure my friend——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman can assure some of those who wish to go away by saying that he will object to the consideration of anything else.

Mr. CANNON. I do not desire to quote anybody here by saying that evidently there would be no quorum, if the point was raised.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have been unable to agree with my colleagues upon the subcommittee upon the proposition in the pending paragraph. I have not brought myself to the conclusion that the purchase of this land at the price named in the paragraph is a wise expenditure of money. Yet, having stated my views about the subject, I shall pursue it no further, but yield to the judgment of my colleagues and to the judgment of this committee.

The situation at the Insane Asylum is a deplorable one. I never had been at the asylum until I went over there for the purpose of looking at this ground. I was shocked to find the condition in which those poor, helpless people, who are in our charge, are found, and there is nothing more pressing upon us than an immediate expenditure of a very large amount of money for the care of the insane. So there is no question between us upon that subject. But the question in this particular paragraph is that of the purchase of a large quantity of land adjoining the land already owned by the Government.

The committee ought to understand just the situation over there. The Government owns a large tract of land upon the

right-hand side of the street, upon which the present hospital buildings are situated. That tract of land is not large enough for our purposes. The United States owns about 150 acres of excellent land adapted to the purpose of building new buildings for the hospital; which land lies just across the street. We already own that. It is used for agricultural purposes simply, at the present time.

Now, the tract of land which it is proposed to purchase is in private ownership, and is a continuation, on the same side of the street, of the land already occupied by the buildings of the asylum. The proposition is, instead of crossing the street and using the land which we already own, for the new buildings, which land is adapted for that purpose, to keep upon the same side of the street where we now are, and buy this 140 acres additional.

If I thought the hospital was forever to stay where it now is, I think I should be in favor of that proposition at any reasonable price; but my view is that the hospital ought in time be moved, and I shall state some reasons for that opinion later on.

It is worth while to know a little something about the history of this provision. In the sundry civil bill last year there was a provision attached in the Senate providing for the purchase of 105 acres of this 140 acres, for the sum of $245,000, I think.

That provision went out in conference. Now, then, the same proposition is brought here again. The original proposition presented to our committee asked $2,500 an acre for 140 acres. Suitable and skillful experts were employed by us to appraise the land, and they appraised it at $1,900 an acre, $400 more an acre than the price here. I would say to the gentleman from Maryland, that, in view of the conditions that exist in the District of Columbia, I would rather pay almost any price for land, if we have got to have it, than to take the chance of a jury.

The difficulty here is that the people here do not pay their own bills. They have to pay half of them, and there is not that same public spirit and that same question of expenditures that there is elsewhere. If we were proposing to do anything of this kind in any other city in the country, the press would discuss the matter and there would be some public criticism and discussion upon it on one side and the other. Here the whole community is silent, and we have got to pass on these questions as best we can, unaided by a vigilant public opinion.

Mr. PEARRE. If the gentleman will allow me; has not this whole matter been taken up very recently? Did not the recommendation from the Secretary of the Interior only come to his committee about the 28th of April?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not know.

Mr. CANNON. On the contrary, I will state to my friend that the estimates for the purchase of this land were submitted on the first Monday in December.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I would like a few more moments.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It was discussed last year and put on the sundry civil bill last year.

Mr. CANNON. On the Senate side.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It was $30,000 last year and $35,000 more in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the gentleman's request?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That I have five minutes more.

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

Mr. COX. Before the gentleman takes his seat, I would like to ask him one question.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am not going to take my seat; but the gentleman may ask me a question.

Mr. COX. I take pleasure in asking you a question. If you are going to make this appropriation, I want to ask you are you going to let the old rebel insane go in there?

Mr. BENTON. None of us are insane.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I certainly have no objection, I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee; but we can not deal with it in this bill. Now, to return to the subject——

Mr. COX. One more question. We treat you better than that down in Tennessee.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Come up our way and we will treat you just as well as a man can be treated in Massachusetts; just as we treated Gen. Joe Wheeler.

Mr. COX. Joe Wheeler was but one man in the whole Confederacy; but we do not want to go to your Washington asylum at all.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. We are proposing to pay $1,500 an acre for this land by the paragraph under consideration. That is the lowest proposition that has ever been offered to us by anybody, all agree, and the judgment of my colleagues upon the committee is that it is a safe and wise thing to take that land at that price. I regret very much that I am not of the same opinion.

I went over to see the land. That land, in my judgment, to anybody else except the United States, would not sell for $500 an acre. I do not pretend to be expert on the value of land here, but a large part of it is low Potomac flat land, that is worth absolutely nothing.

I would not give $10 an acre for it. It is of no use unless it can be improved for wharf property. The other part of it, about two-thirds of it, is high land, good land, wooded land, but not situated in a way that will ever make it of very great value. I was told by Dr. Richardson, in charge of the hospital, that the owner is paying taxes upon the land at a rate of a little more than a hundred dollars an acre.

