Williamson and State of Illinois, in the place of L. D. Hartwell, resigned.

William O. Butler, to be postmaster at Laharpe, in the county of Hancock and State of Illinois, in the place of Judd Hartzell, resigned.

Orange L. Campbell, to be postmaster at Knoxville, in the county of Knox and State of Illinois, in the place of L. M. Smith, resigned.

Howard H. Newby, to be postmaster at Sheridan, in the county of Hamilton and State of Indiana, in the place of Frank Oldham, removed.

George K. Covert, to be postmaster at Vinton, in the county of Benton and State of Iowa, in the place of Bernard Murphy, resigned.

Edson E. Burnham, to be postmaster at Amite (late Amite City), in the county of Tangipahoa and State of Louisiana, in the place of Edson E. Burnham. (Reappointment by reason of change in name of post-office.)

Grace W. Buck, to be postmaster at Foxcroft, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine, in the place of A. P. Buck, deceased.

Olive P. Smith, to be postmaster at Ipswich, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. P. Smith, deceased.

John K. Fancher, to be postmaster at Dodge Center, in the county of Dodge and State of Minnesota, in the place of O. H. Phillips, removed.

William Bostian, to be postmaster at Independence, in the county of Jackson and State of Missouri, in the place of G. W. Coakley, removed.

Abram D. Runyon, to be postmaster at Millington, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey, in the place of M. J. Munson, whose commission expires January 12, 1901.

James E. Munger, to be postmaster at Fishkill on the Hudson, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York, in the place of C. W. Anderson, whose commission expires January 7, 1901.

Alfred C. Hodgman, to be postmaster at Fort Edward, county of Washington and State of New York, in the place of B. M. Tasker, whose commission expires December 22, 1900.

John Rielley, to be postmaster at Highland Falls, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in the place of J. E. Brennan, deceased.

Annie Larrabee, to be postmaster at Oyster Bay, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in the place of Annie Larrabee, whose commission expired May 14, 1900. (Reappointed.)

Isaac W. Sherrill, to be postmaster at Poughkeepsie, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York, in the place of F. W. Halsted, resigned.

George B. Tripp, to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, in the county of Saratoga and State of New York, in the place of N. W. Kelso, removed.

George M. Nicol, to be postmaster at Morristown, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York, in the place of J. V. Crawford, whose commission expired March 27, 1900.

William T. Chapman, to be postmaster at Pawling, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York, in the place of W. R. Lee, resigned.

Ellis H. Timm, to be postmaster at Cold Spring, in the county of Putnam and State of New York, in the place of J. S. Boyd, removed.

Charles E. Ainger, to be postmaster at Andover, in the county of Ashtabula and State of Ohio, in the place of J. S. Morley, deceased.

Grenville Reed, to be postmaster at Astoria, in the county of Clatsop and State of Oregon, in the place of Charles McDonald, removed.

Hambleton P. Wilson, to be postmaster at Altoona, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Hambleton P. Wilson, whose commission expired January 7, 1900.

William W. Champion, to be postmaster at Montoursville, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of David Trump, removed.

Ira R. Burns, to be postmaster at Bellwood, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of A. M. Cornmesser, whose commission expired January 9, 1900.

T. F. Berner, to be postmaster at Henrietta, in the county of Clay and State of Texas, in the place of F. E. Squires, whose commission expired March 11, 1900.

Elmer L. Stevens, to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of Baylor and State of Texas, in the place of A. L. Board, whose commission expired December 21, 1899.

I. R. Nye, to be postmaster at Wittenberg, in the county of Shawano and State of Wisconsin, in the place of W. E. Homme, resigned.

Ramon Alfonzo Rivera, to be postmaster at Arecibo, Porto Rico, an original vacancy under the provisions of an act of Congress entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1900.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 6, 1900.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Otto H. Tittmann, of Missouri, to be Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 6, 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.

CONSPIRACY, ETC.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority have until the 4th day of February to file their views, if they so desire, in regard to the bill H. R. 8917, limiting the meaning of the word "conspiracy," etc.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the minority have until February 4 to file their views, if they so desire, on the bill H. R. 8917.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What is the title of the bill?

Mr. RAY of New York. Affecting conspiracy.

Mr. SULZER. Is that a House bill or a Senate bill?

Mr. RAY of New York. It is a House bill. I ask this unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate the minority side of the House, and make it at the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. The author of the original bill is not present, and it is nothing but fair that the extension of time asked for should be allowed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I want to renew my request of yesterday for unanimous consent that the bill made the special order for to-day be postponed until to-morrow, so that we may proceed with the Army bill to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the special order for to-day be carried over until to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the views of the friends of the Army bill, who regard immediate action as of very great importance, the friends of the Grout bill with some reluctance consent.

Mr. HOPKINS. Before they all do that, I would like to know whether this motion made by the gentleman from Iowa will fix it so that the so-called Grout bill will have the same standing before the House on the opening of the session to-morrow that it has to-day under the present order.

The SPEAKER. It will have absolutely the same position.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. And we want to know if it will have no more privilege than to-day.

The SPEAKER. None whatever, if postponed. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPRINT OF OLEOMARGARINE BILL.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the edition of the bill H. R. 3717, known as the oleomargarine bill, has been exhausted. I ask unanimous consent that 2,000 copies be printed, together with the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent that there be a reprint of 2,000 copies of the bill H. R. 3717, together with the report thereon, this being what is known as the oleomargarine bill. Is there objection?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does that include the minority report?

The SPEAKER. The request includes the report.

Mr. GROUT. Of course it would include the minority report.

The SPEAKER. Together with the views of the minority. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ARMY BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 4300.

The motion was agreed to.

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 S. 4300. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at end of line 23, page 20:

"*Provided*, That any vacancy in the Quartermaster's Department may be filled by appointment from civil life or from volunteers serving since April 21, 1898."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I hope that amendment will be voted down.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, a question for information. My remembrance is that we struck out all after the word "ninety-eight," in line 21, did we not, yesterday?

Mr. SULZER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all stricken out.

Mr. HULL. That is all right. Read the next section, then.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 17. That the Subsistence Department shall consist of 1 Commissary-General with the rank of brigadier-general, 3 commissaries with the rank of colonel, 4 commissaries with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, 9 commissaries with the rank of major, 27 commissaries with the rank of captain, mounted, and 150 commissary-sergeants who shall hereafter be known as post commissary-sergeants: *Provided*, That all vacancies in the grades of colonel, lieutenant-colonel, and major, created or caused by this section, shall be filled by promotion, according to seniority, as now prescribed by law. That to fill vacancies in the grade of captain, created by this act, in the Subsistence Department the President is authorized to appoint officers of volunteers, commissioned since April 21, 1898, and whose professional and physical fitness have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to this section. In line 11, page 21, after the word "Department," insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to carry out the agreement entered into with the committee yesterday, I move to strike out all after the word "ninety-eight," in line 13, at the end of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 21, line 13, after the word "ninety-eight," strike out the words "and whose professional and physical fitness have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 18. That the Medical Department shall consist of 1 Surgeon-General with the rank of brigadier-general, 8 surgeons with the rank of colonel, 12 surgeons with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, 60 surgeons with the rank of major, 240 assistant surgeons with the rank of captain or first lieutenant, the Hospital Corps, as now authorized by law, and the nurse corps: *Provided*, That all vacancies in the grades of colonel, lieutenant-colonel, and major created or caused by this section shall be filled by promotion according to seniority, subject to the examination now prescribed by law: *And provided*, That the period during which any assistant surgeon shall have served as a surgeon or assistant surgeon in the Volunteer Army during the war with Spain or since shall be counted as a portion of the five years' service required to entitle him to rank of captain: *And provided also*, That nothing in this section shall change the relative rank for subsequent promotion of medical officers as arranged by results of competitive examination: *Provided further*, That in emergencies the Surgeon-General of the Army, with the approval of the Secretary of War, may appoint as many contract surgeons as may be necessary, at a compensation not to exceed $150 per month.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army, transmitted to the Secretary of War, which I desire to have read in view of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] offering an amendment contained in the letter, as a proviso.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, SURGEON-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 4, 1900.

SIR: In view of the inadequate number of commissioned medical officers provided for in the bill for the reorganization of the Army of the United States, now under consideration by the Military Committee of the House, I have the honor to recommend that the following provision shall be added to section 18:

"That on or after the passage of this act the President may appoint for duty in the Philippine Islands 50 surgeons of volunteers with the rank and pay of major and 150 assistant surgeons of volunteers with the rank and pay of captain for a period of two years: *Provided*, That so many of these volunteer medical officers as are not required shall be honorably discharged the service whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War their services are no longer necessary."

The present method of depending upon contract surgeons for a greater part of the medical service with troops in garrisons and in the field is expensive and extremely unsatisfactory. A constant stream of physicians employed under contract has been sent to the Philippines to replace those returning. Contracts are made for one year, and it takes on an average six weeks from the time contract is made before the physician from civil life arrives at his station in the Philippines. At the end of the year, if he so desires, he is entitled to return home, and as there is no prospect of promotion a considerable proportion of those appointed insist upon returning home at the expiration of the period for which the contract was made. Meanwhile they have scarcely had time to familiarize themselves with the important duties of a medical officer aside from those relating to the medical care of the sick. These duties include the sanitary supervision of camps, the care and accountability for Government property, the instruction and discipline of members of the Hospital Corps, the making of prescribed reports and returns, etc.

Unfortunately these physicians from civil life, unacquainted with the emergencies of the service, must be sent at once to garrisons or to duty with troops in the field, where, as a rule, they are not under the immediate supervision of a trained medical officer who might give them the instruction they so much need. The result is that our troops are being cared for by physicians without knowledge or experience with reference to the special duties pertaining to a medical officer of the Army, and that just when they are beginning to acquire this knowledge their services are frequently lost, and they must be replaced by other physicians from civil life. I would say, however, that a considerable proportion of the acting assistant surgeons who have been employed are young men of excellent professional attainments, who only lack experience and special training to make them desirable medical officers.

The commissioned officers of volunteers provided for should, in my opinion, be selected from the volunteer medical officers and acting assistant surgeons now in the Philippines, many of whom would no doubt be willing to remain if they could be commissioned as proposed.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE M. STERNBERG,
Surgeon-General United States Army.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the Surgeon-General asked for a very much larger increase for permanent officers than the Secretary of War recommended. This recommendation is not for increasing the permanent corps, but for continuing practically in the service volunteer medical officers who are now in the service and thoroughly trained and who can not be retained unless continued as volunteers. It will be much less expensive to the Government to retain these officers, who can be mustered out when the emergency shall disappear, than to largely increase the Medical Corps. For that reason I am in favor of adopting the suggestion, and giving the rank of captain and major to these volunteer surgeons, and retaining them in the service. If the gentleman from Virginia will offer the amendment, I will consent to it.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I will offer the amendment contained in the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to section 18 the following:

"That on or after the passage of this act the President may appoint for duty in the Philippine Islands 50 surgeons of volunteers with the rank and pay of major, and 150 assistant surgeons of volunteers with the rank and pay of captain, for a period of two years: *Provided*, That so many of these volunteer medical officers as are not required shall be honorably discharged the service whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of War their services are no longer necessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the section which has just been read and which I will send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the amendment just adopted the following:

"That the Surgeon-General of the Army, with the approval of the Secretary of War, be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ dental surgeons to serve the officers and enlisted men of the Regular and Volunteer Army, in the proportion of not to exceed 1 for every 1,000 of said Army, and not exceeding 30 in all. Said dental surgeons shall be employed as contract dental surgeons under the terms and conditions applicable to Army contract surgeons, and shall be graduates of standard medical or dental colleges, trained in the several branches of dentistry, of good moral and professional character, and shall pass a satisfactory professional examination: *Provided*, That 3 of the number of dental surgeons to be employed shall be first appointed by the Surgeon-General, with the approval of the Secretary of War, with reference to their fitness for assignment, under the direction of the Surgeon-General, to the special service of conducting the examinations and supervising the operations of the others: and for such special service an extra compensation of $60 a month will be allowed: *Provided further*, That dental college graduates now employed in the Hospital Corps who have been detailed for a period of not less than twelve months to render dental service to the Army and who are shown by the reports of their superior officers to have rendered such service satisfactorily may be appointed contract dental surgeons without examination."

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the bill which was reported unanimously by the Senate committee, the same bill having been reported by the House committee unanimously on two occasions except that the House bill provided for 1 dentist for every 1,000 men. The Senate bill changed that to 1 dentist for every 1,000, men but not to exceed 30 in all. I believe every member of this House has been interviewed on this subject, and I have yet to find a single one who has openly opposed it. I have a list of a few of them here which I will give.

The following are members of Congress who have cordially approved this bill:

Senator JOHN H. GEAR, Iowa.
Representative WILLIAM W. GROUT, Vermont.
Representative IRVING P. WANGER, Pennsylvania.
Representative J. A. TAWNEY, Minnesota.
Delegate D. T. FLYNN, Oklahoma.
Representative J. B. SHOWALTER, Pennsylvania.
Senator C. W. FAIRBANKS, Indiana.
Reprseentative C. B. LANDIS, Indiana.
Representative T. C. CATCHINGS, Mississippi.
Representative C. R. THOMAS, North Carolina.
Representative W. T. CRAWFORD, North Carolina.
Representative J. D. BELLAMY, North Carolina.
Representative H. H. POWERS, Vermont.
Representative N. D. SPERRY, Connecticut.
Representative E. S. HENRY, Connecticut.
Representative CHARLES A. RUSSELL, Connecticut.
Senator JOHN W. DANIEL, Virginia.
Representative L. FLETCHER, Minnesota.
Representative FRANK M. EDDY, Minnesota.
Representative R. C. DAVEY, Louisiana.
Senator KNUTE NELSON, Minnesota.
Senator THOMAS S. MARTIN, Virginia.
Representative H. B. PACKER, Pennsylvania.
Senator A. J. BEVERIDGE, Indiana.
Representative J. OVERSTREET, Indiana.
Senator BOIES PENROSE, Pennsylvania.

Representative J. C. SIBLEY, Pennsylvania.
Representative A. C. HARMER, Pennsylvania.
Senator GEORGE C. PERKINS, California.
Representative JOHN LAMB, Virginia.
Representative H. R. GIBSON, Tennessee.
Representative MARION DE VRIES, California.
Representative J. A. BARHAM, California.
Representative R. J. WATERS, California.
Representative V. H. METCALF, California.
Senator S. B. ELKINS, West Virginia.
Representative S. W. SMITH, Michigan.
Senator J. B. FORAKER, Ohio.
Representative J. B. CORLISS, Wisconsin.
Representative J. C. NEEDHAM, California.
Representative T. F. KLUTTZ, North Carolina.
Senator N. B. SCOTT, West Virginia.
Representative JAMES HAY, Virginia.
Representative W. A. YOUNG, Virginia.
Representative W. F. RHEA, Virginia.
Representative WALTER P. BROWNLOW, Tennessee.
Representative WILLIAM SULZER, New York.
Representative WILLIAM W. KITCHIN, North Carolina.
Representative J. H. SMALL, North Carolina.
Representative John W. ATWATER, North Carolina.

Here are 80 distinguished Army officers—surgeons—I will not read the names of all of them; but they include such distinguished men as Dr. Senn, of Chicago, whom you all know; Dr. Latimer, of Baltimore, whom you all know. And then here is the name of Governor Pingree, of Michigan; Governor Shaw, of Iowa; Governor Lind, of Minnesota, recently elected; Governor J. W. Leedy, of Kansas; Lieutenant-Governor Richter, of Kansas. I could go on and give the names of a number of other distinguished men.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I ask that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OTEY] be permitted to occupy five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Before the gentleman resumes, may I ask him a question?

Mr. OTEY. Certainly—with pleasure.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has the gentleman no way of demonstrating the qualifications of dentists and the necessity for their services without reading the roll of all the public officials in the country?

Mr. OTEY. I did not hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Very well; go ahead. Your time is rolling on.

Mr. OTEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not thrust myself upon the House very often. When I do, I have something to say that is tangible and worth talking about. [Laughter.] I do not know to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] has referred. He reminds me of the Irishman of whom I heard a story. He was eating eggs. The first one he swallowed went down all right; but in swallowing another he heard the sound of a chick as it went down his throat; and then he exclaimed, "Begorrah, you have a swate voice, but you spake too late." [Laughter.] I think, sir, that anybody who opposes this bill "spakes" too late. I want gentlemen to come out now and say whether they are going to take care of 3,200,000 teeth, half of which are aching all the time. [Laughter.] I appeal to gentlemen on this side of the House and on the other side of the House, regardless of recent elections and regardless of political affiliations, to come forward and give the old soldier—that grand old soldier—a chance to get rid of the toothache.

I do not care to occupy further time. I ask for a vote on this question, and I hope every man will stand up or sit down. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one of very great importance, and one which, it seems to me, ought to be considered as a separate, independent proposition, so that each member might have intelligently before him the different provisions. I hope, therefore, the House will not put it on this bill, but will take it up as an independent proposition.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 19. That the nurse corps (female) shall consist of one superintendent, to be appointed by the Secretary of War and whose term of office may be terminated at his discretion, whose compensation shall be $1,800 per annum, and of as many chief nurses, nurses, and reserve nurses as may be needed. Reserve nurses may be assigned to active duty when the emergency of the service demands, but shall receive no compensation except when on such duty: *Provided*, That all nurses in the nurse corps shall be appointed or removed by the Surgeon-General, with the approval of the Secretary of War; that they shall be graduates of hospital training schools, and shall have passed a satisfactory professional, moral, mental, and physical examination: *And provided*, That the superintendent and nurses shall receive transportation and necessary expenses when traveling under orders; that the pay and allowances of nurses, and of reserve nurses, when on active service, shall be $40 per month when on duty in the United States and $50 per month when without the limits of the United States. They shall be entitled to quarters, subsistence, and medical attendance during illness, and they may be granted leaves of absence for thirty days, with pay, for each calendar year; and when serving as chief nurses their pay may be increased by authority of the Secretary of War, such increase not to exceed $25 per month. Payments to the nurse corps shall be made by the Pay Department.

Mr. BINGHAM. I desire to offer as an amendment a provision which appears on pages 7 and 8 of the present bill, being paragraphs of the Senate bill which have been struck out in the preparation of this bill. I see in the report no statement of reasons why the veterinary corps, as etablished by the Senate bill, has been excluded entirely from this bill. I am desirous, however, to have an expression of the judgment of the House upon this question. I therefore offer as an amendment the provision beginning on line 21, page 7, and covering the whole of page 8, relating to the veterinary corps.

Mr. HULL. I object to going back now. We had better finish the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no going back.

Mr. HULL. We are considering the bill by sections, and we have passed over those sections which the gentleman now proposes to take up.

Mr. BINGHAM. We have not passed over these sections. They are parts of the Senate bill which have been excluded from this bill.

Mr. HULL. We have passed over those sections. If the gentleman desires to amend our bill by putting in those provisions, he can do that, I suppose, when we get through regularly with the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why should not these provisions go in now as independent paragraphs the same as any other amendment?

Mr. HULL. Unless the gentleman proposes to offer his amendment to follow the provision in regard to the nurse corps, I object to going back, because I am anxious to get through with the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. I can not understand why there is any going back. The provisions which I offer have never been read. Therefore there is no going back. I claim that this amendment is fairly eligible for position in any part of this bill.

Mr. HULL. But the amendment, in my judgment, is not germane to the part of the bill we are considering. The gentleman, if he wants to put in those provisions, taken from a part of the bill which we have gone over, ought to wait until we have completed the consideration of the subsequent portions of the bill. Unless we adhere to the regular order of proceeding we shall be constantly jumping backward and forward, considering propositions having no relevancy to the matter under consideration.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no purpose to jump forward or backward. We have already considered paragraphs pertaining to the Surgeon-General's establishment; we have just concluded a paragraph pertaining to the nurses' establishment. The amendment I desire to offer has direct relation to those two paragraphs, and is consistent at this point as a part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to introduce a new paragraph at this point. Is that the proposition?

Mr. BINGHAM. I simply ask that an additional paragraph, covering the wording of the Senate bill, may be considered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is the order. The Clerk will report the gentleman's amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 14, page 23, insert the following:

"SEC. 20. 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 a 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 Secretray of War, and the chief veterinarian shall report directly to that officer.

"For pay of officers of the veterinary corps, $33,500."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I fully recognize that the amendment I have submitted (being word for word a part of the Senate bill as it came to the House) would go to conference as soon as this bill passes, along with the other paragraphs of the Senate bill, and would be subject to consideration there. I think, however, at the same time, that this subject has been gone over so thoroughly that there is a conviction on the part of the House of the wisdom and necessity of the establishment of this additional branch of service, so as to be a part of the reorganization of the Army.

This proposition, Mr. Chairman, was carefully considered in the Senate, a great deal of testimony was taken in reference to it, and it passed that body and became a part of the bill which was transmitted to the House. There is nothing whatever in the report of the House Committee on Military Affairs, as I read it, that in any wise refers to crossing out or wiping out the paragraph in the Senate bill to which reference is made in the amendment. We have not been given any information upon that subject.

In the brief I hold in my hand, prepared by Senator KENNEY,

appears this amendment. The statement is made that the entire cost, under the amendment, will not exceed $6,500. It is asserted in this brief that that is the entire cost over and above the cost of the civil employees now engaged in that service. It is also alleged that this will be more than compensated for by the organization of this veterinary corps which the amendment proposes.

Under the rulings of the Department, as well as the judicial decisions, the present force of the veterinary surgeons is declared to be a force of civilian employees—so rated and so paid—$75 a month to one class and $125 a month to another. They hold no commissions and have no commissioned relations with the other branches of the service. It is claimed in this proposition, which has had the indorsement of the most efficient and careful officers of the Army, General Merritt, General Brooke, Major-General Wilson, and other high officers, as well as the approval of President McKinley, General Miles, Commander in Chief of the Army, Quartermaster-General Ludington, and others high in rank, that the proposition is one for the best interest of the service, and that under the proposed organization or reorganization of the Army such a proposition is desirable and necessary. I am informed that, as the Army will be reorganized under the provisions of this bill, if it becomes a law, there will be upward of 25,000 animals to be cared for. The cavalry, the artillery, and the necessary transportation required for the Quartermaster's Department will involve the care of this large number of animals.

Mr. JETT. Let me ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question for information.

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. JETT. I would like to ask if the amendment that the gentleman offers is not a section of the bill that was before the Senate and passed by that body and came here during the last session of the House for our consideration?

Mr. BINGHAM. Absolutely the same, word for word. I have simply torn out the printed sheet of the original bill and presented it here as an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this matter is so thoroughly understood by the House that I have no desire to take time to discuss it. I have shown what the increase of expenditures will be. I have shown that it would be a little in excess of $6,000. Certainly such an organization, indorsed by the leading officers of the service, deserves consideration at our hands, and I think it but fair to say that by the action we now take here the House will either make the paragraph a part of the bill agreed to by both the Houses or leave it as a paragraph to be settled in conference.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not prevail. The Committee on Military Affairs took the Senate bill and struck from it all after the enacting clause and inserted the bill which is now reported here to the House and recommended by the committee. Now, if we take a part of the bill here and there and insert it in the House proposition, you reduce the power of the House to enforce its own will just to that extent; and it seems to me that the position of veterinary surgeon should stand with the other provisions of the Senate bill and let it go to conference as a whole.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of commissioned ranks for the veterinary corps of the Army. I believe they ought to have commissioned rank. As to whether we want to create a new corps, a new bureau in the Army, is another and entirely different question, that ought to be thought over very carefully before this House shall adopt it. I do not believe we ought to put it in this bill. I will say, Mr. Chairman, at the request of one of my friends here, that the veterinary corps has commissioned rank in all the other armies of the world.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true.

Mr. STEELE. Assimilated rank.

Mr. HULL. Well, that is true of the army surgeons in other armies also. They do not have rank for their doctors there. It is only assimilated rank for them, too.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a few words with regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM]. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, familiar with this subject, I concur in all that the gentleman has said. This amendment for a veterinary corps should be incorporated into this bill now. It should not be eliminated here and allowed to go to conference. There is no doubt in the world but what this veterinary corps is one of the most important at the present time in the Army. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] has truly said, there will be over 25,000 animals in the Army if this bill becomes a law, and as a friend of the horse I want to see this House adopt it. I trust it will. It is right. There ought to be veterinary surgeons to look after them. The veterinary corps is one of the most important branches in relation to the Army to-day, and this amendment should be adopted. To defeat it now will probably mean its permanent defeat. I appeal for fairness in the matter in order that our Army animals may be protected.

Mr. GAINES. Why did not the Military Committee report the provision in the bill which they brought in here?

Mr. SULZER. The committee should have reported it.

Mr. GAINES. Why did they not report it?

Mr. SULZER. Because the committee struck out the entire Senate bill and put in the War Department bill without any amendments whatever. This amendment was in the Senate bill passed last session.

Mr. GAINES. Why did they not leave that provision of the Senate bill in the bill which they brought in here?

Mr. SULZER. They should have done so.

Mr. GAINES. Did they give any reasons for their failure to do so?

Mr. SULZER. You will have to ask the chairman of the committee about that. The minority of the committee had nothing to do with it; but as a member of the minority, and speaking for the veterinary surgeons of this country, and for the best interests of the animals that will be in the Army, I think this amendment should be adopted, and I hope every friend of the horse will vote for it.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I can not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], because after a careful consideration of the provision contained in the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], after hearing all the evidence which was adduced before us, I came to the conclusion that it would not be for the benefit of the surgeons to have the veterinary corps established in the form in which it is provided in the Senate bill.

In the first place it creates a new bureau down here in the War Department. It creates a new staff bureau, and we may expect that bureau to be built up as other bureaus have been, at considerable cost. Moreover, the present veterinary corps, if they are given rank such as was suggested by the chairman of the committee [Mr. HULL], should be satisfied. That is all they ought to ask for. They have worked very well so far. They have done good service up to this time, and the animals of the Army have not suffered, so far as I have been able to ascertain. Therefore I do not see why we should create a new bureau in the War Department, at a considerable expense, when there is no necessity for it, and when these veterinary surgeons can have the rank which will give them the authority they now say is necessary in order to enable them to carry on their work in the Army. I hope, therefore, that the committee will vote down the amendment.

Mr. GAINES. What does the bill provide with reference to veterinary surgeons?

Mr. HAY. The bill does not provide anything with reference to veterinary surgeons, as it now stands; but, as I understand it, the probability is that in conference these surgeons will be given the rank of second lieutenants of cavalry.

Mr. GAINES. The bill does provide for veterinary surgeons.

Mr. HAY. Oh, yes; it provides for the employment of them now, but it does not provide for a bureau here.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the House for one minute while I submit some reasons why this amendment should be inserted in this bill.

This represents the progress that is taking place in our country, both in science and in army improvement. In the old days the farriers were sufficient to take care of the live stock of the Army, but with the progress of science now every man who practices the veterinary calling must have a diploma from a university. A man who is educated to that point should be raised above the farrier, and is entitled to the recognition of rank in the Army of the United States. If these men are to be established as a corps, they should be organized as such if you are to have efficiency throughout the Army, $2,000,000 representing the value of the live stock in the United States Army to-day. It is of sufficient value to warrant an additional $6,500 for their care and promotion.