Mr. MUDD. It is assessed at that?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That is the assessed valuation. We have no other means of knowing except what Dr. Richardson told us, which was that they are paying on a little more than $100 an acre; that that was the assessed value of the land.

Mr. GAINES. How much do they ask for it?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Fifteen hundred dollars an acre. Now, we are aware, as practical men, that land of that kind generally is worth a great deal more than it is assessed, but this is a very great discrepancy. What I would do if I had the power, Mr. Chairman, is this: I would take care of the insane people and give them proper buildings.

I would erect those buildings across the street upon land already owned by the United States, and then I would go out upon some of the beautiful hills, upon the Virginia or Maryland side of the Potomac, and find a place not full of malaria as this is. It is full of malaria, as everybody knows, and will be until the Potomac flat there is filled up.

The malaria will not cease unless that is done. I would go out upon some of these beautiful hills where there was railroad communication, ready communication, and buy land at ten or twenty dollars an acre, and buy enough of it, and would erect upon that land such buildings for the care of God's unfortunate creatures as would be an example and inspiration to the people of all the States of the Union instead of it being, as it is to-day, a reproach.

My colleagues agree that that would be a wise and ideal thing to do, but they think it is not practicable. If it is not practicable, we agree that we have got to buy this land, and probably we have got to pay this amount. They have got us by the throat, the people who own the land, and perhaps we have got to pay this amount. I myself think it is not impracticable. I think we could build on our own land or go elsewhere. I shall not make any motion to strike the appropriation out, but I wanted to state how I felt upon this matter.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why not go across the street and build?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That is my proposition at the present time, but the physician in charge of the institution wants that land for farming purposes. The practical effect of it is, of course, that if we occupy our own land for farming purposes and buy this other land at $1,500 an acre, we are really buying land at $1,500 an acre to be used for farming purposes.

Mr. PEARRE was recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can get——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. PEARRE. I simply wanted to offer an amendment, and after I do that I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Inasmuch as I substantially voice the committee in this matter, I would be glad to speak of it now, if my friend will allow me to do it.

Mr. PEARRE. If the gentleman will first let me offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

Mr. PEARRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, beginning with line 24, page 74, and strike out the words "purchase under the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury," and then after the word "three," in line 24, insert the word "condemnation;" so as to read: "for the condemnation at a total cost not to exceed $210,000, not less than 140 acres land adjoining," etc.

Then I desire to offer a further amendment, striking out the proviso from line 3 to line 8.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Where does the gentleman think the Government would come out under that process, when it can be shown to the jury that experts which we sent there had reported to us that the land was worth $1,900 an acre?

Mr. PEARRE. The Government would come out no worse than under this proposition. The Government ought to have the advantage of having the land condemned under the law. The assumption of the gentleman from Massachusetts is that there would be some roguery.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No; not roguery. I said nothing of that kind.

Mr. PEARRE. If the laws of the land do not provide a proper method for ascertaining the value of land, then the law of eminent domain is a failure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 74, line 24, after the first "the," strike out the words "purchased in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior" and insert the word "condemnation;" so that it will read, "for the condemnation at a total cost," etc.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has fairly stated this matter touching this property as to its location, etc., with the exception that he gets most too much of the tract of land it is proposed to buy into the lowland. Now, I quite agree with him that if I was going to construct an insane asylum, I would go over into Maryland or Virginia or a remote place in the District and buy fifteen hundred acres, or a thousand acres at least, and build an asylum. But if you were to do that, before you could get ready to occupy it it would be five or ten years. In the meantime we have got this crowded condition there. So that, in any event, we have got, before going to work, whether we build another asylum or not, to provide quarters for a thousand additional people.

The tract of land across the road, which the gentleman refers to, is 140 acres, a part of it plow land, a part of it grass land, has a dairy farm, and employees' quarters upon it. Now, Dr. Richardson, when we insisted that we ought to go across the road, said that it was necessary for him to have for a certain class of patients some place to employ them. We used that for all it was worth for the purpose of getting the best possible offer upon this land. The new buildings could be constructed across the road; but on that side there are more or less of buildings; and Dr. Richardson and the board of visitors agreed that the buildings which might be constructed over there would not be as private as they ought to be for the purposes of the asylum.

The 140 acres which it is proposed to buy make a very fine place upon which to erect the buildings. The ground is sightly; it is adjacent to the present buildings. In my judgment, as we would have no time in which to enter upon the policy of erecting an entirely new establishment (that may come later), we have to do one of two things, if we perform our duty and are not culpable. We must commence, and commence at once, to provide quarters for these 1,000 additional people, either upon the 140 acres which we propose to purchase, or on the land across the road.

Now, touching the price of this land. At the last session of Congress there came to us a proposition originating in the Senate to buy 104 acres of this land (not 140) at $2,500 an acre. I need not say that that provision went off the bill in conference. The House did not assent to it; and the Senate receded.

Mr. COWHERD. Is the land which it is proposed to purchase on both sides of the road?

Mr. CANNON. No; it is adjacent to the present property and away from the road.