Not only that; I would call attention to the fact that every civilized nation to-day has its veterinary corps to examine animals purchased. England, in the war with South Africa, sent veterinary surgeons to this country, when they were buying live stock, and saved hundreds of thousands of dollars in the purchase of those animals by means of careful inspection. There is another point I would earnestly press upon the House. One of the few disagreeable things that we want to forget about is the spoiled meat served to our gallant troops that were fighting in the armies of this country. If we had had this corps, that meat would all be inspected, and there could no such scandal take place.

It is seldom, Mr. Chairman, that I find myself in opposition to the committee. I can not agree with the suggestion of the chairman of the committee that this matter should go over so that it could be dealt with in conference with the Senate. If this House believes in the measure, they should vote for it now and put it in the bill. This is the proper place to put it in and let it be estab-

lished, and then it is beyond peradventure and can not be traded off for any other proposition, and will be in the bill for the benefit of the Army and economy to the Government. It will be a recognition of a profession which is rising to-day; and all the veterinary schools and that great profession throughout our country are solidly behind this measure. I hope the House will act now and not trust to chance. A wise man never trusts to chance if he can get what he wants in hand. Vote to put this in as the Senate had it in the bill and it places this question beyond peradventure.

Mr. STEELE. Does not the gentleman say that this bureau is to cost $6,500?

Mr. ADAMS. Additional.

Mr. STEELE. The cost is given here as $33,500.

Mr. ADAMS. That gives the entire corps. This will be an additional amount of $6,500.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted by the House at this or any subsequent time. I do not believe it is necessary for the best interest of the service; neither do I believe it would be wise to commission horse doctors as officers of the United States Army. It has been stated here that the armies of all civilized countries have a veterinary corps, with rank It should have been stated "assimilated rank." Assimilated gives the pay, but not the honor or the title of the rank. There is not an army in the world that has a veterinary corps ranking with the officers of the line. It is not necessary, in my opinion, for the best interest of the service that the veterinary corps of the United States Army should have rank.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Why should we not give the horse doctor rank the same as we give the medical doctor?

Mr. MONDELL. I think there is some difference between a man and a horse.

Mr. BUTLER. One is the doctor for the man and the other the doctor for the horse.

Mr. MONDELL. I think there is a difference between doctoring one of our soldiers and doctoring an army mule.

Mr. BUTLER. Are they not both educated men, and ought not both to be men of intelligence?

Mr. MONDELL. The fact that a veterinary might be an educated man is no reason why the horse doctor should be commissioned. An army surgeon in time of action is often necessarily under fire. If the gentleman will recollect the occurrences of the Santiago campaign, he will remember that the surgeons of the Army the most of the time during the operations before Santiago were under fire quite as much as some of the men in the advance. The horse doctor, I do not imagine, under any circumstances, would ever be under fire. I see no reason why a horse doctor, any more than a wagoner, a blacksmith, or other men connected with the Army in various capacities, should also receive a commission.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Wyoming allow me to make a suggestion? The surgeon comes in immediate contact with the men about him who are engaged in carrying men on the stretchers to the hospitals, and furthermore, he comes in contact with other enlisted men who are employed with the men in the hospital, and it is necessary to give him some rank in order that he may discharge his duties and assert the difference in rank between himself and the enlisted men. That is not true in the case of the veterinary surgeon who goes to the cavalry stables to doctor their horses. You might as well give rank to the men who curry the colonel's horse as to confer rank upon the veterinary surgeons.

Mr. MONDELL. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio in all that he says, and I thank him for his remarks. The surgeon in the Army is not only the physician who attends to the wounds and the ailments of the soldiers, but he is also the one who goes among the wounded in the hospital and on the field and cheers and encourages them, and he shares with them largely their privations and their dangers. He does not belong to the same class as the wagoners and the farriers.

It has been stated here that the change would only mean an additional expense of $6,000. Possibly so at the time of the passage of the bill, but it means a constantly increasing corps of officers who in the course of time are to go to swell the retired list, and, instead of $6,000 annual expenditure, in a short time it would add a very much larger sum. If we are not able to secure the services of good veterinary surgeons at the present prices paid, let us pay better prices for our veterinary surgeons, but never give horse doctors, honorable though their calling is, rank and authority with the fighting men of the American Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I want to say that he referred to the Santiago campaign, and undertook to show to the House that there was a difference between the doctor who doctors the soldiers and one who doctors the army mule. I want to say, as an incident of that campaign, that it developed that a horse doctor, Dr. Huidekoper, was assigned to the treatment of soldiers in the hospital, so I do not think that that point amounts to much.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has charge of this bill states that he does not desire to mar the integrity and unity of his bill for the reason that they have crossed out all of the Senate bill and submitted this as a subsitute. He doubtless is as familiar as myself with what goes on in the conference committee. I have had some experience, in common with other gentlemen in the House, and it is simply that when a bill is presented, like this bill, a clean wipe-out, a clean submission of something new, that it comes to a mere barter and trade in conference—"If you will give us that, we will give you this," and you come into the House with a mongrel bill. So far as this bill is concerned I do not want it to have that form or shape. I want this committee to determine the paragraph one way or another and not subject it to rejection because some other paragraph may be admitted.

One word with reference to the statement of the gentleman as to the horse doctor, as he designated him, not being a party to field action or to the battle. Granted. The surgeon is only thus detailed for that special work; others are back in the hospital. The officers of the Ordnance Corps, a large and one of the most intellectual corps of the service, are not in action. It is only occasionally that an officer of the Engineer Corps of the Army is detailed to be in a position under fire.

Mr. BUTLER. How about the paymasters?

Mr. BINGHAM. The paymasters are never in action. That does not make for or against the veterinary surgeon or lessen their usefulness.

As to the objection of the gentleman on the other side who says that the establishment will create a bureau in Washington. The whole cost of these surgeons will be $33,500, an increase simply of $6,500 over the current law. If any bureau was ever established in Washington, they could have the supervision of only $33,500. Therefore, I contend that this criticism does not bring any strength against the proposition contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert at the end of my remarks a "brief in the House of Representatives May 5, 1900, of facts in support of Senator KENNEY'S amendment to the Army reorganization bill, which passed the Senate and goes to the House of Representatives for concurrence."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be granted. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The brief referred to by Mr. BINGHAM is as follows:

Brief (S. 4300. In the House of Representatives, May 5, 1900) of facts in support of Senator KENNEY'S amendment to the Army reorganization bill, which has passed the Senate and now goes to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

Senator KENNEY'S amendment to the Army reorganization bill provides for the establishment of an organized veterinary service, with reputable officers, whose education and competency is insured by rigid examination; to replace the present system of employment of an unorganized class of individual civilians, with no rank, no future, no responsibility, and no official position.

The United States Army is absolutely deficient in a proper veterinary service, which exists in the army of every other civilized country in the world. The present system in the United States Army has less method in it than that found needful in any large contractor's stable or stock farm in the country.

ECONOMY.

The entire cost under the amendment is only $6,500 over the present cost of civilian employees under the present system, and will be more than compensated for by the economy resulting from an organized veterinary corps.

The establishment of an organized veterinary service—

To give proper instruction in hippology, inspection of forage, stable hygiene, and farriery, to officers, cadets, noncommissioned officers, and farriers, at our military schools and large posts;

To furnish expert veterinarians for service as members on boards of purchase of remounts;

To furnish qualified inspectors of live stock and dressed meat for our soldiers' rations [there is not a qualified meat-inspection service in the United States Army];

To furnish practical services in prevention and cure of diseases—

is needed, both on the ground of economy, for the efficiency of the Army, and for the health of our soldiers.

The letters, copies of which have been furnished, from Major-General Merritt, Major-General Brooke, Major-General Wilson, and numerous others of the higher officers of the Army indorse such an organization.

The establishment of such an organization has had the approval of the President, William McKinley.

The General Commanding the Army, Major-General Miles, and the Quartermaster-General, Brigadier-General Ludington strongly approve and favor the amendment.

(Committee on Army legislation, American Veterinary Medical Association, Rush S. Huidekoper, secretary, Washington, May 4, 1900.)

Mr. GAINES. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if the veterinary surgeons contemplated by this amendment are to be graduates of a school or college.

Mr. BINGHAM. The surgeons employed under this corps will be subject to the directions of the Secretary of War, who will make regulations as to their credentials.

Mr. GAINES. Does the gentleman give that as one reason why this amendment should pass?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do. The veterinary surgeon not only does this work for the benefit of the animal, but for the protection of millions of dollars of Government property.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, from the remarks which have been made by members of the House in opposition to this amendment, that the value of the horse and mule in the Army is not at all appreciated. I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that the fighting of our Army is to-day on an entirely different principle from the fighting of twenty years ago, or even of ten years ago. The long-range guns of the artillery and the infantry require the utmost celerity of movement. We shall find in the future that the victories will be gained as often by the rapid movement of our cavalry and our infantry as in any other manner. In fact, the army horse and mule rank second only to the soldier and the gun.

This proposition seems to me an exceedingly fair one. Any man who has watched the movements of even an infantry regiment must have seen the absolute necessity of having some responsible, qualified person in charge of the horses of a regiment. Why, sir, an infantry company can be delayed not only hours, but days, by having a few of its mules out of condition. Almost every part of the impedimenta of an infantry company to-day is moved by the company wagons, and the movements of the company are entirely dependent upon having the horses in condition to move rapidly. If there is any valuable provision that could be introduced into this Army bill—one which will pay the nation in time of war for its adoption, one which would help in winning victories, whether on this side of the ocean or on foreign shores—I believe that this amendment, if adopted, will be one of the most valuable improvements that can be made in the framing of an Army bill.

I ask the members of the House to consider the fact that most of the military work, not only carried on to-day, but which will be carried on by the United States in the future, will be in foreign lands. We all know that the sickness which has prevailed among our troops in the Philippine Islands and in China has been shared by the horses and mules of the Army. Any man who has watched the war in South Africa has had forced upon his attention the fact that the trouble with the English troops has been that they have been constantly hampered by the sickness of their horses everywhere. Thousands and thousands of horses and mules have recently been purchased in this country for use in Africa, simply because of the terrible amount of death and disease among the horses there. It is an old saw that every man's business is nobody's business, and if you want the horses and mules of the Army to be taken care of—if you think they are worth taking care of, as I certainly do—it is absolutely necessary to have a bureau to take charge of this subject, with a competent head, and with persons under him qualified for the peculiar work.

There is only one way to get men who are properly qualified to take charge of horses or to give general directions for that purpose, and that is by giving qualified men rank in our Army. It requires educated men to take care of horses. Perhaps just as much education is required in this line as in taking care of men. And, as I have just said, the only way to secure proper service in this line is to give rank to the officers who have charge of such work. It must be a badge of honor. I am not only pleased to vote for this proposition, but I think it is the duty of every member, especially as the expense of the proposed amendment is certainly not great—though if it were five times as much I should favor it—I believe it to be the duty of every man who has at heart the creation of an efficient Army to vote for this provision.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say one word in favor of the most faithful animal that ever moved a foot or served a master. I would go further than the present proposition; I would require, if I had the power, that these veterinary surgeons should go into places of danger to attend and treat horses, in the same way that a medical officer is required to go on the field of battle under the present regulations. I think this regulation will overcome the distinction made by the gentleman from Wyoming in answer to a question which I put to him a few moments ago.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the total cost of this service, in the pay of the officers provided, would be $33,500. I find by looking at the pay table that a colonel who has just entered the service is entitled to $3,500; and this bill provides for 1 colonel. A major (one such officer being provided by this bill) receives as pay proper, $2,500, allowing nothing for longevity service. Then the amendment provides for 4 captains, the pay of whom would be $2,000 each, without any additional allowances, amounting to $8,000. Then there are to be 10 first lieutenants, at $2,000 (saying nothing of allowances) making $20,000. Then there are 20 second lieutenants at $1,500 each (taking into account nothing for allowances) making $30,000. It will thus be found that the total amount of pay for this corps under this amendment will be $64,000. In addition to that, officers who have been in this service for fifteen years as veterinarians, would receive longevity pay and other allowances. The cost for pay and allowances, saying nothing of traveling expenses, would be about $100,000.

I think, as the chairman of the committee has suggested, that it would be perfectly fair to let this matter go to conference with the other provisions of the bill. In that way we could arrive at a much better conclusion than, I think, can be arrived at by undertaking to act on this subject here and now. While this amendment at the beginning would simply call for a colonel and a major at the War Department headquarters, mark my words, inside of five years the number of field officers will be materially increased, as well as the expense.

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman says let this go to conference. Why not adopt the amendment and then let it go to conference?

Mr. STEELE. If we adopt the amendment, there can be no conference, so far as this provision is concerned.

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. STEELE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. This is a provision of the Senate bill, and if the House and the Senate agree upon the proposition there will be nothing to confer about.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, many of my friends are veterinary surgeons. We should have the very best talent in that service that the United States can afford, and the most experienced surgeons should be found and honored in our Army. But I can not accept the proposition which is now before the House as an amendment to the pending bill; and I beg the House to bear with me a moment and to understand with me what that provision is.

As has been pointed out by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, it is not a question whether veterinary surgeons should have rank or pay or honor, but whether they should constitute a new and separate staff corps. It is whether we should accept this particular provision for such a corps without recommendation by the War Department or the Army, without the opinion of that Department, and without opportunity under the rules to perfect this proposition. We are asked not to accept surgeons as officers, but to establish a new corps. What does that mean?

What is a corps? It is an independent branch of the Army. If this provision is adopted it means that the officers of such a corps are not under the control of the officers of the line.

In the last war with Spain there was a case—there may have been others—but there was a case where a brigadier-general in charge of a camp with a thousand sick men found that the doctors in charge of the hospital were spending their afternoons on hotel porticos away from the camp. He told them to go back to duty and take charge of the sick men in the hospital. He was informed that he was not in a position to give such an order. And, Mr. Chairman, he only got the medical corps back to their duties when, after going 120 miles, he was enabled to find at division headquarters an authority which had the right to give the order to them.

Now, a doctor may rightly order a man out of the ranks, if he is sick and unable to perform duty, and the doctor may rightly send him to a hospital whether his commander assent or no. That is where the question is of human life. But when we come to dealing with horses and mules, a very different case is presented, for there may be conditions which require the quartermaster to work his mules or horses for army transportation whether they are sick or well, and there should be no interference with the performance of his duty under such circumstances.

If a captain of a troop or battery desires to use the horses or mules under his command, sick or well, and finds it necessary to do so if the exigencies of the service so require, no man should be allowed to interfere. You can and should employ a veterinary surgeon where his services are needed; you may make him an officer, but you can not safely employ or establish a veterinary corps which shall in any way supersede the power of the commanding officer.

As I have already said, the surgeon may send a man into the hospital and may order him out of the ranks in case of sickness, but the officer in charge of a battery or a company has the right to use horseflesh—noble as that animal may be—under any circumstances which may present themselves to him. He has enough staff subjection already. The man of the Army, the officer of the line, is subject to a system of staff inspection and orders unknown in any other country. It may be now noticed because it will come up later on in the consideration of the bill. He can not get provisions without going to the subsistence department or transportation without the aid of the quartermaster's corps.

He can not get his men paid without going to a separate pay department, nor get guns or ammunition without applying to a separate ordnance department. His life is a life of requisitions and red tape. Other armies put these departments in each division under the general commanding the division, and in each post, while the staff have assimilated rank and good pay, they are under the commander of the post, under any captain of an

independent command, who keeps, and is bound to keep, all branches of the service under his control so far as his command extends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SULZER. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks that the time of the gentleman from New Jersey may be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. In every other army, especially in the German army, the staff in all its branches is made the servant, or at any rate the friend, of the line. Our great Secretary of War, the greatest, I believe, that we have had since Stanton, says that the need of our Army is to bring the line and staff together. He therefore proposed and urged upon us that details should go from the line to the staff, and from the staff back to the line, as proposed in the Senate bill; that there should be only details and no permanent appointments, so that the whole Army should be one, working harmoniously together through the system of details without subjection of the line to permanent and separate staffs.

The committee and perhaps a majority of this House concluded that we should go slowly. That may be wise. We therefore provide by the House bill that there shall be details, but only in the lower grades of the staff, and we add to the Secretary's plan that these details shall be settled by competition before boards of officers, so as to avoid favoritism and to determine fairly what men shall go into the lower ranks of the staff. The bill thus provides for a perpetual change and flow between the line and the lower ranks of the staff of the Army.

For the higher ranks of the staff the bill provides that from those who have been detailed there shall be competitive examination for appointment to these higher ranks, so that we shall get the cream of our young men in the great staff departments of the Army, while we give them enough army service to keep them in touch with the needs of that Army, and prevent the disposition to red tape that assails anybody who is permanently in a separate corps.

That is the object of this bill, to abolish or, at least, mitigate the evils of separate staff corps. Let us not attack the general object of this bill by establishing another separate corps and counteract the views of our great Secretary of War by putting alongside of the many independent staff corps another corps with independent command, free from control by the line.

Give rank if you please, or honor if you please, but let us aim to unite and not to disunite each division of the Army.

This provision is in the Senate bill. When the matter goes into conference a satisfactory and proper section can be put in its place. But if this amendment be adopted, it must be taken as it is, with its faults.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. HULL. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. BINGHAM, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. SULZER demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 58, noes 56.

Mr. HULL. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. HULL.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 80, noes 72.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. That the Pay Department shall consist of 1 Paymaster-General with the rank of brigadier-general, 3 paymasters with the rank of colonel, 4 paymasters with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, 9 paymasters with the rank of major, and 27 paymasters with the rank of captain: *Provided*, That all vacancies in the grade of colonel and lieutenant-colonel created or caused by this section shall be filled by promotion according to seniority, as now prescribed by law, and no more appointments to the grade of major and paymaster shall be made until the number of paymasters is reduced below 9: *And provided*, That persons who have served in the Volunteer Army since April 21, 1898, as additional paymasters may be appointed to positions in the grade of captain, created by this section. So long as there remain surplus majors an equal number of vacancies shall be held in the grade of captain, so that the total number of paymasters authorized by this section shall not be exceeded at any time.

Mr. DICK. With a view to offering an amendment to that section, I desire to have the Clerk read the letter which I send to the desk. It is a letter from the Paymaster-General, U. S. Army, to the Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter will be read in the time of the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, PAYMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 3, 1900.

SIR: Will you permit me, as head of the Pay Department, to respectfully call your attention to the fact that the organization of the Pay Department as proposed in section 20 of the bill for the reorganization of the Army, copy of which has been furnished me from your office, does not, in my judgment, give us sufficient force to perform the duties which the Pay Department is called upon to perform.

The present number of officers in the regular and volunteer force of the Pay Department is, aside from the Paymaster-General, 55. The proposed bill gives us 43, a reduction of 12 officers. At the present moment there is but one officer of this department on leave of absence, and he was granted one month's leave from the Department of California, succeeding his return to this country from a two years' detail in the Philippines. There is not an officer in the service who could be granted a leave for two months without detriment to the service, unless his place could be filled by some other paymaster during that time.

As the Army is now distributed, we have between four and five hundred different stations to pay in the Philippines, and we have there and en route there 26 paymasters, and I have constant reports of the very severe service the officers there are called upon to perform and the necessity for more help. If the force is reduced it must be by taking away some of the officers from that point, as there is not now stationed within the limits of the United States a single officer whose place could be made vacant without detriment to the service.

Very respectfully,

A. E. BATES,
Paymaster-General, U. S. A.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

Mr. DICK. I move to amend section 20, line 16, page 23, by striking out the word "three" and inserting the word "four."

In line 17, after the word "colonel," insert the words "and assistant paymaster-general;" also, in line 17, strike out the word "four" and insert the word "five."

In line 18, after the words "lieutenant-colonel," insert the words "and deputy paymaster-general;" also, in line 18, strike out the word "nine" and insert the word "twenty."

In line 19, strike out the words "twenty-seven" and insert the words "twenty-five."

In line 24, after the words "number of," insert the words "majors and."

In line 25, strike out the word "nine" and insert the word "twenty."

Mr. HULL. That simply gives them the titles which they have at present.

Mr. DICK. The purpose of the changed phraseology is simply to preserve the phraseology of the law as it now stands. The increase asked for is explained by the letters of the Paymaster-General to the Secretary of War, and its purpose is to give to the Army as it will be reorganized a force sufficient to pay it. At the present time, as fixed by the act of March 2, 1899, the force is 56. This amendment asks for 55. The section which we seek to amend gives but 44. Prior to the Spanish-American war the Army in the United States amounted to about a corps as now organized, but widely distributed over the whole country. The force was then a total of 26 officers, the payments monthly, and the force was sufficiently occupied.

Now the Army is about four times as large, more widely distributed—and paid by a force, but not with the requisite promptness—of 56 officers, and as to the Philippines, and because of the limited number of officers, payments are made every two months, or as nearly so as possible.

It is not the number of troops so much as the manner of their distribution which should determine the numerical strength of the Pay Department.

Then, it is stated that in 15 of the Philippine Islands alone there are 420 garrisoned posts to be visited by paymasters, or about four times as many as there were in the United States preceding the war with Spain; that there are 102 posts in the United States, 8 in Cuba, 8 in Alaska, 4 in Porto Rico; that, except as to the 120-odd miles of railroad in the Philippines, all other means of land communication in these islands is of the crudest kind and surrounded with danger, and that with the present number of 55 working paymasters it is at times possible, in the Philippine group, to pay the Army there with reasonable regularity. It will be easily understood that the present strength of the Pay Department, 56 officers, is the minimum force under which payments can be effected.

This seems not only like a fair request, but a demand to meet the very necessities of the situation. I trust the amendment will be adopted by the House. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio proposes to increase the officials in the Pay Department beyond the estimates submitted by the Secretary of War, which were presumably based upon absolute knowledge of the necessities of the situation. While I was unable, owing to the confusion in the House, to hear all my distinguished friend from Ohio said in justification of his amendment, what I did hear did not convince me that we ought to go beyond the estimates submitted by the Secretary of War; and it looks to me like making a needless increase in the officers of the Paymaster's Department and a needless tax upon this country. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 16, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "four;" in line 17 strike out the word "four" and insert the word "five;" in line 18 strike out the word "nine" and insert the word "twenty;" in line

19 strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "twenty-five;" line 18, after the word "lieutenant-colonel," insert "and deputy paymaster-general;" in line 24, after the word "of," insert the words "major and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DICK. Just one omission, Mr. Chairman, in line 17, "assistant and paymaster," and in line 18, "assistant deputy paymaster."

Mr. HULL. Not assistant at all, but lieutenant-colonel and deputy paymaster-general.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio indicate the word preceding what he proposes to introduce?

Mr. HULL. My understanding of the gentleman's amendment is, after the word "colonel" to insert the words "and assistant paymaster-general," and in line 18, after the word "lieutenant-colonel," insert the words "and deputy paymaster-general;" and in line 24, after the word "of," insert the words "major and;" and these amendments are simply to preserve the titles as they are now and have been for so many years known.

Mr. HAY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and that is, whether it increases the corps of the Paymaster's Department?

Mr. DICK. It reduces it one.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. That the Corps of Engineers shall consist of 1 Chief of Engineers with the rank of brigadier-general, 7 colonels, 14 lieutenant-colonels, 28 majors, 40 captains, 40 first lieutenants, and 30 second lieutenants. The enlisted force provided in section 11 of this act and the officers serving therewith shall constitute a part of the line of the Army: *Provided*, That vacancies in the Corps of Engineers created or caused by this act in the grade above that of second lieutenant shall be filled, as far as possible, by promotion according to seniority from the Corps of Engineers: *And provided also*, That vacancies remaining in the grades of first and second lieutenant may be filled by transfer of officers of the Regular Army, subject to such professional examination as may be approved by the Secretary of War. Vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant not filled by transfer shall be left for future promotions from the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I have received the following communication from the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers, which I desire to have read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter will be read in the gentleman's time.

The letter was read, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, December 5, 1900.*

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter (memoranda accompanying) from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, of this date, by which it would appear that the head of that department considers that the number of officers provided for his department by the pending bill for the reorganization of the Army, which was submitted by this Department to your committee, are insufficient.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of War.

Hon. JOHN A. T. HULL,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

Memoranda relating to proposed legislation for reorganization of the Corps of Engineers.

July 24 the Adjutant-General called on the Chief of Engineers as to the specific reorganization recommended for the Corps of Engineers.

August 10 the Chief of Engineers submitted for the consideration of the Secretary of War certain memoranda showing the necessity for the increase of the Corps of Engineers, together with a draft of proposed legislation. These were based on most careful and detailed consideration of the subject, and the legislation recommended was considered of most vital importance. The numbers proposed for the various grades were the minimum consistent with the efficient performance of duties devolving upon the corps, and the proportionate number of each grade was worked out with great care, with a view to providing for the various duties and for such gradual and proper promotion as must be provided for to keep the Corps of Engineers alive.

The number of officers recommended was as follows:

One brigadier-general, 12 colonels, 24 lieutenant-colonels, 36 majors, 50 captains, 40 first lieutenants, and 25 second lieutenants.

The numbers proposed by the newly printed bill are:

One brigadier-general, 7 colonels, 14 lieutenant-colonels, 28 majors, 40 captains, 40 first lieutenants, and 30 second lieutenants—an increase over present organization of 5 captains, 14 first lieutenants, and 18 second lieutenants, without any increase in the field officers.

In determining the relative number of officers of the different grades the following system was followed:

Two divisions were considered—the first of and above the rank of major, the second including officers below the rank of major.

The average time of service through all grades was taken at forty years. It was assumed twenty years of this time should be spent in the lower division and twenty in the higher; that is, that an officer should serve twenty years before reaching the grade of major; their age at such time would average forty-three years.

Under the present organization the percentage of officers above and including the grade of major is 40, and below, 61. This percentage is about correct to give twenty years in lower division and twenty years in upper division, as shown by a table giving percentages of the number of officers of various terms of service for each year during past twenty-five years and the average for the entire period. It was therefore considered desirable to maintain the present percentage in any increase recommended, and this was done.

The proportion proposed would provide approximately for a service of six years as colonel, six years as lieutenant-colonel, eight years as major, and twenty years as a subaltern.

Considering the relative numbers throughout, they are such as to provide for the duties of the corps without any surplus numbers, and to also provide for a fair and reasonable if not rapid promotion.

The increase provided for in bill is all in the junior officers. It will destroy the approximately fair division of existing organization, interfere materially with merited promotion, and render it more desirable for the highest graduates of the Military Academy to enter the line rather than the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, after the word "that," in line 15, page 24, by inserting the words "Chief of Engineers shall be selected as now provided by law, and hereafter."

Also, in line 16, strike out the words "created or caused by this act" and insert after the word "in," in the same line, the words "all other grades;" and strike out the words "the grade," in lines 16 and 17.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 24, line 15, after the word "part," insert the words "Chief of Engineers shall be selected as now provided by law, and hereafter."

In line 16 strike out the words "created or caused by this act" and insert "all other grades."