Mr. COWHERD. Is the present property on both sides of the road?

Mr. CANNON. About 150 acres are on one side of the road, away from the hospital; and 130 or 140 acres, I am told, are included in the hospital site.

We absolutely refused to assent to $2,500 per acre as the price of this land. After some negotiation on the part of Dr. Richardson and the Board of Visitors, Mr. Parker, a real estate agent of this city and a man of character, having no interests in that part of the District—many members, I have no doubt, know him—and Mr. Waggaman, another real estate agent, who was vouched for and of whom we know something—he also having no interests in that direction—were chosen a board to appraise this land.

They went over it and appraised it at $1,900 an acre. That looked to me like an outrageous price; I think it was. I think I would go a little better than my brother MOODY has said that he would; but if I had the money I certainly would not pay over $1,000 an acre, if that much, for the land as an investment. But it is adjacent to the asylum, and we are under conditions that make it desirable, as it seems to me and as it seemed to the board of visitors and Dr. Richardson, that the new buildings should be constructed upon those adjacent 140 acres—on account of the view, on account of the privacy, and on account of its being adjacent, and that we should keep the 140 or the 150 acres where the dairy farm now is for the purposes I have indicated.

We put this proposition in the alternative, providing an appropriation of not exceeding $210,000 to buy, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, this land which it is proposed to sell to the Government; and if it is not bought we direct the construction of these additional buildings on land now owned by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I would like a minute or two more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to permitting the gentleman to proceed?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. We are not in harmony with the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland for the reason assigned by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have no doubt that any jury that you might impanel in the District of Columbia would, after hearing the evidence, fix for this land a price—I was going to say double, but I will say nearly double—what we can get it for at private sale. It is an industry in the District of Columbia to live off of the Government. I am not speaking disrespectfully of anybody; perhaps I should be the same way if I lived in the District of Columbia. It is a praiseworthy industry.

I repeat, I would not assent to the acquirement of this land by condemnation. Now, we have an offer of the land at $400 an acre less than the price fixed by the appraisers, and $1,000 an acre less than was proposed in the Senate amendment of last session.

Mr. GAINES. I should like to know what has been the experience in this District in regard to the condemnation of property by a jury. Has there been anything like robbery?

Mr. CANNON. At the end of condemnation proceedings an enormous price is always fixed. I do not believe I shall ever vote for another proposition to condemn property in the District of Columbia for the use of the Government. We paid over $1,000 an acre for land for the establishment of the Rock Creek Park, and that was some years ago.

Mr. GAINES. Can not the court, if the jury fixes an exorbitant price, set aside the finding?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I presume my friend understands the situation.

Mr. GAINES. I certainly regret very much that the District of Columbia has in it the sort of people who would practice extortion on the Government.

Mr. CANNON. I have said all that I desire to say touching this matter. I am quite content that the Committee of the Whole shall do what it thinks best.

Mr. DE ARMOND. As I understand this matter from the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Government now owns at this Government asylum over 280 acres of land; and the question before this Committee of the Whole at present is whether it is advisable to buy 140 acres more at a cost of $210,000, or whether it is advisable, without any expense at all for the site, to erect additional buildings on a part of the 280 acres which the Government already owns. I believe about 280 acres was the amount the gentleman stated.

Mr. CANNON. All told, on both sides of the road. I am not precisely accurate, but I think nearly that.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I do not care about the exact amount. Now, that does seem to be rather a remarkable proposition to a man who has not given it much consideration and who does not assume to know much about it. A quarter of an acre, a half an acre, or an acre of this land will be occupied by the buildings to be erected, and yet, with the Government owning 280 acres of land, the proposition is made here that none of that land be utilized, but that 140 acres more, at the enormous price of $1,500 an acre, be bought in order that the buildings to be erected may be placed upon that new site.

One of the reasons suggested is that the land which the Government now has, which it is proposed not to use for a building site, is desirable as a playground or place of exercise for some of the patients. How much of that ground would be taken? Just the quantity precisely that the new buildings to be erected would occupy, and no more? It may be suggested, and I believe was suggested, that this land ought to be held for agricultural purposes. Then, in order to hold some of the lands that we have for agricultural purposes, we are to buy substitute lands, 140 acres of them, at $1,500 an acre, while the land for agricultural purposes is probably not worth $10 an acre. The agriculture, probably, is the most expensive performance that the Government can engage in, aside from investment in such lands.

Now, I do not assume to know much about this. I have not been upon the committee. I am not acquainted with the facts in the matter, except as they are disclosed here by the bill, and by the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. But it seems that this is as clearly an unnecessary waste of money as anything that can be suggested.

The provision itself is a remarkable one, and the gentleman calls attention to it. It provides that if this land can not be bought for the $210,000 or less, that the $210,000 shall be utilized for making improvements, for erecting buildings for special classes of patients, on the present grounds of the hospital. The whole proposition rests upon the other proposition, that it is necessary to have additional hospital facilities for these patients. The additional hospital facilities are urgent, it is said here, and are to be supplied, provided the money is not utilized by the purchase of this land at an enormous price, land which is not needed and which the Government ought not to buy. If the $210,000 goes for the purchase of the land, then so far as the buildings or improvements are concerned, why the patients can wait and the overcrowded condition can continue.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman simply has not read all of the provision. If he will read on further he will find how badly in error he is.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Well, that may be. Very frequently a man

by reading more, finds out more and discovers that he is in error. I have not time to read that, and will take the gentleman's suggestion in regard to it.

The proposition, however, is that there shall be appropriated $210,000 more, if the gentleman's suggestion is correct, for these needed improvements, provided the land is bought, and $210,000 less if the land is not bought. I suppose I am right about that.

Now, the improvement is to be made upon the other side of the road if we do not buy this land. How important it is to have the improvements all upon one side of the road! There is a suggestion that a building put upon this other side of the road would not be just as private as might be desirable. Two hundred and ten thousand dollars for this privacy is privacy purchased at rather a high rate, it seems to me. Two hundred and ten thousand dollars for 140 acres of land that probably could not be sold for $80,000, unless it is unloaded upon the Government, is an investment I think we ought not to make.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MUDD. I desire to move to strike out the section in order to have the matter squarely before the House, to strike out the paragraph from line 24, on page 74, down to line 8, on page 75.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] has been recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have given the matter under consideration a good deal of attention, as a member of the subcommittee that framed this bill. Dr. Richardson, who has charge of the asylum, is said to be one of the best-equipped men for his duties in this country.

The condition of the asylum and the improvement of the facilities for caring for the unfortunate insane was brought to our attention not only by the estimates sent to our committee, but by Dr. Richardson himself.

The crowded condition of the buildings already there and the condition and proximity of those buildings amount almost to a national scandal.

Dr. Richardson thinks with the scheme and plans he has in his mind he can make this one of the model asylums of the world if he could secure the 140 acres of land, the purchase of which is contemplated by the paragraph under consideration, and he and those associated with him in the conduct of the asylum and the board of visitors are very anxious to acquire the same.

There is not room on the present site of the asylum for the buildings necessary. While there is some land across the street that belongs to the asylum, now used as a farm, on which buildings could be erected, it is not in his judgment, nor is it in mine, suitable for the purpose, even if it were not needed for a farm.

The land suitable for building sites is near the street and has not that privacy that should be had for buildings for the keeping of the insane. There would be many other inconveniences besides the practical destruction of the farm, which he thinks very essential for the working of a certain class of lunatics. In the matter of hauling alone he thinks he could save $7,000 or $8,000 a year by the running of a railroad switch up a ravine on the land sought to be acquired.

As has been stated, during the last session of Congress the Senate added to the sundry civil bill a proposition to buy 104 acres of this land, at nearly a thousand dollars an acre more than we propose to pay for it now. The conferees on the part of the House opposed the amendment, and it was rejected. After this matter was brought to our attention a proposition was made, I think by the owners of the land, that the representative of the Government should select a man, and they would select one, and let them agree on the price.

This was done. The gentleman selected by the representative of the Government valued the land at $1,800 per acre, and the gentleman selected by the owners valued it at $2,000, and they finally agreed on $1,900 per acre. Our committee was not a party to this agreement, and we were all impressed with the idea that the price was too high.

The chairman of the committee suggested to me that we look somewhere else for a suitable site for the asylum. We made inquiries and went out to the country—4 or 5 miles out—near and beyond the Soldiers' Home, to look at some sites. The best offer we could get for a desirable site was $2,000 per acre.

We had not then visited the asylum. When we went over there I was not only very greatly impressed with the necessity for some immediate steps being taken for the relief of the asylum, but I was also greatly impressed with the impracticability of moving the asylum away from the present site. You would spend millions of dollars before you would get a new site and put on it what they have there now in the various forms of improvement.

It is one of the highest locations anywhere about Washington, and the present site, in connection with the land sought to be acquired, in my judgment, would make one of the most beautiful locations to be found anywhere. Of all the pretty views about this city I know of none comparable to those from the high points overlooking the river on the present grounds and those they wish to acquire.

You gentlemen can go out there on the balcony now and see this location, but you can not fully appreciate the view you get from there. From a point in the woods on the ground we propose to purchase is a view of Washington, Arlington, Alexandria, the entire river from above Georgetown to Alexandria, and I doubt if there is a prettier place for an asylum to be had within 100 miles of the city of Washington. I have no idea it will ever be moved from there.

Then the question presents itself, If you are going to expend a million of dollars on improvements on a permanent institution, will you put that investment where those best informed as to the needs of the institution think they ought not to be, on account of the price proposed to be paid for the land that those who should be best posted about it think is decidedly preferable?

I always thought myself that it was an exhibition of poor economy for a man who was going to erect a fine building to allow the price between a suitable and an unsuitable lot, if the price were anywhere within reason, to select the unsuitable lot.