After the word "in," strike out the words "the grade."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, one minute. The first amendment comes in after the word "that," and before the word "vacancies," in line 15, and not the word "part," as read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "seven," "fourteen," and "twenty-eight," in line 11, page 24, and "forty" after the word "majors," and "thirty," in line 12, page 24, and insert the words "twelve" before "colonels," "twenty-four" before "lieutenant-colonels," "thirty-six" before "majors," in line 11; also "fifty" before "captains" and "twenty-five" before the word "second," in line 12.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to make this bill conform to the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers as contained in the communication which has just been read. The increase which is provided in the Engineer Corps by this bill is an increase in the lower grade of that corps.

The colonels remain the same as at present, the lieutenant-colonels the same, and the majors the same. There is an increase of 5 captains, an increase of 26 first lieutenants, and an increase of 12 second lieutenants. It is in the lower grades of this corps that the increase is not needed to such an extent as it is in the upper grade, and for this reason: The Engineer Corps is devoted almost entirely—in fact, entirely—to the work of constructing the fortifications and great public improvements carried on the river and harbor bill. The independent work given to the officers of the Engineer Corps is not intrusted to the officers of these lower grades. As a rule they are assistants to the officers of the engineers in charge of the actual work.

Now, with the increase of our territory and the necessity of sending engineers to Porto Rico and the Philippines, with the natural increase also of the public works from year to year, the necessity of officers capable of handling this independent work increases, and thus calls for an increase in the corps in the grades above that of first lieutenant. The Chief of Engineers does not recommend any increase over this bill in the corps of first lieutenants, being satisfied with the forty. He recommends five less in the grade of second lieutenants, recommending twenty-five instead of thirty, as the bill provides. But he does provide for a substantial increase in officers of the higher grades, twelve instead of seven colonels, twenty-four instead of fourteen lieutenant-colonels, thirty-six instead of twenty-eight of the grade of major.

Now, the precedent has been in all the bills governing this corps that there should be, as the Chief of Engineers says, 39 per cent of the corps of the grade of majors and above, and 61 per cent of the corps of the grade below that of major. That has been the record of the corps. The amendment which he has suggested to the Secretary of War provides for the continuation of that ratio; whereas the House bill as now presented reverses that and puts a much greater proportion of Engineer Corps below the grade of major than at present.

Not only that, but according to the record in this corps it takes twenty years for an officer in this branch of the service to reach the grade of major. He starts in as a cadet from West Point of the age of 21 to 23 years, and the record shows that he is at least 43 to 45 years of age before he becomes a major. The present Chief of Engineers did not reach the grade of colonel until he was 57 years of age. Now, under the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, twenty years will be the usual length of time for a graduate from West Point in this corps to reach the grade of major. He will then have eight years as major, six years as a lieutenant-colonel, and six years as a colonel before his retirement. It does seem to me, in view of the vast interests committed to this corps, in view of the special training these officers have in this service, that this recommendation of the Chief of Engineers should be followed by this House and the bill amended in accordance with the terms I have submitted.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this amendment will not be adopted. If adopted it puts the Engineer Corps way beyond every other corps in the Army in regard to promotion. The gentleman forgets that two years ago we gave this corps promotion in the higher grade, additional officers, improving their opportunities by which the whole corps was moved up. If you

adopt this, you give the engineers one major for two captains, and one lieutenant-colonel for every two majors, something unknown in every other corps. We did increase the quartermasters yesterday, but how did we do it? In the lower grades. We gave them, where they asked for twelve colonels, one increase; we gave them only two in the lieutenant-colonels, and put the others in as captains. The Engineer Corps under this bill, figured out with the ratio of the other grades in the Department, have to-day an equal chance for promotion with the Ordnance or any other corps of Army.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but they are lieutenants in six years, captains in fourteen years, and in the other lines of the Army they have all to serve twenty years to get to the grade of captain. If we listen to what the different bureaus want in regard to the higher grades, they will all be colonels, lieutenant-colonels, and majors. I want to see the line drawn somewhere which will preserve something like equity and justice as between these corps, and I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. HAY. Is it not a fact that this bill was carefully prepared by the Secretary of War with a view to the needs of each one of these various departments?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. HAY. And that we have not in any case, except in the Quartermaster's Department, I believe, increased these corps.

Mr. HULL. We made an increase in the Quartermaster-General's Department and in the Pay Department.

Mr. HAY. But not in the lower ranks.

Mr. HULL. None in the grades of colonel and lieutenant-colonel to amount to anything. We have in the Quartermaster's Department 72 captains, who have to look forward to only seven colonelcies, as I remember now. If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, we shall have 40 captains looking forward to 12 colonelcies. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I entirely concur in the view of the chairman of our committee that this amendment should not be adopted. If adopted, it would make the Engineer Corps top-heavy. The recommendations of the Secretary of War in regard to the Engineer Corps do that corps more than justice. I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. BROMWELL was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That the Ordnance Department shall consist of 1 Chief of Ordnance with the rank of brigadier-general, 4 colonels, 6 lieutenant-colonels, 12 majors, 24 captains, and 24 first lieutenants, the ordnance storekeeper, and the enlisted men, including ordnance sergeants, as now authorized by law. All vacancies created or caused by this section shall be filled by promotion and appointment as now prescribed by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move to amend by striking out the last word. I will occupy only one minute of the committee's time to say that as I do not desire to go upon record as appearing to vote against any increase of the Army in the present emergency, I shall, at the proper time, if no one else does so, offer a substitute continuing the existing establishment for two years.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 23. That the Signal Corps shall consist of 1 Chief Signal Officer with the rank of brigadier-general, 1 colonel, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 3 majors, 9 captains, 9 first lieutenants, 80 first-class sergeants, 120 sergeants, 150 corporals, 200 first-class privates, 150 second-class privates, and 10 cooks: *Provided*, That vacancies created or caused by this section shall be filled by promotion of officers of the Signal Corps according to seniority, as now provided by law. Vacancies remaining after such promotions may be filled by appointment of persons who have served in the Volunteer Signal Corps since April 21, 1898: *Provided*, That the *President* is authorized to continue in service, during the present emergency, for duty in the Philippine Islands, 10 volunteer signal officers with the rank of first lieutenant and 10 volunteer signal officers with the rank of second lieutenant. This authority shall extend only for the period when their services may be absolutely necessary, and not beyond July 1, 1902.

Mr. HEPBURN. I now offer an amendment in regard to which I have consulted with the chairman of the committee, and I think that it meets his approval and perhaps that of other members of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, in line 11, strike out "one" and insert "two;" also strike out "three" and insert "five;" also strike out "nine" wherever it occurs in line 11 and insert "nineteen;" so that the section will read:

"That the Signal Corps shall consist of 1 Chief Signal Officer with the rank of brigadier-general, 1 colonel, 2 lieutenant-colonels, 5 majors, 19 captains, 19 first lieutenants, etc."

The question being taken, the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the proviso, beginning in line 21, with regard to ten volunteer signal officers being continued should be stricken out. I offer an amendment to strike out that proviso. My understanding is that we have already taken these volunteer signal officers, authorized their continuance, and put them in the regular establishment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 25 strike out all of section 23 after the word "ninety-eight," in line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 26. That whenever there shall occur a vacancy, which can not be filled by promotion or appointment under the provisions of preceding sections of this act, in offices of the grades of lieutenant-colonel and major in the Adjutant-General's and Inspector-General's departments; of captain in the Quartermaster's, Subsistence, and Pay departments, and of first lieutenant in the Ordnance Department and the Signal Corps, such vacancy shall not be filled by a permanent appointment, but shall be filled by the detail, by the Secretary of War, after competitive examination, as hereinafter provided, of an officer of the line, who shall serve for the period of four years unless sooner relieved, and shall not again be eligible for detail in any staff corps or department until he shall have rendered actual service for two years with troops of the arm in which he is commissioned. Any officer detailed for staff duty under the provisions of this section shall be selected from the grade corresponding to, or from the grade next below, that to which the detail is to be made, and shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of the grade to which detailed. No detail for staff duty as herein provided shall be made in the case of any officer until he has actually served with troops for at least four years if his rank is above that of a second lieutenant, and for at least two years if he is a second lieutenant; and no such detail shall be made in the case of any officer until he shall have passed a satisfactory competitive examination by an examining board composed of three officers, of whom one may be a line officer and two shall be permanent or detailed officers of the department or corps in which the detail is to be made, said examination to be conducted under regulations to be prescribed by the examining boards, to be constituted as herein prescribed, for the various departments and corps in which details are to be made shall be convened by the Secretary of War at such times and places as the exigencies of the service may require, and said boards shall examine and report upon, as far as practicable, all line officers who may be applicants for details to staff duty, and who shall have been recommended by their commanding officers for such details. A separate list of officers reported on favorably by such examining boards shall be kept for each department or corps in which details are to be made, the officers on said list to be arranged in accordance with the ratings given them by the examining boards, and to be detailed for duty, in the department or corps to which the list pertains, in the order of their standing upon said list, beginning with the officers having the highest rating; but no officer shall remain eligible for detail for more than two years unless he shall again successfully pass the examination hereinbefore prescribed: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to require the detail for staff duty of any officer who, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, is mentally, morally, or physically unfit for such detail.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill as printed does not correspond with the action of the committee. The committee resolved to leave the Ordnance Department out of the detail system absolutely; so that the words "the Ordnance Department and," in line 25, should be stricken out. I move that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow me a question at this point?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will this bill make the Adjutant-General's Department or the Inspector-General's Department larger than they are under the statute organizing the Regular Army, on the basis of 27,000 or 29,000 men? There are men now in that corps detailed to other branches of the service. When it comes to filling the vacancies that your bill makes, will the men in that corps be relegated back to their rank in the Regular Army or will they have precedence for appointment in the volunteers?

Mr. HULL. If this bill passes they will, in my judgment, remain permanently in the corps. They have reached there by examination.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, I understand that, according to the gentleman's judgment, if there should be any vacancies they will be filled from the men now in the Adjutant-General's and Inspector-General's corps?

Mr. HULL. That would be my judgment, they being now in the Regular Army.

Mr. HAY. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to this proviso on page 28, beginning with line 18:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to require the detail for staff duty of any officer who, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, is mentally, morally, or physically unfit for such detail.

I do not understand that those words were put in the bill when we had it under consideration in the committee.

Mr. HULL. Yes; they were inserted in the amended bill as adopted.

Mr. HAY. I think they ought to be stricken out, because they give the Secretary of War absolute power to turn down any officer who may have passed an examination.

Mr. HULL. I do not believe that any officer who is mentally, morally, or physically unfit will be given an examination.

Mr. HAY. I do not think so either. Therefore that proviso ought to be stricken out.

Mr. HULL. This proviso does not apply to volunteer officers. So far as the regulars are concerned, I did not object to the Department fixing up the provision in whatever way it wanted to.

Mr. HAY. But we ought not to give the Secretary of War arbitrary power to turn a man down.

Mr. HULL. I assume that the Secretary of War would not have a man mentally, morally, or physically unfit examined. With regard to volunteers, where we struck out a similar authority on the part of the Secretary of War, the idea of the men who opposed that provision was that the Secretary of War might prescribe a rigid examination which the average volunteer would

be unable to pass. But in this case, where officers of the Regular Army are concerned, the man can not pass the examination until his commanding officer has designated him in orders for that purpose.

Mr. HAY. Does the gentleman from Iowa regard this provision as at all necessary in the bill? Does he not think that it might be stricken out without injury to this provision of the bill?

Mr. HULL. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the provision does neither harm nor good.

Mr. HAY. Then why not let it go out?

Mr. HULL. I have no special objection.

Mr. HAY. I move, Mr. Chairman, to strike out that provision which has just been read.

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to its going out.

The amendment proposed by Mr. HAY was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 27. That whenever there shall occur a vacancy, which can not be filled under the provisions of preceding sections of this act by the promotion of officers holding permanent appointments, in offices of the grades of colonel in the Adjutant-General's and Inspector-General's Departments, of major in the Quartermaster's and Subsistence Departments, of major in the Pay Department after the number of paymasters of that grade shall have been reduced below nine, and of captain in the Ordnance Department and the Signal Corps, such vacancy shall be filled by the appointment of an officer to be selected from among those who have served by detail, under the provisions of this act, in the next lower grade in the department or corps in which the vacancy occurs.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the word "nine" in line 4 of this section should be stricken out and "twenty" inserted, in order to correspond with the amendment made to the bill in regard to paymasters.

I move that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. I move also, in line 5 of the same section, to amend by striking out the words "The Ordnance Department and."

This would make the provision conform to the action already taken by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next section.

The Clerk read section 29, as follows:

SEC. 29. That vacancies in the grade of field officers and captain, created by this act, in the cavalry, artillery, and infantry shall be filled by promotion according to seniority in each branch, respectively. Vacancies existing after the promotions have been made shall be provided for as follows: A sufficient number shall be reserved in the rank of second lieutenant for the next graduating class at the United States Military Academy. Officers now holding commissions in the Volunteer Army may be ordered before boards of officers for such examination as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. Volunteer officers who establish their fitness before these examining boards may be appointed to the grade of first or second lieutenant in the Regular Army. Volunteer officers so appointed to the grade of first or second lieutenant shall be arranged according to rank, on a separate list. All vacancies then existing in the grade of first lieutenant in each arm of the service shall be filled from this list and the lineal lists of second lieutenants, according to seniority, as determined by length of prior commissioned service; but nothing herein contained shall change the relative rank of officers heretofore commissioned as second lieutenants in the Regular Army.

When the vacancies in the grade of first lieutenant shall have been filled from the two lists, the names of the remaining second lieutenants shall then be placed on one list in each branch, arranged as to seniority, according to the dates of their commissions, and promotions thereafter shall be made as provided for in existing law.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs made some amendments to this section which would make the officers under it eligible as volunteer officers of the Army without regard to any age limit. I am afraid that by the provision as it stands we have injured, instead of benefited, the volunteer officers, because under the present law a man could not come in from the ranks and would necessarily be under 30 years of age.

Now I desire to offer an amendment to carry out the idea of the committee, providing that a volunteer officer shall be eligible to the grades of first and second lieutenant without regard to age.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. All who served as volunteers to be so eligible?

Mr. HULL. Yes; that is the idea. I have not yet prepared the amendment, because I understood that Mr. MONDELL or Mr. PARKER would offer it. But I will prepare and offer the amendment if the Chair will indulge me for a moment.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will this amendment which I have here answer the gentleman's purpose?

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman from New Jersey give his attention and see if I have this in a form which is satisfactory to him?

That the present restrictions of law or regulations as to age shall not apply to those who have served as volunteers since April 21, 1898.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. For the purposes of appointment.

Mr. HULL. I will add that—

So far as appointments to the grades of second or first lieutenants of the line are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 24, page 30:

"That the present restrictions of law or regulations as to age shall not apply to those who have served as volunteers since April 21, 1898, so far as appointments to the grades of second or first lieutenants of the line are concerned."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this paragraph, any volunteer officer is eligible, after examination, in the creation of this new army, to be made either a first or a second lieutenant. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HULL. I think that is correct, because I think this list limits it to volunteer officers.

Mr. BINGHAM. Now, you say this further, that it shall be done according to seniority as determined by length of prior commissioned service.

The cadets of the class of 1899 were graduated some months before the usual date of graduation, as well, I think, as the class of 1900. According to this provision, a volunteer officer who has served prior to the graduation of those young men from the Academy will get credit in his rank as either first or second lieutenant when it comes to his commissions. Therefore each one of those cadets who were graduated in 1900 and in 1899 will be junior to this body of men transferred from the volunteer service to the regular service. Is that so?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will look at the bill he will see that it makes two lists—one list of those who are in the Regular Army and one list of those who are volunteers. The commissions of the volunteers govern as against each other in the matter of length of service. Those who are now in the Regular Army will be pushed up in their promotion according to their seniority in their own list, but the volunteers will be in another list, and their length of service will balance with each other.

Mr. BINGHAM. But not in competition with or antagonism to the Regular Army officers.

Mr. HULL. No; not in competition with the Regular Army officers. They are already in the Regular Army, and are on a lineal list provided for in the same section, upon which they go according to their rank.

Mr. BINGHAM. Therefore none of these men who are in the classes from the Academy to which I have referred will be junior to these volunteers to be appointed hereafter.

Mr. HULL. Not at all. Of course there are men now in the Regular Army, appointed from civil life, who are a part of the permanent establishment under present law, who will hold their present places above cadets who have been graduated since.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, yes; they are now in the permanent establishment. I refer to those to be appointed hereafter.

Mr. HULL. I ask that the Clerk proceed with the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 30. That to fill vacancies occurring from time to time in the several organizations serving without the limits of the United States with trained men the President is authorized to enlist recruits in numbers equal to 4 per cent in excess of the total strength authorized for such organizations.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, we live in the most extraordinary age and in the greatest country of the world. What shall we say of the two mighty revolutions which have marked the progress of our own country during the last one hundred and twenty-five years? One converted thirteen weak colonies into a nation which has spread itself from the Atlantic to the Pacific, not by the desolations of successful war, but by the triumphant march of industry and enterprise. The other threatened to disrupt this great Republic, but, guided and governed by the inscrutable wisdom of Providence, its results are renewed prosperity and a more closely united people.

No epoch of the world's history can exhibit a people so numerous, so homogeneous; we have one form of government; we speak a common language; our people enjoy the widest personal and political liberty; we have a domain of imperial expanse wherein may be found every variety of climate and every character of soil. Our population is something over 76,000,000 people. The arts of civilization, the benefits of commerce, have been carried to their utmost perfection; education is diffused throughout our population and its benefits are felt alike by rich and poor. The productions of our farmers, the yields of our mines, the vast wealth of all kinds with which our country abounds, strike the mind as something stupendous.

We live under the freest Government in the world. This happy condition of affairs has been brought about, first, by the goodness of Almighty God, and, second, by the institutions of government under which we have lived since 1776. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, adhered to by our forefathers, have made this a great country and a happy and prosperous people. Because of our free institutions millions of people have come to us from other lands, and the tide of immigration is continuing to flow toward our shores. Up to the time of the passage of the bill for the government of Porto Rico this Government had taken no step which could be called a departure from those policies and principles which have guided and governed our statesmen during the past one hundred and twenty-four years.

The question of the Philippine Islands was then and still is unsettled. For, while the President has governed it as a military province, his policy has neither been indorsed by the people of the country nor by this House. In the past we have steered clear of the quarrels of Europe. We have obeyed the behest of Washington and have formed no entangling alliances abroad. We have adhered to the principles and practices of the Monroe doctrine. Since the war of 1812 no foreign soldier has set his foot upon our soil, and no foreign country has insulted our dignity at home or abroad. It is now proposed to depart from the settled policy of this country, and the first step to be taken in that direction is the maintenance of the great standing Army under the provisions of this bill.

The next step will be the building of many ships and the enlistment of many sailors. The next is the conferring upon the President of the United States absolute military and civil power in the Philippine Islands. It is within the power of this House to give to the Executive all the soldiers necessary to maintain the authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands and at the same time to adhere to these maxims of government which are recognized as best for our country. It is dangerous to depart from our well-settled policy of maintaining only a small standing army. It is true that the Republican party in the last campaign ridiculed the idea of imperialism and denied strenuously that there was any intention on the part of the Government to enter upon such a policy. But that the granting of such enormous powers to the Executive is cause for serious alarm no candid man will deny. It will be argued that the people by their votes have retained in power the party which advocates these measures, but it is equally true that the votes of the people did not indorse the policy of military expansion, of great standing armies, of enormous expenditures.

If all the people who then and now condemn the Philippine policy of the Administration, the raising of a great standing army, the possibility of conscription, and the enormous taxation which must accompany this policy had voted against the Republican party, its candidate would have suffered an ignominious defeat. There were other questions which seemed to the people of more importance for the moment, and they were satisfied that they could deal with the question of imperialism later on. The battle is just now joined, and will not be decided until the people of this country have an opportunity, untrammeled by other matters, to express their opinions at the polls. It may be true that many members of this House honestly believe that there is no harm to result to the Republic from the steps which are now proposed. It has been the history of all republics that imperialism has crept upon them unawares; that the advocates of such a policy—some of them honestly—have diverted the minds of the people from issues so vitally important.

But to all who have studied the history of the past and have marked the trend of current events the policy of the Administration seems fraught with great danger to the Republic. The greatest and wisest statesman of this country has said "that a great standing army is a menace to freedom." He said this, having before him the examples of history, and had he lived in this age he might have seen the whole of Europe bending under the burden of armies and groaning under taxation levied for their support. These great European armies and navies are maintained and supported for the same purposes and for the same ends which this Administration is striving to accomplish. Shall we enter the same pathways and pursue the same course which have been fatal to those who have gone before us?

The present Administration has given to us two examples of its purpose to govern as dependent colonies the territory which we have unfortunately acquired from Spain. Take as the first example the treatment of the people of the island of Porto Rico. We all know that when our Army, commanded by General Miles, invaded that island the people welcomed him with open arms; that the little children came down to the shores of that island with United States flags in their hands and garlands of flowers to strew the pathway of our soldiers. They did so because they believed that this was a free and independent republic; that it would suffer no subjects under its flag, and that it would confer upon them the free institutions of the United States—that they would receive the immunities and privileges of our own citizens. They were strengthened in this belief by the proclamation of the Commanding General of our Armies, which declared that they should be free. And yet in the last session of Congress a bill was passed for the civil government of Porto Rico, which while it provided for a representative body to be elected by 27 per cent of the people of that island, it also provided for an executive council, which was given the power to pass upon every measure adopted by the representative body.

The members of the executive council are appointed by the President of the United States. They are his creatures. They depend for their offices upon his will and pleasure, and thus he holds within his grasp the absolute power of governing the people of that island. They are not even given a representative upon this floor. They are taxed without representation, and every principle of freedom is violated by that measure. This legislation was an astounding revelation to the people of Porto Rico, particularly so when they were about to send representatives to the Spanish Cortes. I will not stop to speak of the outrage perpetrated upon these people by forcing them to pay tariff duties. Thus we see what the purpose of the Administration is in this instance.

Another example of the intention of the Administration to disregard the principles of the Constitution and to violate every maxim of our republican form of government is the treatment which has been accorded to the people of the Philippine Islands. In the first place, why should we ever have acquired islands from seven to eight thousand miles from our nearest seaport, populated by from eight to ten millions of people who can never become citizens of this country, having a climate unsuited to our people, presenting no advantages for enterprise or for business and situated in a part of the globe which is the storm center of the world, right at the door of China, where the eagles are gathered together for a division of spoil; where it will be almost necessary that we should take an active and perhaps a militant part in the quarrels of the great powers—islands whose permanent retention means a war with some one or other of the great European powers? We are told that it was a manifest destiny which placed upon us the burden of these islands. Was it manifest destiny which caused the commissioners of this country at Paris to demand the Philippine Islands and to pay for them $20,000,000? Was it not rather the will and wish of the President to acquire these islands which caused that clause to be incorporated in the treaty? The public knows nothing of the secret instructions given to the commissioners who negotiated the treaty of Paris, but assuredly they simply obeyed their instructions. Why should the President have desired the possession of these islands, and, having acquired the possession of them, why did not he lay down a policy to be pursued toward them which would have assured them of self-government? If this had been done we would have been spared the loss of blood and treasure which has marked every step taken by the Administration in the Philippine Islands.

In casting about to find the reason for this remarkable purchase of these islands we can only come to the conclusion that it was done for the purpose of giving to the Administration an opportunity of pursuing and building up a policy of colonization and imperialism. It is an excuse for a standing army, for a great navy. What will be the result of this permanent retention of the Philippines? First, it is necessary to maintain a large standing army—witness the provisions of this bill, which provides for an army of over 100,000 men—and which it will cost this country at least $125,000,000 a year to support. Nor will this cost be confined to one year, or two years, or twenty years. By the passage of this bill we are fixing upon us and our posterity a great burden of taxation. Generations yet unborn will bear it, for it has been the history of all European countries which have undertaken to conquer and subdue Asiatic populations that they were compelled to maintain for generations large standing armies in those countries.

England has been governing India for two hundred years, and yet to-day she maintains in that country an army of 80,000 men. France has been undertaking to subdue Algiers for seventy-five years, and she maintains there to-day a standing army of 72,000 men. Nor can it be said that it is possible to pay these armies from the revenue of the colonies. I venture the assertion that after the payment of the civil officers and other internal governmental expenses of the Philippine Islands out of the island revenues nothing will remain with which to pay the Army. I desire to call attention to another phase of this question of a standing army, and that is whether it will be possible to recruit the same by voluntary enlistment.

At no time in our history has the standing Army of this country been recruited up to the number of men allowed by law, and there is no reason to believe that it can be done now. Everyone familiar with the conditions in the Philippine Islands knows that it will be necessary, if they are to be permanently retained by this country, to have the Army up to its full complement, and if they can not be obtained by voluntary enlistment they must be by conscription. Another inevitable consequence of the permanent retention of the Philippine Islands is the building of a navy as large as any other navy in the world, because, being in the very center, as it were, of those entanglements and quarrels which are now pending between the great European powers, we must prepare ourselves to defend the possessions which we have acquired in the Orient, and to do this we must build up our Navy.

To build a navy equal to that of England it will cost for years to come a hundred million of dollars per year. Then, too, we must fortify the coasts of these islands, and that expense, together with the expense of the civil government of those islands, will amount to no less than fifty millions per annum. The pension list of this country is now $150,000,000 per year, and the increase of the Army will mean a corresponding increase of pensions, and

the ultimate result of this policy advocated and insisted upon by the President and his party means, in money alone, $500,000,000 per year, to be collected in shape of taxes from the people of this country.

I do not speak of the blood which will be shed, of the many who will die of disease as a result of this imperial policy. There have been very many deaths among our soldiers in the Philippines. Hundreds of them are in lunatic asylums; hundreds of them have become useless from disease and are pensioners upon the bounty of the country. We are told that the time has come for this country to be a world power, and by world power is meant a fighting power, for since the Declaration of Independence one hundred and twenty-four years ago we have been a world power in the best sense of the word. Under our influence this continent has been free from European aggression, and every State in Southern and Central America has had over them the protecting wings of our Government.

Our commerce has been projected into every sea. Products of our factories and of our farms are sold in the uttermost parts of the earth. Our inventions, our improvements in all the arts of civilization have been diffused into every corner of the globe. The power and dignity of our Government have been respected by the great States of Europe. We have been appealed to to settle the difficulties of other countries, and we have been recognized the world over as one of the great powers of the earth. No amount of warfare can add to our renown. The acquisition of no island and of no foreign territory can enhance our greatness. No standing army and no great navy can do more for our commerce; no imperial policy, no colonization can be of benefit to our people.

We are to-day the greatest, the most independent, of the nations, and we will remain so as long as we faithfully adhere to the Declaration of Independence and to the Constitution. But it is said that the Democratic party, under the lead of Thomas Jefferson, was the first to inaugurate a policy of expansion. It is true that in the early years of our country, and while the Democratic party was in power, we added to our domain the Louisiana purchase in 1803, Florida in 1819, Texas in 1845, California, New Mexico, Arizona, and a part of Colorado as a consequence of the Mexican war; but that was true expansion. It was an expansion over territory where the Constitution followed the flag. It was expansion over people who could become a part of and be assimilated with our people. It was the expansion of our political ideas, and it produced for this country great States and statesmen.