I am as much opposed as any gentleman here to seeing the Government imposed on by exorbitant prices, and I will go with any gentleman on this floor on any feasible proposition to get this land at as low a price as it can be had.

I made the suggestion myself in the committee that we have this land condemned, but I became convinced, from the statements of the chairman of the committee, who has had much more experience in condemnation proceedings in the District of Columbia than I have, that it would be more expensive to the Government to have it condemned.

We therefore, by a good deal of talk about going elsewhere and "bluffing" around about it, had some assurances, if this amount of money were appropriated, we could secure this land and that this was the best figure at which we could buy it, and, believing it very desirable and knowing no way to get it for less, I agreed to and favored the paragraph now sought to be stricken out.

I wish the members of this committee could go over to the asylum and see the necessity for the extension, have Dr. Richardson explain the scheme of the extension, and I believe they would be impressed, as I have been, with the importance of carrying it out by the purchase of this ground.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] says that we would be paying too much for privacy. I differ with him, Mr. Chairman. If privacy is better for this poor, unfortunate class, the care of which the Government has assumed, it is hard to pay too much for it. They are sent there to be treated and if possible cured, and if not, cared for. Then, whatever will best secure the purposes for which this institution is intended is not too high, in my opinion. He also suggested that the building would only cover a quarter or half an acre. He is very much mistaken. They will be erected on 75 or 80 acres.

Mr. DE ARMOND. They will not cover 75 or 80 acres?

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. They will not actually cover the whole ground, but the system of buildings which it is proposed to erect will occupy that much ground. It is not intended to be one great building, but, as we have been informed and believe, the most approved system now is to distribute the patients around in small buildings, and not have so many of them in the same building.

Mr. COWHERD. But the extension is to be fireproof, as provided for in the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. It is to be fireproof, of course.

Mr. COWHERD. That does not mean a system of cottages, then?

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Yes; the cottages are to be fireproof.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. DE ARMOND. What is the reason it would not be better to build another asylum away from there if the cottage plan is a good plan? Why should all this asylum be over there? Why not have two places removed a considerable distance, any distance, so far as that is concerned?

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. I do not know that there is any particular objection to it except the objection there always is to making two or three institutions where one will answer, and that you multiply to a considerable extent the expense of your institutions when you divide them up.

Mr. DE ARMOND. If you build small cottages, you will have multiplied them.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. You may multiply somewhat the number of your attendants by the cottage plan, but there are very many expenses that would be doubled by making two asylums instead of one.

Mr. DE ARMOND. You have to have so many attendants.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Now, in conclusion, gentlemen of

the committee, while the price of this land may appear to you to be high, and doubtless is, yet remember you are going to erect permanent fireproof buildings and improvements, the cost of which will be a million of dollars. You are fixing up an asylum in one of the most beautiful cities in the world, for one of the greatest governments in the world, and an asylum that will probably remain there as long as the Government lasts. This being the case, you should put your improvement on the most desirable ground to be had for the purposes to which this great institution is dedicated.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offered the amendment to strike out the paragraph. I do not want to take up the time of the committee, but as I made a point of order against this section I desire to say a word or two in explanation of my reasons for so doing.

I want to say in the beginning that most certainly I am in favor of making adequate and even liberal provision for the care and the maintenance of the insane. But my objection to this particular section in the way it reads is that from the information that comes to me the price proposed to be paid for this land is excessive. We are proposing to pay $1,500 an acre for land which is now assessed at a hundred dollars, and I can not believe there can be that amount of difference between the assessed value and what the land is really worth.

Another objection is, we propose to buy a certain specific piece of land from a certain particular individual or syndicate. That, I understand, is the intention, and that will be the consequence if this provision is adopted. I think that is an obnoxious method of buying land for Government purposes. And, further than that, my information is that this tract of land takes in a part of a subdivision known as "Pencote Heights." This subdivision, the exact size of which I do not know, has been laid out in streets, lanes, and alleys, constituting in area about a third of it, in pursuance of a law which, as I understand, was upon the statute book some years ago, if not now.

Now, there is a bill before the Committee on the District of Columbia, having already passed the Senate, for the repeal of this subdivision, and providing that the streets, lanes, and alleys shall revert to the original owners. The language in this bill does not provide that we may buy such portion of the 140 acres of land that we choose, or that we may buy no more than 140 acres, but that we shall buy at least 140 acres of the land. Therefore, if the information that comes to me is correct, if this section of the bill shall remain, we will have to include these streets and lanes and alleys, and we will pay $1,500 an acre for land that has been so laid out over there, the title to which is now in the Government of the United States.

I say that I am not quite clear as to whether this information is true or not, but it came to me in such a shape that it seems to bear the earmarks of truth, and therefore I think it would be better that this paragraph should go out of the bill now and let the bill go to the Senate, and in the meantime more definite and more accurate information can, and I assume will, be obtained, and this matter can be considered and passed upon with more of reliable information and knowledge than the committee seems now to be in possession of.

I understand the Government has a large quantity of unoccupied land over there.

It seems to me that this House should not require the Secretary of the Interior to buy one specific tract of land already marked and bounded, perhaps already informally bargained for, including streets and alleys, the title to which is now in the United States, when there might be a better arrangement made or perhaps a better bargain secured for just as desirable land.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Who is the owner of this land?

Mr. MUDD. I do not know positively. I am just recently informed that it is owned or controlled by a Mr. A. E. Randle, a most excellent gentleman, I may add, for whom I have a very high personal regard, and I would like to see him prosper in any way that he can; but I am not in favor of any arrangement that contemplates a bad bargain for the Government or the purchase by it of any part of its own property with its own funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PEARRE].

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CANNON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 23, noes 12.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for tellers. I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The gentleman can not carry over his demand for tellers.

Mr. CANNON. Let us see.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the committee may rise pending the demand.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Undoubtedly it can.

Mr. BARTLETT. I make the point of order that the committee was dividing, and nothing else is permissible until that is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The result has not been announced.

Mr. BARTLETT. The House was about to divide, and no motion is permissible while the House is dividing.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The House had divided and the Chair had announced the result, and the committee had a right to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not announced the vote.

Mr. BARTLETT. The point of order, Mr. Chairman, I make is this: The committee was dividing—had not finished dividing—and the Chair had not announced the vote, and as a result of what was the apparent vote the gentleman from Illinois called for tellers; that part of the division—that part of the process of dividing on the part of the committee had not taken place; and the point of order that I make is that while the committee is dividing no motion is permissible.

The CHAIRMAN. It is perfectly competent for the House, upon an order for the yeas and nays, to entertain a motion to adjourn, and quite as competent for the committee to rise upon a demand for tellers.

Mr. DE ARMOND. An order for the yeas and nays is one thing and a demand for tellers another. It has not been determined whether tellers are to be ordered or not. Is the demand to go over? If the demand does not go over, the demand is withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. Well, let the Chair announce the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the yeas are 23 and the nays 12.

Mr. CANNON. There are not 100 present, Mr. Chairman, and I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The gentleman may find that that point may be made again.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will not purchase immunity. If the gentleman will spend a half a day over there to-morrow, I will take his judgment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. If those who are opposed to this should leave and go over there, the gentleman might get this item through. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. I said a half a day to-morrow morning. I am not interested in this any further than the public service.

The CHAIRMAN (having counted). Forty-eight members present; not a quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11212, and finding itself without a quorum, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8188. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1893, for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following change of reference:

The bill (S. 3339) for the relief of Leonard Wilson—from the Committee on War Claims to the Committee on Claims

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TERRY, for three days, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. MAHON, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BARTHOLDT, indefinitely, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Labor, submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for that Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2559) authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to redeem or make allowance for internal-revenue stamps, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1200); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4129) to detach the county of Dyer from the eastern division of the western district of Tennessee and to attach the same to the western division of the western district of said State of Tennessee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1201); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORLISS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10966) permitting the building of a dam across the St. Joseph River near the village of Berrien Springs, Berrien County, Mich., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1202); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11283) to establish Calais, in the State of Maine, as a subport of entry, and to extend the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the ports of Eastport and Calais, in the State of Maine, reported the same in lieu of H. R. 2960, accompanied by a report (No. 1206); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COUSINS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 7) authorizing foreign exhibitors at the Pan-American Exposition, to be held in Buffalo, N. Y., in 1901, to bring to this country foreign laborers from their respective countries for the purpose of preparing for and making their exhibits, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1207), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10740) to regulate the grades of Twentieth street, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1209); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10040) to amend Title LXV of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to telegraph companies, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1210); 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. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2570) granting an increase of pension to John M. Swift, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1203); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3480) granting a pension to John Holland, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1204); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10870) granting a pension to Herbert J. Graff, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1205); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6573) for the relief of P. B. S. Pinchback, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1208); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JETT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3135) to correct the military record of Lieut. Edward B. Howard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1211); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