In order to carry it out it was not necessary to maintain great standing armies and vast navies. The territories which we took were within our geographical limitations. We did not have to send our soldiers 8,000 miles across the ocean. In other words, it was true and natural expansion of the boundaries of our country. In one sense it was an expansion for self-defense, because through the Louisiana purchase we obtained control of the Mississippi River—that great artery of commerce which extends from Minnesota to Louisiana—and it would not have been unwise had we further extended our power and controlled the St. Lawrence as well. How different was that expansion from that which is now proposed by the Republican party. That party proposes to erect in distant lands governments antagonistic to ours in form and substance, to be maintained by military force, and to necessitate for all times a tremendous burden of taxation and a useless waste of life.

I am unalterably opposed to the creation of this great standing Army, because I know that once created it will remain forever an incubus upon us and our posterity. I do not believe that there is any necessity for it if the Administration will declare its purpose to grant to the people of the Philippine Islands self-government. The war now being waged there will cease, and all necessity for such a body of soldiers as 65,000 men in those islands will be obviated. There are now in those islands a large number of men. There are a large number of military stations. There are many ships and many sailors stationed in the waters of those islands, and yet, after two years of warfare, the authority of the United States does not extend beyond the sound of their guns.

It is reliably stated that one can not go from one garrison to another without the protection of an armed escort. It is a crime to continue a policy such as this, under the conditions now existing, when all could be changed by a mere declaration of the Government. This Government owes it to itself and to its people and to the traditions of the past and to the hopes of the future that a perpetual warfare should cease, that the blood and treasure of this country should no longer be poured out for purposes of conquest.

However much I may be opposed to this incubus of standing Army, I recognize that it is necessary to provide troops for the immediate necessities in the Philippines and in this country. From the best information I can obtain I am inclined to the belief that 100,000 men will not be too many for the present needs. While we were told before the election that Mr. McKinley's election meant immediate cessation of hostilities in the Philippines; while the Philippine Commission made a report to this effect, which was widely used as a campaign document, yet we are now confronted with a report from General MacArthur, the commanding general of the United States in the Philippines, in which it it is declared that it is absolutely necessary to continue the present number of troops now in the Philippines, and indeed to increase that number.

Therefore it is that we must provide the necessary number of soldiers until this Administration shall declare a policy which will make it possible to have peace in those islands. The substitute offered by the gentleman from New York will give to this Administration all the time it needs to pacify these islands, if they can be pacified. It keeps the Army up for the length of time that enlistments are made in the Regular Army. Best of all, it provides for a temporary instead of a permanent army. If during the two years before us the people of this country shall determine that they want a permanent standing army, that army can be provided for without additional cost or expense by repealing the act proposed by the gentleman from New York.

I want now to call attention to the fact that the section which has just been read shows that the President is authorized to maintain and raise a standing army of 100,000 men.

I shall vote for the substitute which will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN], which gives the country the law now on the statute books and continues it for two years. It does seem to me that it is the duty certainly of every Democrat on this floor to do everything in his power to prevent a permanent standing army, and the only way to do this is to vote for a temporary army. If there is one principle which we have contended against, it is against a permanent standing army. Under this bill we have a permanent standing army of a hundred thousand men placed upon us.

Now, it may be said that the responsibility is not upon us upon this side; but the minority has a responsibility as well as the majority, and if the members on this side of the House want to do their duty by the country under the circumstances which now confront us they must vote for the lesser of two evils. By so doing we may prevent the passage of this bill. We know that we can not avoid voting at this particular time for some bill which will provide for troops in the Philippine Islands. It may be that the decision of the Supreme Court may so affect the minds of our friends on the other side that they will not want to stay in the Philippines. That is another reason why this question of a permanent standing army should be postponed as long as possible. I say that we want to defeat a permanent standing army, and in order to give an opportunity to the members of this House to vote against a permanent standing army we should offer something affirmative; we should construct something.

When we offer them the same military system under which the country has been living for the past two years, we give ourselves time, so that circumstances may change and the Republicans not be able to insist that there is any necessity for a large standing army by reason of conditions in the Philippines. In this way we may avoid entirely a permanent standing army in this country. It is the only feasible plan, it does seem to me, for a great party to assume; it is the only position which can be defended; and I believe that if gentlemen will think about this proposition and about this standing army they will vote for the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from New York, and if that is not accepted by the House they will then vote against this bill providing for this permanent standing army. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say one word about this section. The reason it is put in the bill is because if you make the net a little low the enlistments are stopped at once, and by giving this authority you can hold the maximum at 96,000, if it is desired, or above the 58,000, so that the full number of the minimum can be maintained.

Mr. HAY. I withdraw my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 31. That the President is authorized to maintain the enlisted force of the several organizations of the Army at their maximum strength as fixed by this act during the present exigencies of the service, or until such time as Congress may hereafter direct.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add after the word "direct," in line 9, section 31, the following:

"*Provided*, That in the event of the enlistment of a soldier in the Army for the period required by law, and after the expiration of one year's service, should either of his parents die leaving the other solely dependent upon the soldier for support, such soldier may be honorably discharged from the service of the United States, upon due proof being made of such condition to the Secretary of War."

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I can see no sense of justice whatever in holding a soldier in the service under such circumstances. Of what use is a man in the Army if his mother is at home dependent upon him, and mourning her life away because of his absence under circumstances which entirely changed after his voluntary admission into the Army? I know of

cases where parents have spared their sons to the Army when the emergency arose which required them to go, and without hesitation they parted with perhaps their only son.

At the time the family of the soldier was intact, his father and mother were living, and no particular necessity existed for him to remain at home; but after his admission into the Army his father may have died, leaving the mother solely dependent upon her soldier boy. Is it right or proper that the mother should be deprived of the services of her son at home under such circumstances? All praise should be accorded to the generous, patriotic mothers of the country who have spared their sons in time of the nation's peril, and no better appreciation can be shown for this great and voluntary sacrifice than to permit the son to return with an honorable discharge when he may be needed to sustain his widowed mother at home.

I believe it is the custom, and one of the regulations, of countries operating under conscription laws, that they will not take an only son, even under conscription or draft, as they recognize the fact that he may be as necessary to his widowed mother as to the country itself. Surely, our country can be as generous as the empires across the sea, when we recollect that the greatest armies that the world has ever seen have been recruited from among the young men of our country, who voluntarily came to its service whenever peril or disaster threatened our land. I am unwilling that there should be no law regulating matters of this kind. It may be said that the Department regulations should control, but I deny that they are either as effective, as just, or as kindly as they should be in their administration, and I think if we put into the statute law governing the Army a wholesome provision of this character we will be doing but justice to the families of enlisted men. I understand that this is not objected to by the committee, and call for a vote.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 32. That the Secretary of War is authorized to detach from the Army at large such number of enlisted men as may be necessary to perform duty at the various recruiting rendezvous, and while performing such duty one member of each party shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of sergeant, and one the rank, pay, and allowances of corporal of the arm of the service to which they respectively belong.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, to be added after the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

And that the Secretary of War is hereby directed to have made and delivered to each officer and enlisted man who served during the war with Spain and who has not been dishonorably discharged from the service a bronze medal of such design as he may approve, such medals to cost not more than $1 each.

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order against the amendment. It has nothing to do with the organization of the Army or any part of it.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. HULL. I withhold it at the gentleman's request.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I will say frankly that I am inclined to think that the gentleman's point of order is probably well taken. I intend to introduce a bill along the line of this amendment, and knowing that when introduced it will go to its long sleep, and probably its last, in the box of the proper committee and may never be heard from again in the House, I wanted to bring it before the House at this time, in the hope of getting the attention of the proper committee to the matter. I believe that it is a wise and just provision. We are following so many precedents set by foreign armies, and a good many of them, it appears to me, bad precedents, that I think it is time we borrow some good ideas from them. A medal is given, as I understand it, in nearly every service except that of the United States to every soldier who participates in actual war. It becomes an heirloom in the family; it is preserved and handed down from father to son, and I believe that any boy raised in the presence of his father's old musket or old sword, or who has received as part of his heritage one of these medals for gallant service in actual war, is a better citizen and more likely to be a patriot and offer his services when the country needs them than one who is not. For this reason I have presented this amendment and intend to introduce a bill containing similar provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 36. That any officer of the Army on the active list below the grade of brigadier-general who served during the civil war shall, when retired, be retired with the rank and pay of the next higher grade, except such officers as may be retired under section 34 of this act.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 22, page 32, after the word "act," insert the following:

"And all officers of the Army who served during the civil war and have heretofore been retired at a grade below that of brigadier-general, and are still living, shall hereafter be entitled to the rank and pay of the next higher grade."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was under general debate I called the attention of the committee to the effect of the provision which has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, which is to retire all officers now upon the active list who served during the civil war at one grade higher than that which they occupy on the date of their retirement. It leaves out of consideration a large list of officers who served during the civil war and were compelled by the wounds which they received in that war, or in the Indian wars following it, to retire before their age compelled their retirement. In other words, it rewards length of service without rewarding hardship of service.

The naval personnel bill which we passed a few years ago contained the same provision with respect to the Navy as that now before the committee. The result has been that there has been a continued agitation by the officers who were discriminated against in favor of some such measure as I have now proposed. Such a measure has passed the Senate, is now before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I understand it is giving them a great deal of trouble. The gentleman from Iowa, in reply to my questions, admitted that this provision was discriminating justice; that it discriminated against the officer who has heretofore retired. I think the provision ought to go out or be amended. Without further delay I ask the Clerk to read a letter which I have received since the beginning of this session of the House, which puts in graphic form the hardship of the discrimination which the committee proposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

HON. W. H. MOODY.

DEAR SIR: That clause in the Army reorganization bill, now up in the House of Representatives, relating to the future retirement of officers with one grade who served during the civil war, etc., fails entirely to cover that class of officers who served during the civil war, but who were compelled to be retired on low rank on account of the severity of their service by reason of wounds or disability incurred in the service. That is no disgrace and should not militate against them now that they are on the shady side of life. That clause was originally intended as a bill in equity to even up things as a matter of justice. The law of October, 1890, gave many officers, also disabled since the civil war, an advanced grade, some of whom were never on a battlefield, and consequently not so much entitled to this distinction as we are. They are comparatively young men, and it is very galling to those of us who know what we went through in that war to see such discrimination. This bill will have practically the same effect. In short, the whole thing is a discrimination now in favor of those who, by length of service, but not by wounds or disease or necessarily severe service (perhaps they never once placed their lives in jeopardy), have already got all the rank they were ever entitled to or could reasonably expect, and will result in again making the retired list top-heavy with brigadier-generals and colonels, instead of giving those who got the brunt of that war and were retired as first lieutenants and captains, the advanced grade to even up matters in equity and justice.

Mr. Chairman, the writer of that letter is a type of the many hundred officers who served throughout the civil war and in our Indian hostilities after the close of the civil war. He was compelled to retire long before the age limit on account of disabilities he had incurred in the service. If you pass this provision in the manner in which it is reported, we shall all be beset by officers on the retired list who will believe that they have been discriminated against, and their cause will be a just one. The provision ought not to be passed at all, or it ought to do equal justice to all soldiers.

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts be reported again to the House.

The amendment was again read.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MAHON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

ARMY BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. If this section in the bill passes, a rank injustice will be done to a large number of men on the retired list. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] that the provision of this section must cover all the men on the retired list or cover none.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs time and time again have been appealed to to allow officers to be retired with the rank and pay above the rank which they now held, and the committee has uniformly refused to report such bill. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] that personally I have no objection to this amendment, but of the men that this section will cover I can safely say that seven-eighths of them were never under fire. You retired last year three officers who went through the civil war and had four or five wounds on their persons, who served twenty-two years on the frontier fighting Indians. Do you propose that these men shall be discriminated against? Mr. Chairman, if you are going to discriminate and have any class legislation, let it be in favor of the men who bore the brunt of the civil war. [Applause.] You propose to put in a young man who entered the service in 1865 and

since that time has been holding a position in the War Department.

Mr. HULL. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the bill provides that these men shall be men who served through the civil war.

Mr. MAHON. "Served in the civil war" or "during the civil war;" that is, any part of it. Now, Mr. Chairman, this section covers men that have never been under fire, but because they have been detailed to perform civil services in the War Department, will you put men of that kind on the retired list, with rank and pay above the grade they hold, and turn down old men who are walking through the streets of Washington to-day, many of them with one arm and many on crutches, men who bore the brunt of battle and served many long years in our Indian wars? I hope this amendment will be adopted or the whole section stricken out.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does this amendment include the Indian wars?

Mr. MAHON. I think not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the justice, or partial justice, of this proposed amendment; but I warn the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] and the committee that if it is adopted, and the living men to come within the scope of the amendment are put on the retired list at a grade above that which they hold, what are you going to do about the discrimination that has already, or will thereby be done, against the dead men who were carried on the retired list at the grade they did hold? It will simply result, in my judgment, in a general provision shortly that the heirs and legal representatives of these dead persons shall have the right to assert a claim to equalize them as representatives upon the same basis as the men who have lived to see this day; and there probably would be a great equity in their favor, because a great many of them died on account of the superior service which they rendered.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that this is not retroactive.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I understand that; but it creates a retroactive principle.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I see the embarrassment, but it arises out of the section; strike out the section altogether.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the trouble about the amendment as offered is that you enter upon a wide field, and there has been no definite information given as to what it will do.

The section as reported by the committee confines its benefits to a very few cases; there is no question about that. It corresponds in some degree with what the nation has already done for the Navy. In the provision for the Navy no restriction was made as to rank, but each officer as he retired was allowed to do so at the next higher grade than that which he actually held. In this bill the benefits of the provision are confined to officers below the rank of brigadier-general.

I can sympathize with what my friend from Pennsylvania says to some extent, but not to the full extent that he goes. I know men who are now in the service who have performed service continuously since 1861 and who are now simply majors in the regular establishment. One such officer, whom I now call to mind, has just returned from Manila broken in health, compelled to retire before he could attain the next higher grade. If this provision be stricken out entirely, he will be compelled to retire with the rank of major.

It seems to me that if my friend from Pennsylvania can not get all that he wants he ought not, for that reason, to stand here and refuse to such men as Major McClure the small meed of recognition for long, faithful, and distinguished service by allowing him to attain one grade higher before he retires. For many reasons I would prefer that the section remain as it is, rather than that we should endanger the passage of a measure recognizing men who have been performing this meritorious service.

I know the case which my friend has especially in mind—the case of a gallant soldier who fought his way up from civil life to be a colonel, when he reached the age of retirement. I would be willing to see this recognition given to such officers; but in the committee and since it has been my conviction that if we undertake to provide for all these officers we shall endanger the passage of the amendment and thereby fail to do justice to those who should have justice done to them.

Many officers now on the retired list have for the last twenty years been engaged in other business, making more money than the amount they would receive as full pay. There has been nothing to prevent any man on the retired list from transacting some line of business, or doing something by which his pay might be increased, while men in the regular line, with only one-fourth more pay, can not do anything to add one penny to their salary.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Suppose the retired officer is disabled, which is frequently the case.

Mr. HULL. I have known such officers to be disabled, with an arm off or a leg off. I have known men to have served in the volunteers—men who had been shot through the body and who were living on a pension. But when we undertake to extend this provision as proposed, we are liable to enlarge the scope of the measure to such an extent as to endanger the entire proposition, and thus deny justice to many officers who have been in the service during all these years.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if this section had been drawn so as to confine its benefits to officers who have been for thirty or forty years in the Regular Army there might be some excuse for it. But I want to repeat, in regard to the men who bore the brunt of the battle in the civil war as regular officers—who went through four years of active service in the field—that there are not many of those men who are not to-day on the retired list, forced there by reason of exposure or wounds in the field.

But you propose to take men who are still on the active list—which is evidence of the fact that they have never performed any extraordinarily hard service during the civil war—men who are still in active service forty years after that war has ended, and put them on the retired list, promoting them over the heads of men who deserve this recognition at the hands of the Government.

Mr. HULL. General Lawton served all through the civil war, and but for his recent death in battle he would be in active service to-day.

Mr. MAHON. I offered a bill for the benefit of a man who belonged to Senator Lane's company, who entered the White House on the 16th of April, 1861, to defend that house and the President, who served as a sergeant in that company and was discharged, who carries to-day a discharge signed by President Lincoln, he being one of the only five men in this country who hold such a discharge. Having been wounded three times during the war, besides having been confined in Libby Prison, he went into the regular service as a second lieutenant. After the war he was sent to the frontier. He was not one of the pets of the Department. For thirty-four long years he served in the Rocky Mountains, fighting the Indians, without even a detail, and, notwithstanding the fact that his body was scarred with wounds, this committee refused to bring in a bill here to authorize the President to put him on the retired list as a brigadier-general.

Mr. HULL. Did not the committee report that bill?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

Mr. HULL. It did.

Mr. MAHON. Well, you never called it up in the House.

Mr. HULL. We could not get it up.

Mr. MAHON. That man fought his way up from civil life to the rank of colonel in the Sixth United States Cavalry, and by operation of law he was compelled to retire as a colonel.

I for one, as a member of this House, will never agree that men who have been holding down chairs in the War Department shall have the benefit of a provision of this kind, while men such as those I have named are kept out. With me this is not a matter of money. Justice is justice, let it cost what it will. If the men embraced in the provision of the committee are to be retired, in the name of God, I appeal to the chairman of this committee to allow my amendment to pass, to do justice to such men as those for whom I am now speaking. I remember that on the battlefield of Gettysburg a division of regulars marched into that bloody wheat field and were swept into those woods, so that in less than nine minutes eighteen hundred of them were on their backs. Men who were regular officers in that charge are walking the streets of this city to-day, maimed for life. Yet the provision of the committee would forbid those men being placed on the retired list at a grade above the rank they held when forced out of the service on account of being crippled.

Now, the gentleman talks of the families of these men. Why, Mr. Chairman, we take care of the men in their lives. We take care of them in this world, but do not propose to provide for them in other worlds. We are not bound to take care of their familles in this respect. Our pension laws provide ample protection for them. But if you place these men on the retired list, then I appeal for justice in the first place for the men who fought the terrible struggle during the civil war and fought it to a successful conclusion. And even though near forty years have elapsed since that war began, there are many men who fought in that war still on the active list, which is proof positive that their service was not of the hardest kind and did not disable them from active service in the affairs of life.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HULL. I understood the gentleman to refer to men who were not in perfect health.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wish a moment longer. I wish to offer an amendment which will include all Indian officers in the same category. There are many men still living who were crippled by wounds or ill health in the Indian wars, and I want the House to adopt an amendment to provide for them, and then, if you see proper to do so thereafter, you can vote down this whole provision as amended if this section is not regarded as a wise one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from

Pennsylvania that the amendment would not be in order at this time, as another is pending.

Mr. MAHON. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but I simply gave notice that I shall offer the amendment at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The amendment proposed by Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts was again read.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 61, noes 74.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I call for tellers on the vote just taken.

Mr. MAHON. I move to strike out the entire section, No. 36.

The CHAIRMAN. The first question is on the amendment now pending, and upon which tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered.

The Chair appointed Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts and Mr. HULL as tellers.

The committee proceeded to divide.

Before the vote was announced,

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to do so, I shall withdraw the demand for tellers and move to strike out the entire section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that motion has been suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion has already been made by two gentlemen on the floor.

Mr. HULL. What is the pending motion now?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is to strike out the entire section.

Mr. HULL. Before action is taken upon that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard for a moment.

I hope the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, which I understand to be to strike out the section, will not be agreed to by the committee. The provision as it stands in the bill simply gives to those who are now entitled to be upon the active list and who served throughout or during the civil war, or in the Indian war, of which my friend from Pennsylvania speaks so pathetically, or during the last war with Spain, a grade higher than that to which they are now entitled upon their retirement. The appeal for the old soldier who was on the retired list for some years can be made more eloquently by the gentleman from Pennsylvania for those who are now on the active list and must soon retire at low grades in the Army.

When the Navy personnel bill was passed the officers of the Navy received one grade higher, regardless of rank, for all those who served through the civil war and were then on the active list. This provision confines the rank below that of brigadier-general, so that it will not give the higher ranks to men placed on the retired list under this provision. There are a few of the old soldiers of the civil war who served from 1861 who are now ready to be retired and who will retire as majors, one or two as captains, and one or two as lieutenant-colonels, unless this provision is adopted. It simply gives to the Army in a small degree the recognition so generously and freely and heartily accorded to the Navy during the last Congress. It seems to me that because an amendment extending its scope was not adopted by the committee, that should be no reason for refusing this act of justice to these old men, who have served their country continuously for almost forty years.

It does not apply to the men to whom my friend refers, men holding soft jobs in Washington; because in almost every case of that character, where a man has been in Washington continuously, holding staff positions, having served through the civil war, he is now on the retired list as a colonel or as a brigadier-general. It refers to the men who have been on the frontier, who have not had the opportunities for promotion, who have served their country, who have been confined to the meager pay of each rank of the service, and who now come to Congress through this provision, adopted, I think, with practical unanimity by the committee, recommended by two or three Secretaries of War, approved, in my judgment, by the conscience of everyone who has investigated it.

I hope this provision will be held in the bill by the votes of this committee. It does seem to me that the man who poses as the friend of the old soldier will not take occasion, through pique at not getting all that he wanted, to strike in the face the most deserving old soldiers who can be found.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; I yield, if he wants to ask me a question.

Mr. GAINES. I desire to ask if, when this officer is retired with higher grade, he also gets a larger salary?

Mr. HULL. Why, of course; it gives him three-fourths of the salary of the grade.

Mr. GAINES. It not only retires him, but gives him a higher salary?

Mr. HULL. Well, if he is a major now, and there is one case of that kind, he would be retired as a lieutenant-colonel, and the salary of a lieutenant-colonel on the active list is $500 a year more than the salary of a major. This provision would give him three-quarters of that extra $500.

Mr. GAINES. Then you are not satisfied, when he retires from active service, that he shall have the same salary that he has been getting while in the active service, but, in other words, you want to promote him and give him a higher salary when he is doing nothing than he received when he was in active service.

Mr. HULL. I believe that you ought to give to the Army in this small degree what you have already given to the Navy in a much larger degree.

Mr. GAINES. You propose to retire a man and give him an increased salary for the privilege of doing nothing.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, apart from the glaring injustice of this bill advocated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], which gives to a few men emoluments which ought to have been given to all of the class if they ought to have been given at all, the provision is vicious for the further reason that it builds up the retired list of the Army. Already this list is enormous, and you have today added 36 officers—a colonel, a major, 4 captains, and 20 or 30 lieutenants and second lieutenants of the Regular Army—who will be placed upon this retired list. Moreover, your bill, which provides for a minimum standing army of 58,000 men, provides for officers enough for an army of 100,000 men. In other words, when you decrease your army of 100,000 men down to 58,000 men you will still have officers for 100,000 men, who will have no troops to command. So that I say from every point of view it is not right to keep this section in the bill. It is an injustice to a large number of retired Army officers, and it is taking another step toward building up the retired list, which is growing in numbers every day, which is costing millions of dollars, and which will continue to cost more with this permanent large army which you propose to put upon the country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we might as well be frank about this matter, and I propose to state my position. I am willing to put any man on the retired list with the grade and pay above his rank for distinguished services in behalf of his country. We have many men in this country, many men as brave as any country ever produced, that this Congress could with great propriety and great justice put upon the retired list with a slight promotion. The gentleman talks about being in the way of the old soldiers. I am not in favor of putting a man on the retired list with promotion and additional pay unless he has rendered some service to the Government that entitles him to that promotion. Now, if the gentleman will amend the bill and say it shall apply to all the officers on the active list and retired list who served through the entire civil war and the Indian wars, and after the civil war on the frontier in active service for twenty-five years, I will vote for your amendment.

In the last Congress, Mr. Chairman, in what was intended to be only a small bureau of the War Department, we now have a gentleman holding the position of chief clerk with the rank of brigadier-general. The people of this country, Mr. Chairman, will stand so much and no more, and I believe we have reached the extreme point of making soft places for men who have not earned them by compelling this House to promote them by putting measures for their benefit into general bills that we can not defeat. If gentlemen think of services which entitle a man to promotion, bring in a private bill, and if you convince the House he is entitled to it he will get it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, maybe a few cases of hardship may come from the striking out of this section; but, on the other hand, a large number of men who will be benefited by this section are men who never earned it on the battlefield. The men on the active list to-day are few that were in the civil war from 1861 and in it all through, and then spent their days on the frontier in fighting the Indians. There are not many of those men on the active list to-day. The officer who did no hard service and who was not exposed to the elements, did not expose his body to the deadly bullet, is the one to be benefited by this. I will venture to say that seven out of eight men that this bill will favor never had a bullet scratch upon their bodies.

I have no doubt that some of them had; but I will not, for one, allow you to take these men and promote them and give them extra pay who are still on the active list and could go out and work at blacksmithing if they were compelled to do it. There are men on the active list and on the retired list by operation of law of 63 years, and there are some old soldiers maimed in battle now in their eighties, or at least in great age, and yet you would give these men on the active list more pay. Many of these old men were compelled to lay down their swords because they had no hands to hold them, many of them because they had no limbs to march with, and many of them quit the service because they were broken in health, and they have been living all these days until they are now old men. The gentleman says it is not going to cost much. This also will not cost much. I am in favor of striking

out this section and do justice to all these men. I will favor a bill promoting men for distinguished service, but will not favor it otherwise.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, I desire to call just one proposition to the attention of the House. The bill provides, and the chairman who reports it says, that however long or short a time an officer has served in the Army, whether he has been in active service or not, when he is retired he shall be retired at a higher salary. In other words, when he does nothing he receives more than when he is doing something. This section so provides. Is this right? Mr. Chairman, is there to be no such thing as retrenchment and reform again? If so, is it not high time when such a brazen proposition as this is presented that we should begin? I say in justice to the Government and in justice to the taxpayers that no man who retires, to do nothing but luxuriate at the summer resorts and take his Eastern trips, should have his salary increased, when for years he served actively for what he considered a satisfactory sum, with the right to resign. Such a law is an inducement to retire from posts of duty and for monetary considerations.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this section ought to be stricken out. The principle involved in it is illogical. Promotion is given to a man in service for two reasons—one as a reward and a stimulant, and the other to give a higher field and broader opportunity of service, so that the experience secured in the lower grade may be utilized for the public good. Now, this proposition is that a man who has reached that point where no other services can be rendered by giving him this broader field of usefulness shall be promoted. I do not believe that it is right. I believe that it is an attempt to modify the pay of these men, the retired officers. I believe it ought to be done by direction rather than by indirection, if done at all. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that during my absence from the floor the retired list of the Navy has been referred to. In the reorganization of the Navy, in an act passed some two years ago, we made provision that those officers who served during the civil war should be retired with the rank and pay of the next higher grade, but the reason we did it at that time was due to the special conditions which then existed in the line of the Navy. We found that there were a great many officers who had come in during the civil war and were clogging up the higher grades of the Navy and keeping back the younger men, so that, for instance, we had lieutenants in the line of the Navy who were 50 years of age, and they were not reaching the rank of command until they were really too old to command a ship. Now, we inserted that clause as an incentive and an encouragement to the men who had served in the civil war to retire from the service for the benfit of the whole Navy.