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. 3076) granting a pension to George Edward Littleton, late pilot of steam vessels of United States—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11270) for the relief of Abraham Pope, of Lovejoy, Ill.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5857) for the relief of Crosby J. Ryan—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 11280) to repeal certain acts relating to Chinese immigration, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 11281) permitting building a dam across New River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11282) to extend the privileges of section 1226 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to all officers who served during the war with Spain and in the campaign in the Philippine Islands as volunteers in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means: A bill (H. R. 11283) to establish Calais, in the State of Maine, as a subport of entry, and to extend the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the ports of Eastport and Calais, in the State of Maine—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 11324) to divide the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory, into counties, to establish county seats therein, and to provide for a land office and recorder in each county, and defining the duties of county clerks as recorders, and so forth—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A resolution (H. Res. 245) fixing a time for consideration of the bill (S. 2) to construct a Pacific cable—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A resolution (H. Res. 246) providing for the moving, cleaning, and cataloguing of books, documents, and so forth—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 11284) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. E. F. McCormick—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 11285) to correct military record of James H. Davis, late of Company B, East Tennessee National Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11286) to correct the military record of John W. Hays—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11287) to correct military record of Pleasant Thomas, late of Company B, East Tennessee National Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11288) to correct the military record of Capt. John C. Wilson, late Company C, Forty-seventh Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11289) to pay Preston B. Stanfill for services rendered as a scout in civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11290) granting a pension to Mrs. Emily Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11291) granting a pension to Henry C. Gay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11292) granting a pension to Dora C. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11293) granting a pension to Allen C. Hyden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11294) granting a pension to Starlin Stanfill, late a scout, Twenty-third Army Corps, civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11295) granting a pension to James Whitehead, late Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11296) granting a pension to Mrs. Bethena Brumley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11297) granting an increase of pension to Eli Marlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 11298) for the relief of Thomas C. Gibbons, of Ascension Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 11299) granting a pension to W. W. Houston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11300) granting a pension to Samuel Briley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11301) granting a pension to Mary Esser—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 11302) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew S. Abbott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 11303) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Killen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 11304) for the relief of West H. Washburn, of Humphreys County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11305) granting a pension to Grace B. Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11306) to increase the pension of James J. Christie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11307) to increase the pension of John Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 11308) granting an increase of pension to Byron C. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 11309) for the relief of Marshall Snyder, of Matteawan, N. Y.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 11310) granting an increase of pension to John Vale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 11311) granting a pension to George W. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11312) granting an increase of pension to Johnson H. Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11313) granting an increase of pension to Mathias T. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 11314) granting an increase of pension to John F. Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11315) granting an increase of pension to George W. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 11316) for the relief of the Good Shepherd Industrial School—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11317) for the relief of James Conway, late of Company I, Tenth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11318) for the relief of Chauncey Boyce, late of Company C, Sixth Michigan Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11319) for the relief of Charles Stewart, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11320) for the relief of Hiram Winas, late of Company G, Fifteenth Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11321) granting an increase of pension to Harriet V. Gridley, widow of the late Charles V. Gridley, captain, United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11322) for the relief of William T. Perry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11323) for the relief of Edward W. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 11325) granting a pension to Phineas L. Squires—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. E. McCormick—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Congregational Church, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Montrose, Frances Willard Union, of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging the enactment of a law forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Union of Pueblo, Colo., against the ceding of public lands to States and Territories—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of R. B. Hayes Post, No. 90, of Windsor, Colo., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Protests of Painters and Decorators of America and the Building Trades Council of Cleveland, Ohio, and vicinity, against any legislation increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Petition of M. S. Vandusen and others, of Stuttgart, Ark., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of Jo. Allen Hudson and 22 citizens of Texas, urging the enactment of the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Champion Hill Post, of Brookston, Ind., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 1477, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin: Petition of the Science Club, of the University of Wisconsin, favoring Senate bill No. 2019, relating to the United States Naval Observatory—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Williamson Post, No. 109, of Dodgeville, Wis., Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of amendment to pension act of 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Resolution of the Boot and Shoe Club, of Boston, Mass., with reference to the bill for the encouragement of the American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GAINES: Petition of heir of Mrs. Nancy Batson, late of Humphreys County, Tenn., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petition of Charles A. Bye and other retail druggists of Lakewood, N. J., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. J. Bailie Adams and the Presbyterian Church of Elwood, N. J., urging the passage of House bill prohibiting the sale of liquor in the Army and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Alex, C. Yard and other citizens of Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, in the interest of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of churches of Oakmont, Pa., urging the enactment of a clause in the Hawaiian constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petitions of Building Trades Council and Painters and Decorators, of Columbus, Ohio, against the passage of the Grout bill taxing butterine, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolutions of American Federation of Labor, No. 6876, Chillicothe, Ohio, for the passage of a free-homestead bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Ross County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of National Bicycle Workers and Allied Mechanics; also resolutions of Journeymen Horseshoers' Union and Carpenters' Union No. 61, of Columbus, Ohio, against the passage of the Grout bill to increase the tax on oleomargarine, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of the Woodbury Drug Company, of Woodbury, Conn., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACK: Paper to accompany House bill No. 7985, to correct the military record of John Carroll, of Westmoreland County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the case of Marshall Snyder, of Matteawan, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of G. L. Walker and other druggists of Ottumwa, Iowa, for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petitions of 544 farmers in Androscoggin, Cumberland, Kennebec, Franklin, and Oxford counties, Me., in favor of the Grout bill increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Johnson H. Fitzpatrick, of Greene County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Mathias T. Hamilton, of Doverhill, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Papers to accompany House bill