Since that time those who served during the civil war, but who retired before the passage of that act, have been importuning us to give them the same rank and pay which have been received by those who retired under the operation of the personnel bill.

But if you retire these officers as a reward for past services, in that case you should treat them all alike, in my judgment, the whole retired list.

But the reason why we inserted a similar clause in the Navy bill at that time was due to the peculiar conditions which existed in the line of the Navy. I do not consider that can be used as an argument in connection with this section of the reorganization bill of the Army.

Mr. HULL. Why did you not insert a clause retiring them without giving them the extra rank and pay?

Mr. FOSS. We did not have the power, under the old law.

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; you could have retired them at any age you wanted to.

Mr. FOSS. Not unless they were retired for disability.

Mr. HULL. It is not the disability which retires a man; it is the law. Congress can fix the age at 54 as well as it can fix it at 64. Congress can retire a man at any age it sees fit.

Mr. FOSS. Oh, yes; we could have passed a new law.

Mr. HULL. You could have provided that all men who have been in the service thirty or twenty years should be retired, and covered your civil-war soldiers by that provision, as easily as you could by giving them additional rank and pay. All I ask is that the Army be placed in some degree on the same footing as the Navy.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say. I wanted to point out the special reason why we did it at that particular time. It was not as a reward to these men who served during the civil war, but, as I say, it was put in as an incentive and encouragement for them to retire for the good of the service.

Mr. DAYTON. I would like to suggest that the provisions for the retirement under the personnel bill of the Navy provided two methods for retirement, one voluntary and one involuntary. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposing to strike out all of section 36.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

When, in the opinion of the President, natives of the Philippine Islands shall, by their services and character, show fitness for command, the President is authorized to make provisional appointments to the grades of second and first lieutenants from such natives, who, when so appointed, shall have the pay and allowances to be fixed by the Secretary of War, not exceeding those of corresponding grades of the Regular Army.

[Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 39. That the President is authorized to organize and maintain one provisional regiment of not exceeding three battalions of infantry for service in Porto Rico, the enlisted strength thereof to be composed of natives of that island. The regiment shall be organized as to numbers, pay, and allowances as authorized for infantry regiments of the Regular Army. The field officers shall be selected from officers of the next lower grades in the Regular Army and shall, while so serving in the higher grade, have the rank, pay, and allowances thereof. The company and regimental and battalion staff officers shall be appointed by the President. The President may, in his discretion, continue with their own consent the volunteer officers and enlisted men of the Porto Rico regiment, whose terms of service expire by law July 1, 1901. Enlistments for the Porto Rico regiment shall be made for periods of three years, unless sooner discharged. The regiment shall be continued in service until further directed by Congress.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I move to amend by adding to this section the words—

The President shall, on or before the 1st day of December, 1902, reduce the enlisted force to 25,000, which number shall not thereafter be exceeded.

Mr. HULL. I rise to a point of order. Unless the gentleman applies this provision to the whole bill, the amendment is not in order. The pending section relates to a regiment of Porto Ricans. You can not reduce that regiment to 25,000. I submit that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is not germane.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I move it, then, as an independent section.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in order. It will be in order as an additional section.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, probably this proposition should have been offered as an amendment to section 35, but in the rapidity of reading and discussion I failed to offer it when that section was before the Committee of the Whole.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is the duty of every patriotic citizen, absolutely independent of partisan affiliation, to uphold the Executive hand in putting down the revolt now existing in the Philippine Islands. Those islands having become part of the land owned by this Union, it is our duty to uphold the hand of the Executive in restoring order there. After order is restored the line of demarcation between the great parties of this country will be sufficiently in evidence to allow full discussion of questions of political policy with reference to the government there—questions of such moment that they have not, in my opinion, been paralleled in our history.

But this proposition of reorganizing the Army of the United States finds its base and support when presented to the people of this country upon the ground that we must of necessity protect our possessions in Asia. Having grown from being the United States of America to be the United States of America and Asia, popular glamour, created by words of war, by reference to armed troops and generals and captains and lieutenants and the rank and file, that glamour may for the moment deceive the public, so that a temporary applause will be given to the passage of this bill. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill does not mean the mere suppression of riots in the Philippines. It means the undemocratic and un-American creation of a standing army for all time. If your excuse is the existing condition in the Philippine Islands, then limit your bill to an army of 100,000 men for two years. If you can not suppress the insurrection in the Philippine Islands within those two years, then it will be proper policy for the United States of America to do what Spain did after she had held those islands for three centuries—to find some other nation that wants to buy a gold brick in Asia and sell those islands to her. [Laughter.]

That excuse, Mr. Chairman, is the only one that has been given to the people for the creation of an army that is 25,000 greater in number than the troops called for by President Lincoln in 1861. There is no necessity for such an army. If there is a temporary necessity, let there be a limitation. If in two years 100,000 men can not quell a riot in islands populated by 9,000,000 of Malay Indians and Chinese—populated by 9,000,000 of people, only 5,000 of whom are of Castilian blood and pure whites—if you can not make American citizens of those people in two years, you can not do it at all.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HULL. It seems to me there is no necessity for further debate on this amendment, and I call for a vote.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. McDERMOTT was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of of the bill.

The Clerk read section 40, as follows:

SEC. 40. That no officer or private soldier shall sell intoxicating drinks of any kind, as a bartender or otherwise, in any army post, or on any army transport, or in any encampment, or fort, or on any premises used for military purposes by the United States; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue such general order as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maine will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out section 40 of the bill, and inserting in lieu thereof the following section:

"SEC. 40. The sale of or dealing in beer, wine, or intoxicating liquors by any person in any post, exchange, or canteen, or army transport, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States, is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of War is hereby directed to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect."

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this section of the committee's bill involves what is known as the "canteen" question. The section as reported by the committee is substantially the existing provision of law, with regard to the provisions of which there has been so much controversy in the last few months.

I will read the provision of law as it now stands:

SEC. 17. That no officer or private soldier shall be detailed to sell intoxicating drinks, as a bartender or otherwise, in any post exchange or canteen, nor shall any other person be required or allowed to sell such liquors in any encampment or fort or on any premises used for military purposes by the United States; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue such general order as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect.

Very serious criticism has been made of the Attorney-General of the United States because he held that under this section of the existing law the sale of intoxicants and liquors of any kind was not prohibited in the canteen. Now, I think that due justice to him requires the statement on the floor of the House that this section did not accomplish that result. All that the section accomplished, practically, was simply to prohibit the detail of any person in the service of the United States for the sale of intoxicating liquors at such places, and to provide that persons not in the service of the United States were not allowed to sell intoxicants at such places. The obvious inference from this language is that persons in the service might be allowed to sell, although they could not be detailed for that purpose. To this extent, at least, the opinion of the Attorney-General is not properly the subject of criticism, and it is clear that the section did not accomplish the desired purpose.

Now, the provision of the bill that the amendment attacks is substantially that which has been construed by the Attorney-General, and about which such criticism has attached throughout the country. The amendment is substantially the Bowersock bill, which was reported at the last session of Congress by the Committee on Military Affairs, and with the concurrence of all of the committee with the exception, I think, of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], who submitted their minority views. The amendment as read will absolutely prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in any canteen, exchange, or premises occupied for military purposes by the United States.

I should say, before going further, that the amendment is not quite as drastic a proposition as the one which the Military Affairs Committee reported favorably, because the bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee provided that no intoxicating liquors should be sold on any premises used or owned by the United States, which goes vastly further than to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the canteen. Briefly, as to the propriety of the amendment, I am fully aware that there is a great difference of opinion, and an honest difference of opinion, as to the wisdom and propriety of this amendment. I am fully aware that the Committee on Military Affairs received from the War Department an adverse recommendation in connection with this measure, and I will read very briefly the succinct statement of General Corbin in relation thereto, because I desire later to read another statement by General Corbin, made earlier, in connection with the same subject. The extract that I read from General Corbin's letter to the committee is as follows:

In conclusion I desire to say that the canteen system is carefully watched by this office and any reported infraction of the regulations thoroughly investigated and, if well founded, promptly corrected. At present it is working well. It has the approval of more than 95 per cent of the officers of the Army, and, in justice to the best interests of the service, ought not to be disturbed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I shall have to ask for a few moments more.

Mr. BROSIUS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to continue for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Maine be allowed to continue his remarks for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I ought to state that the figures upon which the Adjutant-General bases his statement are taken from answers to inquiries received from 1,020 officers, when there are something like 2,200 officers in the service. Now, as against the opinion of General Corbin in 1900, I feel as though I ought to give the House the benefit of his opinion, announced in 1892, upon the same subject, which was as follows, referring to the canteen:

A cause of restlessness (in the Army) is traced to the excesses of the exchange, the saloon feature of which is not productive of good, and should be done away with without further experiment. The sale of beer, superintended by a commissioned officer and served by noncommissioned officers and soldiers, is not conducive to discipline, nor is it a picture that can be submitted to the people for their approval. The men who drink spend the greater portion of their money for beer. The credit system brings them to the pay table with little or no money due. This takes all heart out of them, and makes them quite ready to ask their discharge and try some other calling.

This extract is from his official report when he ranked as assistant adjutant-general.

And I ought also to state that as late as February 9, 1899, as I am advised, General Corbin reiterated these conclusions, which I assume he reached in 1892 after due and reasonable consideration. So that was his opinion, I may safely assume, up to 1899.

Now, I make no criticism of General Corbin. It is an important question, and one upon which any man has a perfect right at any time to change his opinion; but I call the attention of the House to these facts in order that they may understand that a condition of things, at least, existed in 1899 which, in the opinion of General Corbin, would justify and require this legislation. I read a brief extract now from the report of General Miles, in which he makes an extract from a report by General Ludlow, then in Cuba, relating to this same subject:

In this department thus far endeavor has been made to make the prohibition absolute, and, while it is perhaps not possible to enforce this with entire thoroughness, the weight of authority and precept is thrown against the use of intoxicants, and the men are in every way discouraged from its use. It is believed that these measures are practically imperative. * * * It is particularly important where a large proportion of the troops are recruits that nothing be officially done to create in them any habit of using intoxicants; and this, it is believed, would be the result if, as has been deemed desirable in some portions of the United States, canteens be established in the posts, where light wines and beer are regularly furnished. In such circumstances the temptations of sociability and companionship are practically irresistible, and the habit of drinking is readily acquired.

I have called attention to these statements by these distinguished men for the reason that I think it may suggest the foundation for the able report of the Military Affairs Committee made to the House May 24, 1900, from which I now read, a report, as I have already stated, concurred in by every man on the committee except the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Texas. Referring to the Bowersock bill, which is in substance the amendment that I propose, the report says:

The bill was referred to the War Department and a very voluminous report was returned to the committee against the passage of the bill, but the committee believes that, in view of the legislation of the last Congress, when it was intended by Congress to abolish the canteen, but on account of faulty language did not accomplish it, the present bill should pass. The expressions received from all parts of the United States go to the point that even if the canteen results in the decreased consumption of liquor by the Army, the United States Government should not in any sense be connected with the liquor traffic, but let private parties conduct it under the laws of the different States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the amendment which has just been offered by the gentleman from Maine will not prevail. I think he, as well as every sensible member of this House, must realize the fact that the canteen system as now practiced and carried out in the Army is easily the best method of handling this great question, and it seems to me that if we are not going to act as hypocrites we ought to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine, and to vote for the provision as it exists in the bill now before the House. It is, in my judgment, impossible to enforce prohibition in any portion of this country or in any portion of the world.

It is impossible to enlist an army of 65,000 men, in my judgment, to serve in the Philippine Islands or any other portion of the world where their services may be needed by the United States Government and attempt to have all those men total abstainers. In this condition of affairs, if these men must obtain liquor, it seems to me the part of prudence and the part of wisdom on the part of the United States Congress to provide the means of obtaining that liquor that will give the most temperance and the best results.

I witnessed a good deal of the agitation on this question during the past two years. I have heard of the benefits of the present system at the Charleston Navy-Yard, and I have heard, within an hour, of the great improvement brought about by the establishment of the canteen system at Togus, Me., in the gentleman's own State; and it is only within the last hour that persons well acquainted with the conditions that existed in that State told me

that the conduct and morals of the soldiers of that Home had improved wonderfully with the system now in vogue.

The gentleman comes from the State of Maine, where a prohibition law is in existence, and has been for the past twenty years, and yet the law has never been enforced, and is not enforced there to-day; there is more liquor sold, and as openly, as in any community in the United States, and when it was made an issue in the city of Portland the Prohibitionist candidate was elected because he promised to enforce the law. Now, the gentleman knows I am speaking the truth upon this question. He knows how the prohibition law has operated in Maine—that it has not decreased crime there, but has resulted in bringing about improper relations between the officers of the law and private individuals engaged in selling liquor. He knows that corruption has increased in different portions of the State, and that the people, in order to be relieved of this condition of affairs, in one community elected the Prohibitionist candidate to office, something unheard of in the State of Maine before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought at least to be honest in this question. We all have read the stories that come to us from the Philippine Islands about the character of the liquor that is served there to the soldiers and the evil effects that it has upon the men. I say in all fairness that we ought to consider this question as men interested in the soldier, interested in the best method of dealing with this question; and if we act upon this question honestly, in accordance with the reports that have been submitted upon this very question, after an experience of twenty-five years, by the majority of the officers in the United States Government, men who have dealt with this question from a practical standpoint, then we must vote for the bill as it is reported by the committee and vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

I am not a drinking man myself, and think if the soldiers refrained from drinking liquor they would be better off. I can not, however, be blind to the conditions that surround us on this question, and I therefore hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I propose to place myself in an attitude the propriety of which I am in some doubt about. I do not believe a great deal in, nor have I hitherto had faith in, the suppression of intemperance by law. I believe that the evils of intoxicating drink can be minimized by law. I believe that the experiments heretofore made in total prohibition in this country have been substantial if not absolute failures, and have resulted in the increase of the sale of bad liquors, violations of law, and degradation of the law by reason of its violation.

I have been led to believe that the report of the Army officials correctly states the facts in regard to this question. They above all men have the greatest interest in the question. General Corbin has not given his opinion upon his own judgment and knowledge alone, and it is due to General Corbin—and I am sure that the distinguished gentleman from Maine does not intend to do him an injustice—it is due to him to say that in 1892 he was not Adjutant-General of the Army and was only acting in a subordinate capacity, but he became Adjutant-General of the Army during the last two or two and a half years. So that his means of observation and general knowledge was not in 1892 what it was in 1900, at the time he made the report to which reference has been made. I treat with very small appreciation the report that somebody is said to have made that somebody had heard him say that somebody thought in 1899 he had a different opinion from what he has this year.

I have a grave apprehension that the adoption of this amendment will do harm and not good. I am going to vote for the amendment, and I am going to state my reasons for it. I am satisfied that no amount of testimony, though one should rise from the dead, will disabuse the minds of the vast majority of the people of this country upon this question.

I know very well that it was believed—firmly believed and distinctly understood—that the adoption of the prohibition law in the State of Maine a great many years ago was going to create a condition of absolute immunity from the evils caused by the sale of liquor in that State, and consequently be a great moral object lesson that was to sweep over the country; and yet I have lived to see the time when the object lesson of Maine is a warning to statesmanship from one end of the country to the other. No man now seriously believes that the attempts at State prohibition can be successful, and local option of towns or municipal corporations, with taxation and stringent limitations, is the best course.

The result in Maine does not stand alone. The same is true of the results in Kansas and in Iowa, and the same will be true of every other State that relinquishes the regulation of and the taxation and partial prohibition of liquor traffic and which substitutes the attempt at prohibition. But the people of this country have the impression firmly fixed that we will have a temperate army, a virtuous military army, if this canteen is only abolished. I think the experiment must be tried. They will not hear the testimony of men who say that it is a great modification of the saloon.

General Corbin was talking about the saloon in 1892. All these saloon features have long ago been eliminated from the Army canteen. Therefore the people of the country have the impression that drunkenness will be eliminated, in the absolute teeth of the testimony that if you drive out the sale of light wines and beer in the canteen the soldier will go and get drunk on the outside of the limits of the camp or reservation. There is not a saloon keeper in the United States of America to-day resident near an Army post who does not favor the abolition of the canteen in the Army—not one. I can take you to a city where they are now standing ready to come down upon the Army posts so soon as the canteen is abolished.

I am going to vote to abolish it, and if good comes from it, if temperance comes from it, and if sobriety in the Army comes out of the result, I shall thank God that I had the privilege of voting for it. If I am mistaken, and good comes from it, nobody will be more willing to testify to it than I will. If no good comes from it, and we discover that we made a mistake in overriding all the opinions of the Army officers of the country, all that I have heard from, then we can easily retrace our steps.

But when there is such an uprising, such a great moral determination among the people of this country, I am willing that the experiment shall be made, and this, too, even in the light of the unreasonable criticism which has been made of the Attorney-General and the false and malicious attacks upon the President, all of which have been utterly without foundation. I overlook the false and scandalous assaults upon the President by a petty preacher, a petty candidate for office, a peregrinating libeler who traveled over the country during the recent campaign and impugned the motives of the President of the United States. While I condemn these things, I vote for the amendment with the hope that good shall come of it.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be closed in twenty minutes.

Mr. HAY and others. I object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HULL. Well, I will make it thirty minutes.

Several members objected.

Mr. HULL. I give notice, then, that at the end of thirty minutes I shall move to close debate.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in May of last year I, together with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER], signed a minority report upon the canteen question. That report opened with these words: "The passage of this bill we think would be a calamity to the cause of temperance." I had arrived at that opinion after a careful examination of the question and after a personal investigation at various military posts throughout the country. I say I had arrived at the opinion expressed in the opening paragraph of this report after mature deliberation and to the extent of my opportunities after examining the operation at the posts in this country. I believed then, and I believe now, that the abolition of the post exchange would be a calamity. I believed then, upon the evidence submitted by hundreds of officers of the United States Army, that it would be detrimental to the good order and discipline of the Army if the post exchange were abolished.

I am absolutely convinced, Mr. Chairman, that if the members of this House would read the report, submitted by the Secretary of War last year, of the testimony of the officers of the various branches of the military service they would also come to that view. But, Mr. Chairman, they utterly disregard testimony submitted on this question which, in my humble judgment, should convince any jury after a careful examination.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there are gentlemen in this House who will not vote their convictions upon this question. It is the Woman's Christian Temperance Union which "doth make cowards of us all" on this occasion. If all the gentlemen in this House who have read this testimony, and who believe that the post exchange contributes not merely to the comfort and the discipline and good order of the Army but to its temperance, will vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine, it will go down in overwhelming defeat.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to briefly call the attention of the House to a little evidence which I have gathered, and which has been submitted by the Secretary of War. I will ask the Clerk to read from the desk a letter addressed to me by the quartermaster of the Military Academy at West Point in reply to interrogatories which I submitted.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY,
QUARTERMASTER'S OFFICE,
West Point, N. Y., June 5, 1900.

SIR: In reply to your queries in regard to the post exchange, I would say that after fourteen years' service I have become convinced, beyond any question of a doubt, that the post exchange works for the good of the temperance cause in the Army. It promotes discipline and increases the contentment and self-respect of the enlisted men.

Since its establishment the records of the Army show a very great diminution in the number of cases of drunkenness and other accompanying offenses. Were the post exchange to be abolished there would inevitably be a return

to the condition that prevailed before its establishment, viz, numerous cases of drunkenness in the towns adjacent to military posts, followed by fights among the soldiers or between the soldiers and citizens, the soldier finally lying drunk in the street or along the roadside.

Such occurrences as these are now almost unheard of.

I wish to add that I am a temperance man, and that I do, and always have done, all I can to promote temperance in the Army.

Respectfully,

MALVERN-HILL BARNUM,
First Lieutenant, Tenth United States Cavalry.

Hon. J. L. SLAYDEN,
Member of Board of Visitors, West Point, N. Y.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That letter is signed by a gentleman of distinguished service in the Army of the United States, who for fourteen years has been connected with the Quartermaster-General's Department and who has had opportunity to observe the practical working of the post exchange.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I occupied?

The CHAIRMAN. Six minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I ask that the gentleman have four minutes more.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in conjunction with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] I had the temerity to sign a report which has made me the object of attack by various temperance organizations throughout the country; and I ask for more time in which——

The CHAIRMAN. How much more time?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may continue his remarks for ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I would like to have five minutes; and unless that time can be allowed me, I must object to the gentleman's request.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I ask, then, for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Consent is asked that the gentleman may continue his remarks for five minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, if reputable gentlemen can be believed, and if reason and not hysteria is to control in legislation, this amendment will be voted down. All of the evidence submitted, or practically all of it, goes to confirm the statement made by its advocates that the post exchange is an agency for temperance. Out of a thousand replies received by the War Department from both commissioned and noncommissioned officers, the overwhelming preponderance of the testimony was to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, in five minutes I can not, of course, undertake to make the argument upon this question which I had hoped to make; but I want to say that there is evidence here from gentlemen whom I have personally known for twenty years—whom I know to be men of character and truth—men who have been brought into personal contact with the operations of the post exchange and who know whereof they speak; and without a dissenting voice they urge its continuance. To-day I had a personal interview with a chaplain of the United States Army recently returned from a fourteen months' term of service in the Philippines. He tells me that he went out there strongly opposed to the principle of the post exchange, as well as being an active and zealous prohibitionist in civil life.

He said to me this afternoon that his observation of the operations of the post exchange in the Philippines convinced him of the fact that at least there it was a necessity and that perhaps he had been mistaken as to its operations in other parts of the world. That clergyman, who served fourteen months in the Philippines and who has been brought into personal contact with the soldiers, tells me that he saw no drunkenness about the canteens or post exchanges. He tells me that the profits made on the sale of the beer, wines, and foods sold there are subsequently distributed in the way of dividends among the soldiers and contribute to the physical comfort of the men in that unhappy climate. No whisky, no ardent spirits of any kind, are permitted to be sold at those post exchanges.

Now, unless you intend to make prisoners of your soldiers, unless you intend to keep them under constant surveillance from the time of their enlistment to the time of their discharge, you can not prevent them from drinking. The practical question, then, is whether you will give them a harmless beverage at a reasonable cost, which will satisfy their longings for something more than the mere rations given by the Government, or whether you will drive them to the outskirts of the military posts, where they will, according to the evidence of this chaplain and other chaplains, fall not only into the habit of drinking ardent spirits, but into other habits of a more immoral nature; for, as this clergyman said, upon the confines of the posts, just beyond the limits of the military jurisdiction, you will find flagrant immorality allied with the opportunity to obtain intoxicating drink. And he says that there is not the same temptation to the soldiers where they are permitted the privileges of the post exchange as conducted in this country.

Allusion has been made to the opinion of the Adjutant-General given in 1892. His mature judgment, given in the fall of 1900, is entitled to your respect; and he says, in his report just issued, that—

The operation of the post exchanges during the past year, despite the attacks of the opposition outside the Army—

Mark you, the opposition comes from men who are not informed—

which have been persistent and unremitting, has been especially gratifying.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are other members here who want to say something on this question, and I yield the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to inform my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] that upon this, as upon every other question, I have the courage to vote in accordance with my convictions; and I have no hesitation in saying that I shall vote against this amendment, not because I am not just as sincerely in sympathy with temperance as my friend from Maine, but because I believe, after a very careful examination of this canteen system as it is operated at every post of the United States (and I have visited nearly all of them), there is no institution which does more to fortify temperate habits and induce temperance in the Army than the canteen system; and there is no measure of law that would do more to break down the temperance influence of the Army officers and to increase intemperance than the measure proposed by the gentleman from Maine.

Why, let me ask him, has he not included in his amendment a proposition to forbid and absolutely prohibit the carrying of any kind of intoxicants upon a governmental reservation by the officers as well as by the men? If an officer of the Army has the right to drink beer or wine, certainly the enlisted man has precisely the same right, and we ought not to withdraw that right from him. I have seen the canteen introduced in the Army, and I well remember the condition of affairs before its introduction. There are now, I may state, in every city of the Union, saloon keepers and dive keepers waiting and watching the enactment of such an amendment as this, to enable them to surround the Government reservations with their saloons, where the business they conduct can be carried on safely and the poisonous compounds which they dispense may be furnished to the soldiers of the Army. That is the reason that I am opposed to such legislation as has been suggested here. Under the care and regulations which now exist for the control of the canteen system of the Army it is, in my judgment, a wise provision and one which should be continued, and for that reason I shall vote against the proposition which is now pending, to prohibit the continuance of that system in the future. I think the suggestion is unwise and unwarranted, and I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I should not take up the time of the House even for a moment on this question were it not for the fact that I advocated this amendment in the Committee on Military Affairs and desire to state the reason on the floor of the House for doing so. I do not regard it whatever as a question of prohibition. We are not undertaking to prohibit the sale of ardent spirits throughout the country. That is not the proposition at all. It is not a question of "hysterical legislation" in any sense of the word. I am supporting the amendment because I believe that it is wrong for the Government of the United States to engage in the sale of intoxicating liquors, either upon its own property or in any other place anywhere. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. This bill provides that no officer or private soldier shall engage in the sale of intoxicating liquors, and consequently you can not implicate the Government of the United States under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HAY. Oh, yes, I can; because under the decision of the Attorney-General somebody else can be authorized to engage in this traffic near the Army post or upon the Government reservation.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But if he does so engage, it is as a private citizen, and it is not in any sense of the word the action of the Government.

Mr. HAY. But how does he get there? He gets there by force of a permission which is granted to him by the authorities of the United States, because under other circumstances he would be absolutely excluded.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will say that I am in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maine, because the young men of this country who join our Army either at home or for service in the Philippines ought not to have this temptation offered to them at all times in the very posts of the Army in which they go to serve their country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And by the Government of the United States as well.

Mr. HAY. Yes, and by the Government itself, which offers the temptation by the sale of whisky.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman from Virginia permit me

to interrupt him for a correction? I am sure he does not want to misstate the matter. The Government does not permit the sale of whisky at any post at all.

Mr. HAY. Oh, well, I understand that. It does not permit the sale of whisky, in direct words; but it permits soldiers and civilians about the posts to sell intoxicating liquors. It is simply a begging of the question when you say they are not permitted to sell whisky.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman certainly knows that the soldier or the civilian is only permitted to sell the mildest classes of beverages, like beer or wine, and there is no permission granted to any civilian to sell whisky at the Army post.

Mr. HAY. Of course I understand that. But they are permitted to sell beers and wines and liquors of that class, and a man can get drunk just as well on beer or wine as on whisky——

Mr. SLAYDEN. Hardly.

Mr. HAY (continuing). Although it may be a little more expensive proceeding. And at all events, the use of these intoxicants under such conditions gives him a taste for the whisky, and we do not propose to allow that to exist if it can possibly be avoided in connection with our young recruits.

I am told that this thing should be allowed to proceed in the Army posts because otherwise these establishments would be erected around the posts, and the temptation would be furnished to the soldier in that way. Why, Mr. Chairman, they are around the posts now, and the man in the Army who wants whisky can go outside and get it in a few moments, notwithstanding the operation of the canteen system.

It is absurd to say because you have a canteen where you only sell wine and beer that the man who wants whisky is not going out to get it. He does go out to get it, and the evidence of Army officers is not all on one side upon this question. There are very many Army officers who have testified to the fact that this canteen is a bad thing for the soldiers.

Some people say that the private soldiers ought to have the same rights as the officers, and that they ought to have their clubs. Why, they can have their clubs, but they can have them in a healthy way, and these canteens ought not to be permitted in the posts, or upon the transports, or upon the encampments of the armies of the United States. I trust, therefore, that this House will adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Maine. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I do not sympathize with the views of the man who decides to vote for this amendment in order to please any general sentiment which through ignorance has grown up among the people of the United States, and thereby knowingly votes to hurt the soldier. We are trustees for the soldier. [Applause.] We are charged to speak and act for his temperance and his good order, and when we abolish the canteen system of the post exchange temperance in the Army will have received almost a death blow.

The adoption of this amendment, we think, would be a calamity to the cause of temperance. None greater could befall that cause in the Army and in the Soldiers' Home than the prohibition of the canteen feature of the post exchange. This is not a matter of theory, but one of actual experience. Soldiers, as well as everyone else, resent interference with their personal freedom. To adopt this amendment means that those who would otherwise drink beer in moderation under the eyes of their fellows will go outside where they will get strong drink, and that all the evils that once existed will be renewed.

In old times we had the sutler's canteen, the sutler being employed by the Government to sell liquors as desired, and at that time the Army was a whisky-drinking army. Later we had the post-trader system, where the post trader, a private individual, was licensed to sell whisky to soldiers, and then we also had a whisky-drinking army. It was an army in which pay day meant absence from the post of half of the command, men imprisoned by the score in the guardhouse, men who overstayed their leave, and men who were fleeced by dive keepers on all sides.

There were rows of liquor saloons at the gates of every post, where vile liquor and sometimes vile drugs were dispensed, and where all the abominations that are annexed to such places were put in the way of the young men who were in the Army. At last an experiment was tried; at first at but one post. It spread gradually through the Army until it has become a matter of regulation in all posts and is called the post exchange.

This post exchange system is one developed for and by Americans. By the Army Regulations, of which I annex an abstract, the post exchange is to combine the features of reading and recreation rooms, a cooperative store, and a restaurant in order to supply the troops at reasonable prices with the articles of ordinary use, wear, and consumption not supplied by the Government, and to afford them means of rational recreation and amusement, while through exchange profits it provides means for improving the messes. Buildings are ordered to be set apart or rented at every post for the exchange. An officer is put in charge of the management and a noncommissioned officer of firmness, now an outsider, is made exchange steward. The exchange is superintended by a council of officers, with a subcommittee of noncommissioned officers. Rules of order are prescribed, prohibiting gambling and restricting the entry of civilians.

The sale and use of ardent spirits * * * is strictly prohibited. But on the recommendation of the exchange council the commanding officer may permit beer and light wines to be sold at the canteen by the drink whenever he is satisfied that giving to the troops the opportunity of obtaining such beverages within the post limits will prevent them from resorting for strong intoxicants to places without such limits and tends to promote temperance and discipline among them.

The canteen must be in a separate room, preferably in a separate building. The sale of beer is limited to week days, the beer to be consumed upon the premises, and treating is not permitted.

In the cooperative store the goods are got at cheap prices, and lunchroom prices are made as small as possible. Sales are made on credit, and the profits applied, 5 per cent to the band, a part to gardens, reading room, and gymnastic appliances, and the rest to company funds, which enable the soldiers to get better meals and comforts, or returned in dividends.

Such an exchange was first undertaken as an experiment in Vancouver Barracks in 1880, but was not established in the Army till 1889, and came into full use in the year 1891.

This is the American system that treats the soldier as entitled to his home and his reading room, where he may meet his friends and do what he wishes, always in moderation. It has attracted attention abroad. It is recommended by General Roberts in place of the sutler's canteen system. By it the soldier has his club. It is, by regulation, attached to every post. There is thus established a building in which there are reading rooms, newspapers; a cooperative store for the sale to the soldiers of what they need and can not get in the ordinary rations.

There is a refreshment saloon for coffee and tea and for food at odd times when the soldier can not get meals or comes in from guard duty and wants something to eat. Generally there is provided a gymnasium. It pays something toward the regimental band, in which they all have pride. It supplies the material for polo, football, and other games, and all this is done by saying to those who wish to have a drink, "Do not go outside; come in here and buy among your friends in your own club." Without the profits of these sales it could not be supported. But nothing except beer and light wines are sold—no heavy intoxicants—and there is no treating.

The results have been marvelous. They are embodied in Report No. 1701, at the last session of this Congress.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman let me ask him one question?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I should be glad to answer any question if I had the time. If the gentleman's question does not come out of my time, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. HAY. Would you advocate putting a canteen at the Military Academy at West Point?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAY. You would?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I would, for the soldiers stationed there. There is a canteen at the Military Academy for the soldiers stationed there, and the officers at West Point have testified to the benefit of it. Major Hess, in a report to the War Department——

Mr. HAY. Do you mean to tell me——

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I hope the gentleman will excuse me. I decline to yield further.

Mr. HAY. Do you mean to say there is a canteen for the cadets at West Point?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will answer all questions, if I can have the time, but I must have some time for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HAY. I ask that the gentleman be allowed further time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from New Jersey be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Now, if the gentleman from Virginia will ask me his question——

Mr. HAY. The question I wanted to ask was if there was any canteen at the Military Academy for the cadets.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; certainly not. Cadets can not go outside; soldiers can. It is to prevent the evils of outside saloons that canteens are established. Let us go a step further. In order to find out the sentiment of the Army on this subject inquiries were sent out to every post commander, every troop, battery, and company commander, every regimental commander, and to many noncommissioned officers. Over a thousand replies were received.

The results are contained in the report of the Secretary of War in 1899, which contains the views of the practical experience of over a thousand officers and noncommissioned officers, including

company, troop, and battery commanders and post commanders (to all of whom inquiry was addressed), and also a number of noncommissioned officers of long experience. Each man gives his own views.

These officers are charged with the discipline of the Army. They know their men, and they fear drunkenness as no one here can fear it. The decision is almost unanimous; 981 are opposed to prohibiting the canteen, 36 for prohibition, and 3 are doubtful.

We learn that since its establishment hospital admissions for alcoholism have diminished by more than half, and desertions by the like ratio, as well as convictions for drunkenness.

I quote from the report referred to, No. 1701, of the first session Fifty-sixth Congress, when a like measure was proposed by bill 8752. The references are to the appendixes to the Secretary of War's report of 1899.

Its results are carefully tabulated by Surgeon Munson, on pages 277 to 281 of the same appendix. Comparing the years before 1891 with those afterwards, hospital admissions for alcoholism gradually diminished from 64.28 per thousand in that year to 30 per thousand in 1897.

In 1890 there were 17 posts in which the admission rate exceeded 10 per cent of the strength. In 1897 there were but 2. Particular posts are instanced on pages 277 and 278. The percentage of desertions (see p. 279) fell from an average of 9.18 per cent of the enlisted force in seven years before 1891 to 4.54 per cent of the enlisted force in six years after that year. The total trials and convictions for drunkenness in the Army during the seven years before 1891 averaged 372.5 each year, and in the six years after 1891 160.6 in each year. The average number of men making savings deposits increased over 13 per cent (p. 280).

The opinions of the officers (pp. 97 to 276) are almost unanimous. They have to be read to be appreciated, and experience is the only thing to be thoroughly believed. Many of them say that they are total abstainers themselves. Many more state that they viewed the establishment of the canteen with disapproval, but after their experience changed their minds. Those who are opposed to prohibiting the canteen are 981. Those who are for its prohibition are 36, and 3 are doubtful.

Almost all of them have expressed their official opinions as to the effect of the canteen upon the morality, discipline, desertions, the number of courts-martial, and cases of drunkenness, and on the likelihood of the soldier to go outside the camp for intoxicants. The following table shows the number of those who think the canteen beneficial in those regards, the number who think it is detrimental, the number who think these effects doubtful, the number who think it is of no effect, and the number who expressed no opinion.

Answers of various commanders of troops, companies, batteries, and regiments, and noncommissioned officers of long service in the ranks as to the working of the canteen system and its effect on the Army.

Answers made.	Effects of the canteen system on—					
	Morality.	Discipline.	Desertions.	Courts-martial.	Drunkenness.	Outside saloons.
Beneficial	892	908	739	825	909	980
Detrimental	35	40	6	20	20	11
Doubtful	29	27	49	38		
No effect	90	71	116	43	33	61
No opinion	19	19	155	139	103	13

These opinions have to be read to be appreciated. I give only a few quotations as to their views of the post exchange. "It is the enlisted man's social club." "They have no such desire to visit disorderly places outside." "Desertions lessened." "Drunkenness decreased." "Nearly all drunkenness at present can be traced to strong liquor purchased outside." "It has been the essential feature for the prevention of desertion. Under the old system men would visit saloons outside the posts, overstay their passes, or absent themselves without leave."

These officers state that the effect of absolute prohibition would be an increase of drunkenness, a decrease of comforts, an increase of absenteeism and of trial by summary court-martial; that it would cause the smuggling of whisky into camp; that any unprejudiced man who has served with troops in the field for twenty years will be convinced that prohibition would result in the increase of low dives near the reservations, with attendant evils; that the temporary suspension of the canteen has always proved the effect to be disastrous; that prohibition would increase the grosser forms of drunkenness and the frequenting of disreputable, disorderly, and degrading saloons; that they have seldom or never known of any drunkenness resulting from the canteen; that prohibition would remove the checks which now exist; that the canteen has certainly lessened the evil of drink in the Army, and that it has done much to elevate the character and moral tone of the soldier; that the soldier would resent any uncalled-for denial of his privileges; that the canteen gives a way of exercising restraint of drinking which is wholesome and yet not provoking.

In various places through this report it is noted that the grogshops outside of a camp are often houses of prostitution and that the temptation, if men go there, is very great; that the sad diseases have greatly decreased since the establishment of the post exchange, and that in case of prohibition the soldiers would obtain liquor clandestinely, or would visit resorts where other and worse temptations await them: that in the exchange "the sale of beer is limited and controlled by officers who have at heart the best interests of the soldier as well as the efficiency of the service," and that "the institution promotes temperance." (Page 105.)

"In 1888 I was called upon to officially express my opinion as to the advisability of replacing the post traders by the canteen. I was strongly against the move. Since then I have been convinced that the change as made was a good one;" that "prohibition would deprive the enlisted man of the moderate indulgence in garrison, and cut off a fund which procures him many benefits." "Proprietors of vicious resorts in the neighborhood of military camps or stations are loud in denouncing the canteen." Officers state that prohibition would result in the resumption "of the old-time sprees" every pay day, and the renewal of the growth of gin mills and rum shops near all military posts.

We are told that prohibition encourages the drinking of whisky, because beer is too bulky to be smuggled into camp, and that "abolition would double the burden of officers and men in their efforts to improve the health, morality, and usefulness of the Army."

And page 117, Captain Wilder, of the Fourth Cavalry, says:

"An army of whisky drinkers has been converted into an army of moderate beer drinkers. As for myself, I seldom touch a glass of beer. The canteen serves the cause of temperance."

Captain Walsh, of the Fourth Cavalry (page 118), says:

"The exchange is strictly a temperance measure; lessens and controls drinking, decreases desertion and trial by courts-martial, and tends to elevate, as conducted in the Regular Army, the morals of a command. It is probable that if the present agitators thoroughly understood the situation, and realized that they were unwittingly allying themselves on the side of the worst features of the liquor traffic and the lowest forms of prostitution, they would insist on the retention of the exchange in place of asking for its abolishment."

Captain Erwin, Fourth Cavalry (page 118), says abolition would increase immorality, lower discipline, increase desertion and trials by courts-martial for drunkenness, decrease money savings, impoverish table fare, and lower the moral and physical standard of the enlisted men.

Lieutenant Carr, Fifth Cavalry, that it would be a return to the time when pay day was dreaded; that volunteer camps are an example of what might happen in the Army if the system were abolished and troops subject again to the villainy and extortion practiced by post traders and saloon keepers.

Captain Macomb, Fifth Cavalry (page 119), believes in the canteen system because prohibition is not practicable. License without abuse is what the canteen system desires.

Lieutenant Rhodes, Sixth Cavalry (page 122), favors the present exchange, with continued improvements; that he uses no intoxicants himself; that when he joined the regiment in 1889 drunkenness, under the old system of post traders, was disgraceful and alarming; that around Fort Wingate little rum shops thrived, crimes, and debauchery, and after each pay day patrols dragged soldiers from the keepers of these dives; the guardhouse always full of drunkards and absentees; that those who were prejudiced against what was termed "Government barrooms" found the benefit so startling that it could not be combated, and now the improvements in morality and discipline have been so marked that officers fairly shuddered when there was a possibility of a return to the old system.

Other officers urge (page 123) that to abolish the sale of beer means smuggling of cheap whisky by soldiers and civilians; that saloon keepers, gamblers, and prostitutes would obtain the money now being used to improve and add to rations now provided; that the post exchange is all right since enlisted men were taken from the bar, and that all retail liquor dealers, kitchen bar room, and dive keepers in the vicinity of garrisons are anxious to have the sale of beer in garrisons put to an end; that at Fort Meade a village of outlaws near the garrison has been abandoned; at Fort Yates the same; that there is no truer friend to the frontier dive keeper than the ignorant partisan of temperance who builds up their business on the ruin of the post canteen.

Officers of the Seventh Cavalry have observed it for 25 years (p. 125) and say that the exchange is a practical means of controlling and regulating the sale of beer; that abolishment would cause discontent and trouble to control the men. "It helps here in Cuba, where before its establishment they used aguardiente or some other Cuban drink, which for a time set them crazy," and more often absent from duty (p. 126); that with the exchange system the men are contented and have no encouragement to drink to excess; that without it in low places which they can not be prevented from visiting, and where they usually procure the vilest liquor, they have every encouragement; that the majority do not abuse the beer feature; that the better element appreciate the fact that when they want a glass of beer they can procure it at a respectable place; that soldiers are not different from others in respect of drinking and should not be treated as children in the matter.

Page 127: That opposition to the post exchange is from misguided persons who desire to change human nature and to enforce total abstinence, the saintly and sordid cooperating to drive our young men from the convenient, clean, sanitary, and respectable places of refreshment and entertainment, where excesses are forbidden, and where the profits are theirs, to the dives which surround military posts and litter the roads to the nearest towns.

Page 128: That to abolish the canteen will make the post exchange unprofitable, lead to the discontinuance of most of them, deprive troop and post libraries of athletic sport and games of support and encouragement; that discontinuance means the partial but certain return to pay-day orgies, increased desertion due to lessened variety in troop mess, lack of amusement and recreation in the post, all of which are purchased by profits of the exchange, and that in North Dakota—when the exchange was established a prohibition State—drunkenness was common, what was called whisky being smuggled; that temperance associations are, strange to say, assisted by the liquor dealers.

Page 129: In Oklahoma in 1898, the exchange being closed, liquor was smuggled. When reopened there was no further trouble.

Page 130: To abolish it would not materially decrease the amount of liquor consumed by the Army, but would be detrimental to the interests of the service. Rum shops would spring up, and men would go where they would not be under control. At present troop messes are really quite satisfactory, the ration supplemented by purchases wholly due to exchange profits.

Captain McBlain, Troop D, Ninth Cavalry (p. 131), says:

"Many years ago, while an enlisted man, I had to invest a portion of my pay in food. The exchange system enabled me to take for use of my troop in Cuba last summer tobacco and canned fruits; to purchase vegetables and ice for my troop while encamped at Port Tampa."

Captain Cole: "The whole discipline of our Army is founded on the character of the American soldier. It is impossible to cram American men into a mold, apply pressure, and turn out the soldier as is done in the continental armies. We have no ignorant class in the European sense. All restrictions must be founded on reason and good sense. We get all conditions of men looking for adventure, who like to ride, hunt, shoot, and see the country—out of a job, wishing the service as a start in life—restless, wandering men. Training makes these men strong, healthy, enduring discipline; association develops good-fellowship and comradeship. They do duty gloriously; stand hardship like Spartans; do not growl at the inevitable; are as apt to laugh as to growl in suffering unnecessary privation.

"A vicious element is speedily eliminated. The mass are firm, hearty, wholesome Americans, each with an independent mind, shrewd judgment, and no especial reverence for anything but the colors. Like all men who have periods of tremendous nervous strain followed by periods of rest, they use intoxicating liquor; are used to it, want it, and are going to get it. The question now can not be one of eliminating this evil, but of minimizing it. Prohibitory legislation is a history of failure."

Page 132: That Kansas is a prohibition State, and Leavenworth abounds with wide-open saloons; that if a law is enacted prohibiting sale of liquor on military reservations it will not be sold openly, but clandestinely; dives with vile liquor will spring up, infinitely more disastrous to health, morals, and discipline than the worst old post-traders' establishment, to say nothing of the canteen, which is a means of control; that sincere people who advocate total abstinence have their work cut out for them in their own homes.

In attempting to grapple with a condition they can not possibly understand, they place themselves in the position of fools, who "rush in where angels fear to tread;" * * * that a great majority of the soldiers will spend all their money, and why not provide a place where they can get the most pleasure and comfort from it? And the profits, instead of filling the pockets of some grasping trader, are given to an increased quality of the mess;

that the majority will drink—if nothing better, horse medicine, Jamaica ginger, and even red ink—but give them beer, control the sale, and your men will be all right.

Page 133: That abolishment will lead to "boot legging" and low dives; that since the canteen system the old soak has become impossible among the enlisted men, almost to his disappearance; that the exchange furnishes a decent place for the soldier to get his beer among his fellows without the danger of assault or robbery; that it is the soldiers' club, and it is his right to have it; that the soldier says it is unfair for people who can not control their local community and enforce prohibition among people whom they know to attempt to enforce their doctrine in a temperate community among people whom they do not know and for whom they do not care.

Page 134: That the more pay a soldier uses at the exchange the less he has to get into trouble outside; that if he is of saving disposition he will not spend more than a certain amount at any place; that the profits provide billiards, tenpins, dominoes, football, tennis, field sports, and affords a comfortable place to sit, smoke, write, talk, meet comrades from other companies, and promote the esprit de corps; that the beer feature is by no means the principal one; that men will drink, but indulgence may through the canteen be restricted and regulated; that no mistaken zeal for a nominal temperance should take from him that which has steadily bettered his condition for a decade and reduced desertions over 50 per cent.

Page 135: That soldiers should be treated like men, not boys; that a paternal attitude ruins discipline and esprit de corps; that the post exchange is almost indispensable. "Liquor would be procured, vile stuff that makes men wild and hard to control."

Page 136: That dives would increase 100 per cent.

Page 137: That if abolished, conditions would return to those when, out of a six-company post, 25 cases before a court every pay day were not uncommon, with a long list of absentees every pay day, increase of intemperance, and frequent courts-martial; that prohibition is a severe blow to discipline and contentment; that with an exchange a small number of men apply for permission to go away, but without, a large number would make application, be refused and the first step towards discontent is made.

Page 138: That the exchange is a pleasant, clean, respectful club in which he feels ownership and meets no loose characters; that associations here promote good-fellowship; that the exchange has benefited the men more than anything instituted since the civil war; "I am an almost strictly temperate man, and brought up so. The canteen part of the post exchange has my unqualified approval, however;" that it is not too much to ask these good people to trust the officers to do what is right and good for the soldiers' moral and material welfare.

Page 140: That no complaint has come up from the Army against the canteen; "In my opinion it has done more for the material comfort and moral welfare of the soldier than any one thing that I can recall;" that selling beer having been prohibited in this department (Habana), men must be restricted to post limits to keep them from drinking vile native liquors; that it increases drunkenness and is our greatest danger as regards infection from yellow fever; that better saloons refuse liquor to soldiers, and only low dives and resorts will sell; that, as many good men occasionally like a drink of beer, the present situation is debasing.

Page 141: I am practically a "teetotaler." Would stop the sale if possible, but the only practical course is to regulate the sale, and after years of observation I am firmly convinced that a well-regulated canteen is beneficial to a command on point of temperance, morality, and discipline.

The great effort of a battery commander is to inculcate temperate habits among men who desire strong drink; to make it much more expensive, disagreeable, and uncomfortable to get drunk than to remain sober. The post exchange is one of the greatest assistants to this end that can be devised. Rational amusements are furnished.

It is patronized in preference to going out into the streets, contentment is promoted, articles sold at reasonable prices—the vast majorities are satisfied with beer, and no stronger liquor kept. Prohibition of beer in the post exchange will practically break up that institution and turn our soldiers out into the street again to become the prey of unprincipled dealers and liquor sellers. These remarks apply tenfold to service in Cuba, where conditions make it imperative to control drunkenness, but where the cheapness and vileness of the stronger liquor, and the eagerness of dealers to sell despite all law, make it a far more difficult problem than in the United States. (Page 142.)

Page 142: Since arrival in Cuba I have seen the evil of prohibiting beer in post exchange. Men who have been good, steady, reliable, accustomed to drinking beer in moderate quantities, have gone outside and bought cheap liquor that has made brutes of them.

With the exchange "there has been more time spent in garrison, are absent without leave less frequently, and very much more contented and at home." As a choice of evils, the continuation of the exchange, provided the sale of beer can be restricted and the practice of treating prevented.

Page 143: Major Hess, Third Artillery, says:

"When the post canteen was first introduced he was at Washington Barracks, opposed to it, and wrote a report that it would simply add another place to the too long list; that the first month's experience proved the canteen a great success, and before the second month more than half of the little saloons outside had closed up and their proprietors had moved away—drunkenness and trial for absence without leave greatly decreased. This object lesson had the effect of changing his views. He saw in the canteen, and still sees, a powerful instrument of discipline when properly conducted; and that the fear of losing his privileges at the club and being debarred from associating with his fellows there operates as a powerful deterrent upon the occasionally unruly."

Page 144: Captain Hoskins says:

"Thirsty men will drink; go to the nearest saloon, where birds of prey lie in wait, where he is served with vilest liquors, and when his money is gone will be kicked into the street; that every post is surrounded by the lowest type of dives, where the soldier is made much of; that frequently before he is aware he is under the influence of some potent drug; they entice men to dispose of blankets in trade for liquor; they are bitterly opposed to the exchange and desire it abolished."

Captain Califf:

"I am in favor of the present exchange unless prohibition were a fact and not a name."

Captain Humphreys:

That in a year he has had ten men tried for drunkenness—five found drunk at saloons in the city; the other five returned to post drunk.

Captain Potts (page 145):

"With the opportunity at hand to obtain beer almost whenever wanted, weak men are less apt to drink to excess and men of character soon learn the value of their money, properly spent. Under other circumstances, with the very young men now so numerous in the Army, half of the temptation lies in the risk of obtaining it."

Captain Danes:

"Under present conditions there are quite a number of men in my battery who do not use intoxicants."

Lieutenant Kessler (page 145):

"Here in the Philippines men should be supplied with beer by means of the canteen; if not, they will drink it elsewhere, or something worse, and the native drinks are most terrible."

Captain Rumbough:

"When the canteen was first introduced, I was opposed to it, but since I have seen the results I have changed my views entirely. The number of saloons, nearly always of loose character, in the vicinity of post has decreased, and the men now drink beer instead of bad whisky. Advocates of temperance could not do a worse thing for their cause than to abolish beer in the post exchange."

Captain Bennett:

"The only real valid objection to the canteen I have heard is that recruits learn to drink from the contact with the same, when otherwise they would not do so. But many would, but for the canteen, acquire worse habits outside at saloons, in all probability, since, in absence of the exchange, saloons always flourish just outside of a post."

Colonel Guenther (page 147). That he has lived in a garrison ever since the close of the war of the rebellion, and states as his conviction and belief that the sale of beer at posts as conducted under the regulations has done more to advance the cause of temperance and good morals in the Army than anything else he knows of.

Major Fuger (page 147). That he was three months in Florida in 1889 with no canteen, with the consequence that men were absent without leave and summary courts filled, trials daily; that he started a canteen, with the result that he had few cases for trial.

Major Andruss, Fourth Artillery (page 147). That prohibition in the Army would relegate it to the experience of the service before this privilege was permitted; that the men would seek outside saloons where poisonous liquors are sold, and the results on morals and discipline ruinous.

Captain Howes (page 148). That nearly half the trials by court-martial at his post are caused by the use of bad whisky. That an exchange at the post did not prevent them entirely, but reduced it very materially.

Captain Leary, jr.:

"It would drive men who are temperate beer drinkers to the saloon and brothels outside the post in order to get a glass of beer. When the canteen system was begun I objected. With some years' experience, I am heartily its advocate. Its discontinuance would throw the enlisted men back ten years in their moral progress as a body, which moral progress is now patent to all the old officers of the Army."

Page 149: Captain Cummins, that abolition would be little short of a calamity to the soldier and the Army.

It is idle to multiply citations. If we wish to have an army composed of self-controlling, self-respecting men, we must give them the opportunity to exercise the virtue of temperance by choice, instead of trying to enforce total abstinence.

The American Army is not to be governed by State prison rules. When at home they have the right to use liquor in moderation within the walls of their own homes.

When in the Army they claim the same right. If it be denied, those who wish to drink are driven outside to fiery spirits, or worse.

There is no vice more to be feared in any army than intemperance. It is because the post exchange and the canteen has been shown beyond all question to promote temperance that we favor it and deprecate any efforts which by statute will forbid the officers of the Army to do what they find best for the morality, health, and discipline of their men.

The testimonials as to the matter from the various Soldiers' Homes are equally convincing. Some of them are already printed.

This is the first time that this matter has really come up for careful consideration. The anticanteen amendment does not cover this question; no lawyer has challenged Attorney-General Griggs's construction of its terms. It was placed upon a bill for the increase of the Army without much consideration, and certainly without such full knowledge of the facts as we now have. The misunderstanding which earnest people throughout the United States have upon this matter is appalling.

It is certainly true that drunkenness and the vices attendant thereon are of all things the evils most greatly to be feared in an army, and that they are all too rife in any army, but when we are referred to their prevalence among the volunteers we must remember that the volunteers generally had no post exchange, and sometimes allowed them to become mere post traders' institutions, where sales were made without proper restriction.

For example, a very impassioned address was made before the committee by the chaplain of the First Tennessee Volunteer Infantry. That regiment had no canteen, and its adjutant tells us that its good order and sobriety were best when it was brigaded with the Twenty-third Infantry, and the men found their way to the canteen, "where, with much good-fellowship, there was a minimum of disorder" (B. N. Coffman, first lieutenant and adjutant, First Tennessee Volunteers). Lieutenant Coffman states that the same experience was had at Iloilo, where the strictest prohibition measures were adopted, resulting in the greatest amount of drunkenness on native liquors, while as soon as the Eighteenth Infantry established their canteen near the regiment the drunkenness fell off.

This is a question of our practical duty as men and brethren to our brothers in the Army. We must treat them exactly as we do our brothers at home. Unless we are prepared to deny to our friends at home the right to drink a glass of beer in their own houses, it is neither our duty nor our right to enforce such prohibition against our brothers in the Army as distinguished from proper restrictions. For the sake of the cause of order and sobriety and temperance we oppose the adoption of this amendment.

Why should we assume to know more of the Army and its needs than the brigade, regimental, and company commanders, who know their men and have their interests most at heart? I have

no apology for quoting their opinion. Why should we deny to our brothers in the Army the right to moderation in their own home which we claim for ourselves? Why should we drive them out to the vile saloon outside? How can we pardon ourselves if we put the Army back as it was ten years ago?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I ask leave to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will have leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman has the right under the rule to extend his remarks.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I only protest, for the soldiers, that we should not carry this amendment. I add as an appendix the laws and regulations on this subject, taken from the report of the Secretary of War for 1899:

APPENDIX A.—POST EXCHANGES.

By the act of June 13, 1890, Congress provided:

"That no alcoholic liquors, beer, or wine shall be sold or supplied to the enlisted men in any canteen or post-trader's store, or in any room or building at any garrison or military post in any State or Territory in which the sale of alcoholic liquors, beer, or wine is prohibited by law."

By section 17 of the act of March 2, 1899, Congress provided:

"That *no officer* or private soldier shall be detailed to sell intoxicating drinks, as a bartender or otherwise, in any post exchange or canteen, nor shall any other person be required or allowed to sell such liquors in any encampment or fort or on any premises used for military purposes by the United States; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue such general order as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect."

The post exchange is thus described by the regulations prescribed by the War Department:

"The post exchange will combine the features of reading and recreation rooms, a cooperative store, and a restaurant. Its primary purpose is to supply the troops at reasonable prices with the articles of ordinary use, wear, and consumption not supplied by the Government, and to afford the means of rational recreation and amusement.

"Its secondary purpose is through exchange profits to provide the means for improving the messes."

The money which constitutes the capital employed in the operation of the exchange is the money of the men themselves, so that the business conducted is their own business conducted for them, and the benefits of all kinds are equally shared by them.

The regulations relating to the conduct of exchanges have for several years provided:

"9. *Exchange features.*—An exchange doing its full work should embrace the following sections: (*a*) A well-stocked general store, in which such goods are kept as are usually required at military posts, and as extensive in number and variety as conditions will justify; (*b*) a well-kept lunch counter, supplied with as great a variety of viands as circumstances permit, such as tea, coffee, cocoa, nonalcoholic drinks, soup, fish, cooked and canned meats, sandwiches, pastries, etc.; (*c*) a canteen, at which, under the conditions hereinafter set forth, beer and light wines by the drink, and tobaccos, may be sold; (*d*) reading and recreation rooms, supplied with books, periodicals and other reading matter, billiard and pool tables, bowling alley, and facilities for other proper indoor games, as well as apparatus for outdoor sports and exercises, such as cricket, football, baseball, tennis, etc.; a well-equipped gymnasium, possessing also the requisite paraphernalia for outdoor athletics. At small posts it may be impracticable to maintain all of these sections, but at every exchange there should be no less than two departments—the refreshment, embracing store, lunch counter, and canteen, and the recreation, which includes all the other branches.

"10. *Sale of liquors prohibited.*—The sale or use of ardent spirits in any branch of the exchange, and in any encampment or fort, or on any premises used for military purposes by the United States, is strictly prohibited; but on the recommendation of the exchange council the commanding officer may permit beer and light wines to be sold at the canteen by the drink whenever he is satisfied that giving to the troops the opportunity of obtaining such beverages within the post limits will prevent them from resorting for strong intoxicants to places without such limits, and tend to promote temperance and discipline among them.

"Should the commanding officer not approve the recommendation of the exchange council, it will be submitted for final decision to the department commander. The canteen must be in a room used for no other purpose, and when practicable in a building apart from that in which the recreation and reading rooms are located. The sale of beer must be limited to week days, and the beer consumed upon the premises. The practice known as 'treating' *will not be permitted.*"

These exchanges have largely replaced the old and objectionable post-trader store at military posts, and have furnished the only means to relieve the cheerlessness and tedium of an enlisted man's life in time of peace, which lower the morale of the force and repel the better class of enlistments.

During the year ending June 30, 1898, the aggregate receipts of the exchanges in operation in the Army amounted to $1,621,398.67, and there was received as money on deposit $189,258.81, making the total amount of money received $1,810,657.48. There was expended for merchandise purchased, rent, fixtures, and repairs, and expenses of operation $1,297,737.16, which, less deposit, give a profit of $323,661.51. From this amount there was donated to the funds of the several regimental bands $9,154.51; to the maintenance of post gardens, $1,559.17; to post libraries, $640.06; to gymnasiums, $2,913.75; as prizes for the encouragement of athletic sports, $3,338.41; and after setting aside the sum of $60,877.58 as a reserve fund to meet anticipated expenses for at least one month there was returned to the members in the form of dividends the sum of $254,890.93.

During the year ending June 30, 1899, the aggregate receipts of the 80 post exchanges and the 34 regimental exchanges in the Army, so far as reports have been received, amounted to $1,609,492.33, and the expenditures $979,012.26, which, less deposit, give a net profit of $399,588.27. From this amount there was donated to the funds of the several regimental bands $5,563.09, to the maintenance of post gardens $1,089.74, to post libraries $1,121.55, to gymnasiums $1,527.07, to athletic sports $1,312.18, and after setting aside the sum of $104,008.03 as a reserve fund there was returned to the members in the form of dividends the sum of $275,580.74.

The aggregate receipts of the post exchanges, therefore, during the past two years have been $3,420,149.81, and the dividends $530,471.67. The net value of these exchanges—that is to say, the balance of their combined assets over their liabilities—was on June 30, 1899, $253,792.26.

The wide difference between the terms used by Congress in the act of June 13, 1890, distinctly and unmistakably prohibiting all sales of alcoholic liquors, beer, or wine in military posts in States where sales to civilians are prohibited by law, and the terms used in the act of March 2, 1899, which seemed to be designed as a regulation of the sale in post exchanges and a prohibition of such sale by post traders, led to a reference by my predecessor to the Attorney-General for a construction of this provision of the act of March 2, 1899.

The Attorney-General, on the 12th of April, rendered an opinion to the effect that the section in question "does not prohibit the continuance of the sale of intoxicating drinks through the canteen sections of the post exchanges as heretofore organized and carried on, except that, of course, no officer or soldier can be put on duty in the canteen section to do the selling, either directly or indirectly."

The regulations have been amended to comply with the statute as thus construed. I agree with the view that this is the more reasonable construction of the statute. It is, however, questioned by many citizens, and it is very desirable that if Congress does in fact intend to absolutely prohibit the sale of beers and light wines in post exchanges to the soldiers of our Army in States where such sale is permitted by law to all other persons, this intention should be expressed in terms which are free from doubt.

It is to be observed that the sale of ardent spirits is now strictly prohibited by the Army Regulations and that the sale of beer and light wines is limited to the cases where the commanding officer of the post "is satisfied that giving to the troops the opportunity of obtaining such beverages within the post limits will prevent them from resorting for strong intoxicants to places without such limits, and tends to promote temperance and discipline among them."

For the purpose of ascertaining the effect of this regulation a circular letter was sent to each department commander on the 2d of May last, directing the submission of a series of questions to the officers of the Army, designed to elicit the results of their experience and observation as to the effect of the sale of beer, etc., in post exchanges upon the morality, sobriety, and discipline of the troops, and their opinions as to the effect of an actual prohibition.

I append hereto (marked Appendix C) a copy of the circular letter, and an abstract giving the substance of the expressions which have been received in response.

Some troops were of course so situated at the time that it was not practicable to secure expressions from them. Expressions have been received from 24 of the 25 regiments of infantry, substantially all of the 10 regiments of cavalry, and of the 7 regiments of artillery. It will be perceived that the overwhelming testimony of the Army is to the effect that the present regulation has promoted the temperance, discipline, morals, and health of the enlisted men, and that in the interest of morality and effective service it should be retained. No change has accordingly been made in the regulation.

In considering the testimony of these officers it should be borne in mind that enlisted men are not always on duty; that during considerable portions of their time they always are, and necessarily must be, permitted to go about outside of their camps and posts just as other citizens do, and that when they are thus at liberty it is impossible to subject them to restraints which are not also imposed upon the other members of the community. In States where the sale of intoxicants is permitted by law soldiers will drink outside the camp or post just as other people drink, and it can not be prevented except by confining them to the limits of the camp or post.

This would not only be unjust and injurious, but would reduce enlistment to imprisonment, and immediately put an end to enlistments. The practical question to be considered is not whether soldiers should drink or not drink, but whether they should be permitted to drink beer in the camp, surrounded they be driven to drink bad whisky in the vile resorts which cluster around by the restraining influences of discipline and good association, or whether the limits of every military post and camp, and especially around those in which prohibition is maintained. I have no doubt that the present regulation furnishes the wise answer to this question.

I present the subject thus fully in order that, if Congress takes a different view, the matter may be fully before it for action.

Mr. HULL. I move that all debate on this amendment and this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the committee, moves that all debate upon this amendment be closed in five minutes.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Division!

The Chair proceeded to count, and had announced the affirmative vote, when

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I withdraw the request for a division and do not desire to take the time of the House, and will not request tellers if it can be so that I can have a few moments in closing debate.

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Perhaps five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Maine, if it remain at five minutes, he will be compelled to recognize the gentlemen on the committee in preference to others.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, everyone has the right to print whatever he desires on this bill, or any part of it, and I want to have a vote on the bill to-night, and must get it, or it goes over indefinitely.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Will the gentleman on the committee consent to ten minutes?

Mr. HULL. The committee has voted for five minutes. I have no right to give it.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Iowa has carried, and debate is limited to five minutes.

Mr. HULL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri. I will yield to the gentleman from Maine two minutes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that section 40 of this bill represents the sentiment of the War Department on this question. If that is so, I desire to impress my friends here upon the floor with the idea that if the War Department reports or recommends a section of this kind it is presumed that it is based upon practical experience. There is practical experience upon one side and sentiment upon the other. Practical experience teaches the generals, the colonels, and the officers of the War Department that the canteen is an institution in the interest of temperance. The

sentiment which we strike upon the other side is in the interest of temperance. It is only a question as to which side is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DICK].

Mr. DICK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts gives the best reason why section 40 should not pass unamended—simply because it is inoperative law, and therefore accomplishes nothing. The gentleman from Texas is wrong when he says that all army officers testify to the wisdom of the sale of liquors at the army canteen. On the contrary, we have the testimony of General Miles, General Shafter, General Wheeler, Surgeon-General Sternberg, and many other officers who regard it as demoralizing to discipline and as interfering seriously with the efficiency, the health, and the service of the soldier. Contrary to the expression of the member from Texas, and taking decided issue with him, I insist that the mothers of this country who give their sons to the Army of the United States have the right to petition the American Congress, and that these appeals to protect their boys from undue temptation ought not to go unheeded. [Loud applause.]

The gentleman from New Jersey is wrong when he assumes that this amendment aims to destroy the army canteen. Its simple purpose is to keep the canteen from being converted into a saloon, and does not interfere with any of its social features.

The overwhelming public opinion which brought this question into the House at the close of last session has not changed, nor have the conditions it was intended to affect. The amendment may not accomplish all its friends expect of it, but why shall we legislate to encourage an evil? It is not a function of our Government to engage in the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. Chairman, consistent with the report of the Committee on Military Affairs at the close of last session, and in which action I joined, I shall support with my vote the amendment of the gentleman from Maine and urge its adoption by the House. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say, in answer to the suggestions of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD], that I challenge absolutely the accuracy of the statements made by him in relation to the operation of the prohibitory law of Maine. I do not contend that it is an absolute success, that it is enforced with such a degree of success as ought to attend it, but I do contend, and every man who has any knowledge of the conditions knows, that the result of the enactment and enforcement of the prohibitory law has been vastly in favor of the improvement of the people of Maine during the whole of its history. It has increased sobriety, and conserved law and order, and been conducive to good citizenship.

I deny the proposition that during the history of the law there has been any increase of crime or of the evils that are attendant upon the sale of intoxicating liquor. I assert that the contrary is true. I deny the assertion that liquor is sold in Maine as openly as in any other community. In Washington, for instance, it is sold as openly as dry goods, groceries, and other articles of legitimate merchandise. The saloons advertise in the papers, by signs over their doors, upon their windows, and by a display of their goods in the windows on the street to attract the attention of the traveler.

I have lived in Maine all my life and I never saw or had my attention called to a saloon in Maine that thus advertised its business upon the streets or in the press, and I deny that there are any such. While there are saloons in Maine, principally in the cities and larger towns, they have been driven behind the door by the law, where they are looked for, instead of openly and publicly drawing the attention of customers by attractive devices, as do saloons elsewhere. And this, I submit, is far different from the open selling as it exists elsewhere.

But the State of Maine is not on trial here. The only question is whether or not it shall be the policy of the United States to say that its soldiers shall be protected from the evils of intemperance by this legislation. That is the only proposition. Now, I care not what reasons men may have, whether it is because the saloons favor it or not, or whether it is a proposition that temperance people favor, so long as they record their votes in favor of this amendment. I give a list of military and naval officers, many of them eminent in their profession, who condemn liquor selling in canteens.

British Generals Wolseley, Roberts, and Kitchener.

Generals Miles, Shafter, Wheeler, Corbin, Sternberg (Surgeon-General), Howard, Henry, Boynton, Wilcox, Stanley, Rochester, Harries, Carr, Carlin, Graham, Bliss, Lee (Assistant Quartermaster-General).

Colonels of following regiments, which had no canteens: First and Third Nebraska (Col. W. J. Bryan); First Texas; First Wisconsin; Second, Fourth, Sixth, and Eighth Ohio; Fifth, Eighth, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Pennsylvania; Second and Fifth Missouri; Twenty-fifth Kansas; One hundred and fifty-seventh, One hundred and fifty-ninth, and One hundred and sixtieth Indiana; First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth Illinois; First, Second, Third, and Fourth Kentucky; District of Columbia Regiment; First and Second Mississippi; First New Hampshire; Fifth and Eighth Massachusetts; First Washington; Fifteenth Minnesota; First and Second Arkansas; Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-second Iowa; First South Dakota; Second Virginia; Second South Carolina, and Second Louisiana. (Many of these regiments tried the canteen and then abolished it.)

Lieutenant-Colonels Treuman, North Dakota; Beck, Kansas.

Chaplains Sam Small, Third United States Engineers (no canteen); Crawford and Harbaugh, Ohio; House, Massachusetts; Hunter and Brady, Pennsylvania; White, Texas; Todd, Illinois; Phillips, Nebraska; Cook, Georgia; Stamper, Kentucky; Solomon, Missouri; Babcock, Arkansas; Kimball (regulars); Watts, Texas, and Lyman, Louisiana.

Surgeons Genella (regulars); Ward, Missouri; Penrose, Utah; Epler, Tennessee.

Adjutant Venable (United States Engineers).

Maj. Burton R. Ross, District of Columbia.

Capt. R. S. Woodson (expert on tropical diseases); Hunt, Battery D, Pennsylvania.

Lieut. A. K. Taylor (Regular Army), article in United Service Magazine.

Rear-Admiral Sampson, Rear-Admiral Kimberly, and Commodore I. H. Gibbs; Captains Folger, Barker, Higginson, Crowninshield, Bradford.

The following orders, and extracts from letters and articles, fully sustain my contention:

THE CANTEEN IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

[Lieut. A. K. Taylor, then of the Ninth Infantry, in the United Service Magazine for April, 1892.]

What is this institution but one of licensed idleness, with the attraction of beer, cards, dice, billiards, and other kindred solicitations to extravagance and dissipation? The young recruit, fresh from the rural districts, of whom we hope much from his enlistment, is met on the threshold of his military life with the invitation to waste his money, become a beer drinker, a card player, a dice thrower, and an idler of his time. We may, and doubtless will, return him to civil life, if we limit him to one enlistment, as now proposed, enfeebled in body, weakened in mind, and morals tainted—the end a ruined manhood.

OPINIONS EXPRESSED DURING THE LATE WAR.

[General Miles's anti-canteen order.]

GENERAL ORDER, No. 87.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE, *Washington, July 2, 1898.*

The Army is engaged in active service under climatic conditions which it has not before experienced.

In order that it may perform its most difficult and laborious duties with the least practicable loss from sickness, the utmost care consistent with prompt and efficient service must be exercised by all, especially by officers.

The history of other armies has demonstrated that in a hot climate abstinence from the use of intoxicating drink is essential to continued health and efficiency.

Commanding officers of all grades and officers of the medical staff will carefully note the effect of the use of such light beverages—wines and beer—as are permitted to be sold at the post and camp exchanges, and the commanders of all independent commands are enjoined to restrict, or to entirely prohibit, the sale of such beverages, if the welfare of the troops or the interests of the service require such action.

In this most important hour of the nation's history it is due the Government from all those in its service that they should not only render the most earnest efforts for its honor and welfare, but that their full physical and intellectual force should be given to their public duties, uncontaminated by any indulgences that shall dim, stultify, weaken, or impair their faculties and strength in any particular.

Officers of every grade, by example as well as by authority, will contribute to the enforcement of the order.

By command of Major-General Miles:

H. C. CORBIN, *Adjutant-General.*

[General Shafter.]

HEADQUARTERS OF THE FIFTH ARMY CORPS, *Santiago de Cuba, July 30, 1898.*

I have always been strongly opposed to the canteen system or the sale of intoxicating drinks of any kind on military reservations, and have opposed it until absolutely overruled and required to establish a canteen at my post.

I regard it demoralizing to the men, besides impairing seriously their efficiency. There are always in every regiment a number of men that will under any circumstances get and drink liquor, but the great majority are temperate, abstemious men, and it is to those that the evil effects of the post-exchange system work the greatest injury, as young men who would not think of going away from the post for liquor will, when it is placed before them and every inducement offered them to purchase, do so and thus gradually acquire habits of intemperance.

The plea that it furnishes a large sum, which it does, to improve the table fare of the men is, in my opinion, a very poor one, as the Government of the United States is perfectly able to feed its men without any assistance from the profits of rum selling. I have absolutely prohibited the sale of liquor or the opening of saloons in the city of Santiago, and have refused permission for cargoes of beer to come from the States here. I think that the necessity of refraining from drink is fully realized by all the men, and of their own accord they would refrain from drinking.

WILLIAM H. SHAFTER,
Major-General United States Volunteers, Commanding.

["Fighting Joe Wheeler."]

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES FORCES, *Camp Wikoff, Montauk Point, Long Island, September 20, 1898.*

I am a thorough believer in temperance in all things, and am utterly opposed to soldiers being sold intoxicating liquors, and I believe that every effort should be exercised to remove the temptation of such dissipation from them.

You must recollect that all men are human, and if we can not make every thing perfect, we must make it as near perfect as possible.

J. WHEELER,
Major-General, United States Volunteers.

[Surgeon-General Sternberg.]

I do not think much of the beer canteen. The theory that the soldier needs a beer canteen to keep him from going to outside saloons for something stronger is all wrong. There is nothing in it. On the contrary, a great many young soldiers who are not accustomed to drink contract drinking habits at these canteens, and are ruined. There is no need whatever for intoxicating drinks at these canteens, and it will be a good thing for the Army if they are abolished.

[Milo B. Ward, major and surgeon, United States Volunteers, Kansas City, Mo., September 23, 1898.]

I have had good opportunity to observe the effects of beer on the health of the men in the Second Division, Third Army Corps, and I am forced to confess that it was one of the features of camp life which caused the medical

department much concern. I was some of the time medical officer of the day, and in that capacity I visited and inspected the entire division.

I urged in each report made that the canteens be closed. I found the troops who drank beer suffered from malarial jaundice, and many of them were very ill.

I can not say that a limited quantity of beer would have been injurious, but the quantity can not be controlled if canteens are permitted to be open. Many of the regiments found it necessary to close their canteens.

[Surgeon Genella.]

HOSPITAL HEADQUARTERS, CAMP WIKOFF, LONG ISLAND,
September 23, 1898.

What the houses of prostitution are to the youth of the city, so are the canteens of our Army to the soldiers.

W. GENELLA,
Regimental Surgeon Seventh Regular United States Infantry.

[Chaplain E. L. House, Fifth Massachusetts, United States Volunteers, Camp Meade, Middletown, Pa., September 22, 1898.]

There is no doubt in my mind that the sale of intoxicating liquors has done more to contribute to the sickness, death, and troubles of camp life than all other things combined. In our post exchange we have never allowed anything but tonics to be sold. Lager beer, etc., have been entirely excluded, and we have held the record, wherever we have been, of being the best behaved and most gentlemanly regiment of the field. Our colonel, while not a prohibitionist, would not assume the moral consequences that would surely come from the sale of beer. His own words are: "I am not going to educate men to drink, through the sale of beer, that have never drank intoxicating liquors." Almost all our own court sentences have been the result of men getting liquor outside of the camp when on leave, or else running the guard to get the same.

In fact, I have been told by the most trustworthy source that the great disaster of deaths that came to one of our regiments was due, not to the fighting in the trenches of Santiago, but to a weakened condition and disturbance of the stomachs of the men, brought on by the use of intoxicating liquors before arriving in Cuba, which, with the extreme heat and exposure, brought fever to many men.

[Colonel Glenn.]

HEADQUARTERS FOURTEENTH REGIMENT
PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEER INFANTRY,
Camp Meade, Middletown, Pa., September 23, 1898.

There are many ways that a soldier can ruin himself, but I think the canteen is the most damnable of all. I have never allowed one in my regiment, and I never will.

W. J. GLENN, *Colonel, Commanding.*

[General Willcox.]

It is my opinion that the public good, as well as personal character of those concerned, would be enhanced very much by the exclusion of liquor from the rank and file of the Army, except under due medical prescription.

O. B. WILLCOX,
Brevet Major-General (retired).

WASHINGTON, D. C.

[General Rochester.]

There is no doubt that the drink habit works very great injury to the Army. It has been shown over and over again that those who endure the greatest fatigue and exposure are the men who do not drink.

WILLIAM B. ROCHESTER,
Brigadier-General, United States Army (retired).

WASHINGTON, D. C.

[General Carlin.]

It has always, since I was old enough to have an opinion, been my conviction that the public good would be enhanced by the exclusion of liquor from all circles. It does no good anywhere and countless evils everywhere. It is useless to discriminate between the Army and other people. Liquor is a nuisance and an evil, and no greater blessing to mankind could come to it than the total prohibition of its manufacture, sale, and use.

WILLIAM R. CARLIN,
Brigadier-General, United States Army (retired).

GRAND HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE WAR INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Major-General Boynton, who was then in command at Camp Thomas, testified before the commission, and his testimony was in part reported by the New York Tribune as follows:

"Asked if each regiment had a sutler, General Boynton replied: 'They had something worse than a sutler; each one had a canteen.' He said that 372 car loads of beer had been sold in the camp. He deprecated the fact that Army regulations permitted the canteen system."

Col. James C. Lee, assistant quartermaster-general, testified to facts with regard to drink in the camp that were reported in the New York Sun in the following paragraph:

"I think the freedom of the admission of beer and other articles into camp and the frequenting of the rum-selling holes in town more dangerous than sleeping on the ground."

Chaplain Phillips testifies that the canteen was prohibited by Col. William Jennings Bryan in his Nebraska regiment.

ABSTINENCE BEST FOR THE NAVY, TOO.

Rear-Admiral Sampson, in interview published in New Voice:

"I think there is but one opinion among officers of the Navy about grog, and it is that alcoholic liquors have no place in the Navy of the United States except as a medicine. Intoxicating liquors of all sorts should be abolished."

[Commodore Gibbs.]

In my opinion, there can be no question that the public good would be greatly enhanced by the exclusion of alcoholic drink, as a beverage, from both Army and Navy circles. The man who needs the stimulus of alcoholic liquor to enable him to perform his duty is not to be trusted in any capacity. In my experience of nearly fifty years as an officer in the United States Navy I think I can safely say that 90 per cent of all punishments inflicted on board ship that have come under my observation can be traced directly to rum.

I. H. GIBBS,
Commodore, United States Navy.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

[Rear-Admiral Kimberly.]

I should say, as a naval man, that alcoholic liquor could be dispensed with with advantage, except for medical purposes.

In the Navy the grog ration has been abolished for years and coffee substituted in the early morning before any work is done. I look upon alcoholic drinks as medicine, and they should only be used as such.

L. A. KIMBERLY,
Rear-Admiral United States Navy (retired).

SECRETARY LONG'S ANTI-CANTEEN ORDER.

GENERAL ORDER, No. 508. NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, February 3, 1899.*

After mature deliberation the Department has decided that it is for the best interest of the service that the sale or issue to enlisted men of malt or other alcoholic liquors on board ships of the Navy, or within the limits of naval stations, be prohibited.

Therefore, after the receipt of this order, commanding officers and commandants are forbidden to allow any malt or other alcoholic liquor to be sold to, or issued to, enlisted men, either on board ship, or within the limits of navy-yards, naval stations, or marine barracks, except in the medical department.

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

In regard to the above order, Secretary Long, in an interview February 19, 1899, said that the order was issued principally for the protection of apprentice boys in the service. He said in part:

"It is not true that any society outside the service caused the issuing of the order. It was done at the solicitation of naval officers themselves. The matter was first suggested to the Department by Captain Folger, of the cruiser *New Orleans*. After his return from the war he wrote a letter in which he fully explained the evils which, in his judgment, resulted from permitting the sale of liquor on shipboard. This letter I referred to a number of other captains. Among them were Captains Barker, Higginson, Crowninshield, and Bradford. After a careful consideration of the matter they reported, a majority of them favoring the absolute prohibition of beer and liquor on board. Then it was that the order was issued. The Department felt that its duty to the boys and men in the service required such an order." (Washington Post, February 20.)

GENERAL KITCHENER'S VICTORIOUS ABSTAINERS.

The British army has gathered the first experimental evidence bearing upon this military temperance question. Three regiments were selected from each of several brigades for tests at different times, partly during maneuvers. In one every man was forbidden to drink a drop while the test lasted; in the second, malt liquor only could be purchased; in the third, a sailor's ration of whisky was given to eachman.

The experiment was repeated in several instances where forced marches and other hard work was required. The whisky drinkers showed more dash at first, but generally in about four days showed signs of lassitude and abnormal fatigue. Those given malt liquor displayed less dash at first, but their endurance lasted somewhat longer. The abstainers, however, are said to have increased daily in alertness and staying powers. As a result of this experiment the British war department decided that in the recent Soudan campaign not a single drop of stimulant should be allowed in camp, save for hospital use.

The officers, including even the generals, could no longer enjoy their accustomed spirits, wines, and malt liquors at their mess tables. There must have been some wry faces, especially among the Scotch laddies, when the order was published that for all hands, including even camp followers, liquid refreshment was to be limited to tea, oatmeal water, or lime juice and Nile water. To-day it is a great feather in the headgear of the advocates of military total abstainers that Lord Kitchener's recent victory was won for him by an army of teetotalers, who made phenomenal forced marches through the desert, under a burning sun, and in a climate famed for its power to kill or prematurely age the unacclimated. Indeed, it is said that never has there been a British campaign occasioning so little sickness and profiting by so much endurance. (Washington Star.)

Hon. William S. Caine, M. P., of England, at a reception in New York City on October 20, 1898, stated that Lord Roberts, commander in chief, had said to him that one-third of the British army in India, 24,800 out of 75,000, furnish 2,000 more effective troops than the other two-thirds, who are not abstainers.

In a speech before the English Army Temperance Association, Lord Wolseley said: "There are yet some battles to be fought, some great enemies to be encountered by the United Kingdom, but the most pressing enemy at present is drink. It kills more than all our newest weapons of warfare, and not only destroys the body, but the mind and soul also.

These are only a few among similar views expressed by many Army officers of all grades.

EFFECT OF THE CANTEEN AT FORT VANCOUVER, WASH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 20, 1900.*

DEAR SIR: I have read the article written in opposition to the anti-canteen law, and would say I have lived for seven years on a car line that goes to and from the barracks of Vancouver, Wash., and will say as a positive fact that until liquor was sold inside the barracks that we never saw drunken soldiers on the car. Nine were on the car on Sunday morning coming in Portland from the barracks, all in different stages of drunkenness, but all drunk. It is awful. As a member of the body to vote on this, won't you please cast your vote in favor of no canteen, for the sake of our soldier boys?

Respectfully, yours,

S. J. STEWART.

JOHN H. KETCHAM.

In the report of the Adjutant-General for 1899 it is claimed that the "work of these exchanges, so far as the regular regiments are concerned, has been fulfilled in a satisfactory manner," and an effort is made to answer the criticism that had grown out of the operation of certain regimental exchanges by the suggestion that they were in volunteer regiments, and were operated contrary to the principle of the exchange system. It seems that the canteen, in some form in which intoxicating liquor was sold, existed in the regular and volunteer regiments. An analysis of the vital statistics, found in the same report, demonstrates very clearly that there was in operation some cause that was much more disastrous to the regular than the volunteer.

These statistics show that from May 1, 1898, to June 30, 1899, the average monthly strength of regulars was 56,218; average monthly strength of volunteers, 112,041—nearly twice as many volunteers as regulars.

Between above dates, among regulars 1 officer and 32 enlisted men committed suicide; among volunteers 1 officer and 20 enlisted men committed suicide; among 56,218 regulars 26 soldiers died from murder or homicide, and among 112,041 volunteers the same number, 26; among regulars, 924 men were dishonorably discharged by sentence of general court-martial, and 508 among twice as many volunteers; among 56,218 regulars in above period 3,036 deserted while out of twice as many volunteers only 2,736 deserted.

If we are at liberty to infer that this was principally caused by the sale of intoxicants in the canteen, it could hardly be said to operate in "a satisfactory manner" so far as the regulars are concerned.

Finally, the following summary, compiled from the official returns of the English army in India, fully corroborates the position which we maintain:

THE EFFECT OF ARMY ABSTINENCE IN INDIA IN 1898.

	Members Army Temperance Association.	Nonmembers.
Number of soldiers included in return	18,663	48,842
Convictions by court-martial, per 1,000	4.12	36.38
Summary punishments for insubordination, per 1,000	39.70	92.32
Admissions to hospital, per 1,000	209	302

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order to cross out the words "military purposes" and put in "on any premises?"

The CHAIRMAN. It would not. There are two amendments already pending. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in doubt.

The question was again taken; and there were 159 in the affirmative and 51 in the negative.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of a new section, to be numbered section 41.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after section 40, a new section, as follows:
"That no intoxicating drink of any kind shall be sold upon any premises owned or controlled by the United States."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order on that. It is not in order on this bill, and I call for a ruling.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the point of order. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] a few moments ago spoke of the great demand of the people of the United States for the abolition of liquor selling in the military camps of the United States, and said that in answer to that demand, although he did not believe in the amendment, he was going to vote for the proposition; and the gentleman from Virginia——

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I am leading gradually up to the point of order. The gentleman from Virginia spoke about the bad effect the canteens have upon the common soldier. He said their establishment was a constant source of temptation to the soldier to drink. Now, if we are to deprive the soldier of an opportunity to purchase his beer upon the property of the United States let us deprive the members of Congress of the same opportunity and do equal justice and drive liquor selling out of the Capitol. If, as the gentleman from Virginia has stated, it seems discreditable to a large number of the people of the United States to allow liquor to be sold to the soldiers and sailors upon the property of the United States, how much more discreditable must it seem to allow liquor to be sold right here in the National Capitol. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, after the members of this House have voted overwhelmingly a few moments ago to prohibit liquor selling on all property under the jurisdiction of the military government, that it is perfectly proper for us to do a little penance ourselves, therefore I ask for a vote of the House upon this proposition. Let us put ourselves right upon this great question, and let us be consistent by meting out the same policy to ourselves that we deal out to the soldiers and sailors in the service of the United States.

I think the members of this House are as well able to stint themselves in the matter of liquor drinking, particularly when there are so many opportunities near at hand to satisfy their thirst, as the soldier or sailor who may be thousands of miles away from home. We will have the satisfaction at the same time of driving the sale of intoxicating liquor from the National Capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may offer the amendment which he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] may offer the amendment which he desires.

Mr. SHATTUC. I object.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 41. That the President is hereby authorized to select from the retired list of the Army an officer, not above the rank of brigadier-general, who may have distinguished himself during the war with Spain, in command of a separate army, and to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the officer so selected to be major-general, United States Army, with the pay and allowances established by law for officers of that grade on the retired list.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 41 of the bill. I do so——

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in ten minutes.

Mr. KLUTTZ. For the same reasons that moved the House to strike out section 36. Section 41 is intended, and can only be intended, for one purpose, and that is to enable the President to retire one certain officer, whose name I shall not call, with the pay and allowances of a major-general of the Regular Army. I believe there is but one officer on the retired list above the grade of brigadier-general who may be affected by this provision, and it is manifestly in his personal interest that this section is proposed.

I am opposed to any and all personal legislation superimposed upon general bills; and I give notice that if this motion prevails I shall then move to strike out section 42, which is, as I understand, a correlative proposition. I hope the House will sustain the motion to strike out.

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I most heartily second the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KLUTTZ]. The purpose of section 41 is to give to the President of the United States authority to place another officer upon the retired list; and, if I am properly informed, it is an officer now on the retired list of volunteers as a brigadier-general. I do not care to whom the provision may apply, but I believe the time has come when the Congress of the United States should not be trying at every session to increase the retired list.

I have the same objection to section 42 of this bill that I have to section 41. By examining the records, it will be ascertained that since the 2d of April, 1897, there has been placed upon the retired list 3 major-generals and 23 brigadier-generals. And here now it is sought to give the President of the United States the opportunity to increase that retired list. The last Army appropriation bill carried $1,273,000 to pay the salaries of the officers who have heretofore been placed upon the retired list of the Army.

This is direct class legislation. It is that class of legislation to which I am opposed. I stand now, as heretofore, in opposition to the character of legislation that is continually increasing the retired list. I am therefore in favor of striking out section 41 and section 42 of this bill. This bill was introduced for the purpose, as is shown upon its face, not of placing men on the retired list, but for increasing the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States. That being the purpose of the bill, why should these two sections be put in here expressly to give the President the opportunity to place these gentlemen upon the retired list?

I know it will be said that they have rendered distinguished services to the Government of the United States. Let that be granted for the sake of argument; still if they have done so, it is simply because of the fact that they have had an opportunity to do so. There are other distinguished gentlemen in the Army, had they had the opportunity, who would have rendered just as able and distinguished services as have any of the gentlemen who are sought to be taken care of by this bill at this time. I believe that now, when we have seen that we have been compelled to appropriate over a million dollars to pay the salaries of these retired officers, the time has come for us to stop placing men on the retired list. For that reason I am in favor of striking out sections 41 and 42 of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in ten minutes.

Several MEMBERS. Five minutes.

Mr. HULL. Very well; five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to closing the debate on this question in five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the section now under consideration authorizes the President to place a man on the retired list who has had a separate command and who has performed distinguished service during the Spanish war. The House, I suppose, knows whom this is intended for. I assume that if the provision should pass, Brigadier-General Shafter will be made a major-general on the retired list. And so far as I am concerned, I believe that he has earned this recognition by long and distinguished service, commenced in 1861 and continuing without a day's intermission up to the present hour. He has been in the

Army, volunteer or regular, since 1861. He performed distinguished service during the Spanish war. No matter what criticism may have been made at the time, the results of the campaign in Santiago have demonstrated the fact that it was magnificently planned and splendidly executed. So far as I am concerned, it seems to me that an act of Congress giving the President the right to retire this officer just one grade beyond what he has attained will be but an act of mere justice to one of the most distinguished officers of the American Army, who is acting now as major-general of volunteers. I call for a vote.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. KLUTTZ to strike out section 41, it was agreed to; there being on a division—ayes 121, noes 100.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 42. That the President is authorized to select from the brigadier-generals of volunteers two volunteer officers, without regard to age, and appoint them brigadier-generals, United States Army, for the purpose of placing them upon the retired list.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I move to strike out section 142. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to strike out section 42.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I move to strike out section 42.

Mr. JETT. I move to strike out the section.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I made the motion first.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I gave notice in advance that I would make this motion, and I hope the gentleman from Ohio will yield to me, because my friend the chairman of the committee has said——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JETT], who is a member of the committee, has been recognized by the Chair, and has moved to strike out section 42.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the Chair rule that that gentleman made the motion first?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee, was recognized.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Any way, so the section goes out, I do not care.

Mr. JETT. I ask for a vote on my proposition.

The question being taken, the motion to amend by striking out section 42 was agreed to.

The next section was read, as follows:

SEC. 43. That nothing in this act shall be held or construed so as to discharge any officer from the Army or to deprive him of the commission which he now holds.

Mr. HULL. I move to amend the section just read by inserting before the word "Army" the word "Regular."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. I move further to amend by adding at the end of the section the word "therein."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill having now been read through, the question is on the adoption of the substitute as amended.

The substitute was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendment and with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER accordingly resumed the chair, and Mr. DALZELL reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill S. 4300, a bill to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States, had instructed him to report the same to the House with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and that as so amended the bill do pass.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have a motion which I desire to submit to recommit this bill with instructions to the Committee on Military Affairs. I desire to offer that motion at the proper time. I would ask the Chair when it should be done.

The SPEAKER. The time has not yet come.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendments to the substitute and on the bill to its final passage.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Is it in order, Mr. Speaker, to ask the yeas and nays on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD]?

The SPEAKER. It is not, the Chair will state, because that question is not before the House in a separate form, not being reported as a separate amendment, as the Chair understands it, from the Committee of the Whole.

The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is it not in order to have a vote on the amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands from the report of the Chairman of the committee that no separate amendment was reported to the House, but that a substitute was presented for its action.

Mr. DALZELL. The report was, Mr. Speaker, that the committee had instructed me to report an amendment to the bill in the nature of a substitute.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair understood.

Mr. HULL. And we have adopted the previous question.

Mr. DALZELL. As Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, I reported to the House the amendment adopted by the committee in the nature of a substitute for the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that to be the report, and has no knowledge of matters taking place in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is it not possible now, Mr. Speaker, to demand a separate vote on one of the amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that there is but one amendment before the House, and that is the substitute bill.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And no separate vote can be asked upon the several provisions of that substitute?

The SPEAKER. No; as there is but one amendment to be voted on, and hence no separate vote can be taken upon the various provisions of that amendment.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAY. I understand that we considered in Committee of the Whole the bill, which was finally amended by the adoption of a substitute. That substitute was amended in various ways in the Committee of the Whole. Do I understand now that the vote is only upon the substitute as a whole, and not upon the various parts of it which were considered by the committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the House can only vote upon the perfected amendment which has been reported from the Committee of the Whole—that is, the substitute for the Senate bill as amended.

The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The question was taken on the substitute for the Senate bill as amended; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SULZER) there were—ayes 193, noes 107.

So the substitute as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on agreeing to the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The third reading of the bill was ordered, and the bill was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move now, if it be in order, to recommit this Senate bill (No. 4300) to the Committee on Military Affairs with the instructions I send to the desk.

The Clerk began reading the motion of Mr. McCLELLAN.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no desire to force the House to listen to this entire bill. It is six printed pages long. It is the present law with the exception that its provisions are continued until the end of the fiscal year 1903.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To save time, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of my motion to recommit be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first submit the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will it be in order now to ask to amend the instructions contained in that motion?

The SPEAKER. One thing at a time. The gentleman from New York has been on his feet while this motion is being considered. He has not as yet demanded the previous question. If the previous question is ordered by the House, no amendment will then be in order. If not, then an amendment will be in order. The question before the House——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has not the previous question been already ordered?

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will suspend. If the House will be patient we will reach the matter in order. The question now before the House is the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] to dispense with the further reading of the motion. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. HULL. I should like to couple with that a request that the motion of the gentleman from New York be printed in the RECORD. It will not be unless that is granted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have no objection to that, although I supposed it would go into the RECORD anyway.

The SPEAKER. Coupled with that is the request that the proposed bill be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion is as follows:

Mr. McCLELLAN moved to recommit Senate bill 4300 to the Committee on Military Affairs with instructions to report it back, forthwith, with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That from and after the date of approval of this act the Army of the United States shall consist of 3 major-generals, 6 brigadier-generals, 10 regiments of cavalry, 7 regiments of artillery, 25 regiments of infantry, an Adjutant-General's Department, an Inspector-General's Department, a Judge-

Advocate-General's Department, a Quartermaster's Department, a Subsistence Department, a Medical Department, a Pay Department, a Corps of Engineers, an Ordnance Department, a Signal Corps, 30 chaplains, to be assigned to regiments or posts in the discretion of the Secretary of War, the officers of the Record and Pension Office, the officers and enlisted men of the Army on the retired list, the professors, corps of cadets, an Army service detachment and band at the United States Military Academy, and such other officers and enlisted men as may hereinafter be provided for: *Provided*, That when a vacancy shall occur through death, retirement, or other separation from active service, in the office of storekeeper in the Quartermaster's Department and Ordnance Department, respectively, now provided for by law, said offices shall cease to exist.

"SEC. 2. That each regiment of cavalry shall consist of 1 colonel; 1 lieutenant-colonel; 3 majors; 14 captains, 2 of whom shall be available for detail as adjutant and quartermaster; 16 first lieutenants, of whom 1 shall be available for detail as commissary and 3 for detail as squadron adjutants; 12 second lieutenants, 2 veterinarians, 1 sergeant-major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 commissary-sergeant, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a regimental quartermaster-sergeant of cavalry; 3 squadron sergeant-majors, who shall be senior to and have the pay and allowances of first sergeants of cavalry: 1 band; and 12 troops organized into three squadrons of four troops each: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as abolishing the office of chaplain in each regiment of colored cavalry. Each cavalry band shall consist of 1 chief musician; 1 chief trumpeter: 1 principal musician; 1 drum major, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a first sergeant; 4 sergeants; 8 corporals; 1 cook, and 11 privates. Each troop of cavalry shall consist of 1 captain; 1 first lieutenant; 1 second lieutenant; 1 first sergeant; 1 quartermaster-sergeant, who shall have the pay and allowances of a sergeant; 6 sergeants, 6 corporals, 2 cooks, 2 farriers and blacksmiths, 1 saddler, 1 wagoner, 2 trumpeters, and 43 privates. Of the veterinarians provided for in this act, 1 shall have the pay and allowances of a second lieutenant of cavalry and 1 shall have the pay of $75 per month and the allowances of a sergeant-major: *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: *Provided further*, That the veterinarians now in the service who do not pass such competitive examination shall be eligible to the positions of the second class under such rules as are now prescribed by the regulations. The regimental sergeant-major and the regimental quartermaster-sergeant provided for in this section shall have the pay and allowances of ordnance sergeants.

"SEC. 3. That each regiment of artillery shall consist of 1 colonel, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 3 majors, 16 captains, 2 of whom shall be available for detail as adjutant and quartermaster; 16 first lieutenants, 14 second lieutenants, 1 sergeant-major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 band, and 14 batteries, of which 2 may be organized as field artillery.

"Each artillery band shall consist of 1 chief musician, 1 chief trumpeter, 1 principal musician, 1 drum major, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a first sergeant; 4 sergeants, 8 corporals, 1 cook, and 11 privates.

"Each battery of heavy artillery shall consist of 1 captain, 1 first lieutenant, 1 second lieutenant, 1 first sergeant, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, who shall have the pay and allowances of a sergeant; 8 sergeants, 12 corporals, 2 musicians, 2 mechanics, who shall have the pay and allowances of sergeants of artillery; 2 cooks, and 52 privates.

"Each battery of field artillery shall consist of 1 captain, 2 first lieutenants, 1 second lieutenant, 1 first sergeant, 1 stable sergeant, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 6 sergeants, 12 corporals, 4 artificers, 2 musicians, 2 cooks, and 51 privates.

"In addition to the enlisted men specified there shall be 1 electrician sergeant to each post garrisoned by coast artillery having electrical appliances, who shall have the pay and allowances of an ordnance sergeant.

"SEC. 4. That each regiment of infantry shall consist of 1 colonel, 1 lieutenant-colonel, 3 majors, 14 captains, 2 of whom shall be available for detail as adjutant and quartermaster, 16 first lieutenants, of whom 1 shall be available for detail as commissary and 3 for detail as battalion adjutants; 12 second lieutenants, 1 sergeant-major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 commissary-sergeant, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a regimental quartermaster-sergeant of infantry; 3 battalion sergeant-majors, who shall be senior to and have the pay and allowances of a first sergeant; 1 band, and 12 companies, organized into 3 battalions of 4 companies each: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as abolishing the office of chaplain in each regiment of colored infantry.

"Each infantry band shall consist of 1 chief musician, 1 principal musician, 1 drum major, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a first sergeant; 4 sergeants, 8 corporals, 1 cook, and 12 privates.

"Each infantry company shall consist of 1 captain, 1 first lieutenant, 1 second lieutenant, 1 first sergeant, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, who shall have the pay and allowances of a sergeant, 4 sergeants, 6 corporals, 2 cooks, 2 musicians, 1 artificer, and 48 privates: *Provided*, That the limits of age for original enlistments in the Army shall be 18 and 35 years.

"SEC. 5. That all vacancies created or caused by the provisions of this act above the grade of second lieutenant in the line of the Army shall be filled by promotion according to seniority in the several arms, subject to the examinations now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That the additional second lieutenants now attached to each regiment of artillery shall be absorbed in the artillery or transferred to other arms where vacancies exist without loss of relative rank, leaving but one second lieutenant in each battery.

"Vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant shall be filled as now provided by law, except that no person shall be appointed from civil life before he shall have reached the age of 21 years nor after he shall have reached the age of 27 years, nor until he shall have passed a satisfactory examination as to his moral, physical, and educational qualifications.

"SEC. 6. That the Adjutant-General's and Inspector-General's departments shall consist of the number of officers now in those departments, respectively: *Provided*, That vacancies in the grade of major occurring in either department shall hereafter be filled from captains in the line of the Army: *And provided further*, That all such captains who have evinced marked aptitude in the command of troops shall be reported by their regimental commanders to the War Department and shall be entitled to compete for any such vacancy under such system of examination as the President shall prescribe.

"SEC. 7. That the Judge-Advocate-General's Department, Quartermaster's Department, Subsistence Department, Medical Department, Pay Department, Corps of Engineers, Ordnance Department, and Signal Corps shall consist of the officers and enlisted men now provided by law: *Provided*, That the battalion of engineers, and the officers serving therewith, shall constitute a part of the line of the Army: *Provided further*, That in time of war retired officers of the Army may, in the discretion of the President, be employed on active duty, other than in the command of troops, and when so employed they shall receive the full pay and allowances of their grades: *And provided also*, That no person in civil life shall hereafter be appointed a judge-advocate, paymaster, or chaplain until he shall have passed satisfactorily such examination as to his moral, mental, and physical qualifications as may be prescribed by the President; and no such person shall be appointed who is more than forty-four years of age: *Provided further*, That in case of the appointment of an officer who has served in a similar capacity during the war with Spain and has demonstrated his moral, mental, and physical qualifications for the position, then such examination shall not be required.

"SEC. 8. That the Chief of the Record and Pension Office of the War Department shall hereafter have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier-general, and there shall be an assistant chief of said office, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major, and who may be appointed from civil life: *Provided*, That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of Chief of the Record and Pension Office subsequent to the passage of this act said grade shall cease and determine, and thereafter the chief of said office shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel.

"SEC. 9. That the cooks authorized by this act shall have the pay and allowances of sergeants of infantry.

"SEC. 10. That the corps of cadets shall consist of 1 from each Congressional district, 1 from each Territory, 1 from the District of Columbia, and 20 from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and shall, with the exception of the 20 cadets appointed at large, be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or of the District of Columbia, or of the States, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed.

"SEC. 11. That so much of the acts approved July 7, 1898, as authorizes the assignment of certain officers of the Quartermaster's and Subsistence departments with increased rank and the continuance in service of certain volunteer officers of those departments for a period of one year after the close of the present war is repealed.

"SEC. 12. That to meet the present exigencies of the military service the President is hereby authorized to maintain the Regular Army at a strength of not exceeding 65,000 enlisted men, to be distributed amongst the several branches of the service, including the Signal Corps, according to the needs of each, and raise a force of not more than 35,000 volunteers to be recruited as he may determine from the country at large, or from the localities where their services are needed, without restriction as to citizenship or educational qualifications, and to organize the same into not more than 27 regiments organized as are infantry regiments of war strength in the Regular Army, and 3 regiments to be composed of men of special qualifications in horsemanship and marksmanship, to be organized as cavalry for service mounted or dismounted: *Provided*, That each regiment shall have one surgeon, with the rank of major; two assistant surgeons, one of whom shall have the rank of captain and one that of first lieutenant, and three hospital stewards: *Provided further*, That such increased regular and volunteer force shall continue in service only during the necessity therefor, and not later than July 1, 1901.

"All enlistments for the volunteer force herein authorized shall be for the term of two years and four months, unless sooner discharged.

"SEC. 13. That the President shall have power to continue in service or to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, brigadier-generals of volunteers, who, including the brigadier-generals of the Regular Army, shall not exceed 1 for every 4,000 enlisted men actually in service, and major-generals of volunteers, who, including the major-generals of the Regular Army, shall not exceed 1 for every 12,000 enlisted men: *Provided*, That Regular Army officers continued or appointed as general officers or as field or staff officers of volunteers, under the provisions of this Act, shall not vacate their Regular Army commissions: *And provided further*, That no general officers appointed under the provisions of this section shall be continued in service as such beyond July 1, 1901: *And provided also*, That any officer now in the Army, who was graduated at the head of his class at the United States Military Academy and who is not now in the Corps of Engineers, may be appointed to the Corps of Engineers with the same grade and date of commission that he would have if he had been appointed to the Corps of Engineers on graduation; but said commission shall not entitle an officer to any back pay or allowance.

"SEC. 14. That the President is hereby authorized to continue in service, or to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, officers of the volunteer staff, as follows:

"Three assistant adjutant-generals with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and 6 assistant adjutant-generals with the rank of major.

"Three inspectors-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and 6 inspectors-general with the rank of major.

"Five judge-advocates with the rank of major.

"Thirty quartermasters with the rank of major, and 40 assistant quartermasters with the rank of captain.

"Six commissaries of subsistence with the rank of major, and 12 assistant commissaries of subsistence with the rank of captain.

"Thirty-four surgeons with the rank of major.

"Thirty additional paymasters with the rank of major.

"Four signal officers with the rank of major, 9 signal officers with the rank of captain, 9 signal officers with the rank of first lieutenant, and 9 signal officers with the rank of second lieutenant.

"*Provided*, That for each Regular Army officer of a staff corps or department who may be retained in or appointed to a higher volunteer rank in said staff corps or department than that actually held by him in the regular establishment there may be appointed one officer of volunteers of the lowest grade mentioned in this section for such staff corps or department, but no appointment shall be made which will increase the total number of officers, regular and volunteer, serving in any grade, above the number authorized by this act: *And provided also*, That all the volunteer staff officers herein authorized to be appointed or retained in the service shall be honorably discharged on July 1, 1901, or sooner if their services are no longer required: *And provided further*, That the officers herein authorized shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"SEC. 15. That the officers and enlisted men of the Volunteer Army shall be mustered out of the military service of the United States and discharged as provided in the act of April 22, 1898: *Provided*, That enlisted men of volunteers who desire to remain in the military service, either in the Regular Army or the temporary force authorized by this act, may, if found qualified therefor, be transferred to and enlisted in such batteries, troops, or companies as may be below the maximum authorized strength, and when so transferred and enlisted shall be credited on their new enlistment with the periods of service rendered by them, respectively, as volunteers: *And provided further*, That the President is authorized to enlist temporarily in service for absolutely necessary purposes in the Philippine Islands volunteers, officers and men, individually or by organization, now in those islands and about to be discharged, provided their retention shall not extend beyond the time necessary to replace them by troops authorized to be maintained under the provisions of this act and not beyond a period of six months: *Provided, also*, That each and every provision of this act shall continue in force until July 1, 1903; and on and after that date all the general, staff, and line officers appointed to the Army under this act shall be discharged and the numbers restored in each grade to those existing at the passage of this act, and the enlisted force of the line of the Army shall be reduced to the number as provided for by a law prior to April 1, 1898, exclusive of such additions as have been, or may be, made under this act to the artillery, and except the cadets provided for by this act, who may be appointed prior to July 1, 1901: *And provided further*, That no officer who has been, or may be, promoted under existing law, or under the rules of seniority, shall be disturbed in his rank.

"SEC. 16. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit enlisted men of the United States Army to make allotments of their pay, under such regulations as he may prescribe, for the support of their families or relatives, for their own savings, or for other purposes, during

such time as they may be absent on distant duty, or under other circumstances warranting such action.

"SEC. 17. That no officer or private soldier shall be detailed to sell intoxicating drinks, as a bartender or otherwise, in any post exchange or canteen, nor shall any other person be required or allowed to sell such liquors in any encampment or fort or on any premises used for military purposes by the United States; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to issue such general order as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect.

"SEC. 18. That all laws or parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

Mr. HULL. Now I move the previous question. I thought I had moved it to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. That applied to the bill, but not to the motion to recommit made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A point of order.

The SPEAKER. Did the Chair understand the gentleman from New York to demand the previous question on his motion?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Iowa moved the previous question, and said he thought he had done so before, in moving the previous question on the bill to the final passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not advised of any motion made by the gentleman from Iowa for the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HULL. I did make the motion, but the gentleman from Missouri insisted that he was recognized by the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri had not been recognized except for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HULL. I move the previous question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa demands the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. In the interest of proper practice I wish to say that it seems to me that the gentleman from Iowa did move the previous question upon the bill to its passage. If that is true, then it included all motions, with the motion to recommit among the rest.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not take that view of it. The gentleman did ask for the previous question and that was ordered by the House upon the bill to its passage; but that does not preclude the House from voting on a motion to recommit. However, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] now asks for the previous question on the motion to recommit made by the gentleman from New York. That is the question now before the House.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs with instructions.

Mr. HULL. I call for the yeas and nays on that.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I join in the request for the yeas and nays made by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Now I ask again whether it will be in order to amend the motion to instruct?

The SPEAKER. No amendment of any kind can now be made. As many as are in favor of ordering this vote to be taken by the yeas and nays will rise in their places and remain standing until counted.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 70, nays 246, answered "present" 2, not voting 38; as follows:

YEAS—70.

Bankhead,	Davey,	Little,	Ruppert,
Barber,	