granting an increase of pension to George W. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Good Shepherd Industrial School, of Milwaukee, Wis.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of F. E. Willard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Auburn, N. Y., favoring the passage of Graham, Gillett, and Bowersock bills—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of 27 citizens of Victory, N. Y., in favor of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petitions of Wolcott Grange, No. 348, and South Shore Grange, No. 552, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce, and for State control of imitation dairy products as provided in House bill No. 3717—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of C. F. Griffin and others, of New York, against the passage of House bill No. 10275, amending the postal law relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Resolutions of Lyme, Conn., Grange, favoring rural free delivery and other matters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Church of Christ, Ann Arbor, Mich., protesting against the passage of bill extending the limit of time for holding live stock in transit from twenty-four to forty hours—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3958, increasing the pension of Rollin Tyler, of Odell, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Petition of W. J. McClure and others, of Kootenai County, Idaho, for an appropriation to deepen and widen the channel of the Spokane River at the outlet of Cœur d'Alene Lake—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Granville Grange, No. 257, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, for State control of imitation dairy products as provided in House bill No. 3717—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Susquehanna, Pa., urging the passage of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the State Legislative Board of Railroad Employees, favoring Senate bill 3604 and House bill 10302, requiring common carriers to report to Interstate Commerce Commission the details of all injuries to employees—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the State Board of Health of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the State Legislative Board of Railroad Employees of Pennsylvania, favoring Senate bill 3604 and House bill 10302, requiring common carriers to report to Interstate Commerce Commission the details of all injuries to employees—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *May 5, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FLETCHER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for ten days, on account of important business.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the Army appropriation bill, which has been returned from the Senate with amendments.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate be nonconcurred in and that the House ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

There being no objection, the request of Mr. HULL was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. HULL, Mr. MARSH, and Mr. JETT as conferees on the part of the House.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 11212.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. DALZELL in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] to strike out the paragraph which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, at a total cost not exceeding $210,000, of not less than 140 acres of land adjoining the present building site, $210,000: *Provided*, That if said amount of land can not be purchased for said amount or for a less sum, the amount herein appropriated shall be applied to the construction of buildings for special classes of patients on the present grounds of the hospital, suitable for the extension as herein proposed.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to, there being on a division—ayes 40, noes 37.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 75, before line 9, insert:

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by condemnation, at a total cost not exceeding $210,000, which sum is hereby appropriated, not less than 140 acres of land adjoining the present building site of the Government Hospital for the Insane: *Provided*, That if said amount of land can not be acquired by condemnation as herein provided the amount herein appropriated shall be applied to the construction of buildings for special classes of patients on the present grounds of the hospital, suitable for the extension as herein proposed."

Mr. BENTON. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether the effect of this amendment is to put the $210,000 into the buildings?

Mr. CANNON. The amendment provides first for the condemnation of 140 acres, and it further provides that if the condemnation proceedings should result in a valuation exceeding $210,000, those proceedings shall fail and the $210,000 shall then be applied toward the project which follows—the construction of buildings upon the land already owned.

Mr. BENTON. Let me see whether I understand the gentleman. If the amount found by condemnation proceedings does not go over $210,000, then the money is to be put into the buildings?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. If the condemnation proceedings result in a valuation of $210,000 or less, we take the land; but if the amount goes over $210,000, then the land is not to be purchased, but that sum is to go toward the buildings for the accommodation of 1,000 patients upon the present site.

Mr. BENTON. That is what I wanted to understand.

Mr. PAYNE. I think it was stated yesterday that if we had condemnation proceedings those lands would cost more than $210,000. I think I heard that statement made by several gentlemen.

Mr. CANNON. I have no doubt that if we provide for condemnation without fixing an upset amount the valuation would run up to $2,000 or $2,500 an acre.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, if condemnation proceedings are had under this amendment, the price will be $210,000.

Mr. CANNON. It can not be more than that.

Mr. PAYNE. Is not this virtually the same provision which was in the bill and has just been stricken out?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all. In my judgment, condemnation proceedings will probably not bring the price below $210,000, though perchance they may. But if the valuation exceeds $210,000, then title is not to be taken by virtue of the condemnation proceedings.

In view of the conditions existing at the insane asylum and the necessity for improvement, as I have been enabled to study the question, I believe that we ought to acquire those 140 acres if we can.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I offer as an amendment to the amendment the provision which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the proposed amendment the following:

"For the extension of the accommodations for the insane, and to provide for the increasing number of such persons to be cared for by the Government, the Secretary of the Interior shall accept for the Government the absolute free gift of a suitable tract of land, containing not less than 500 acres, if the same be offered; and if no suitable tract be offered as a donation, the said Secretary shall buy for the Government a suitable tract of not less than 500 acres, at a price not to exceed $100 per acre; and the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated for the use aforesaid: *Provided*, That said sum shall be added to the appropriation hereinafter made for buildings for the insane asylum, if not used in buying land as herein authorized."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, to that amendment I desire to make the point of order.

Mr. DE ARMOND. And on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; and I will state now, if the Chair will permit me, the point of order.

I submit that the substitute, or proposed substitute, contemplates the erection of an insane asylum outside of the District of Columbia, and the law expressly provides that it shall be inside of the District of Columbia. The proposition of the gentleman from Missouri contemplates a new institution not heretofore authorized by law; and I submit the point of order on that ground.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman——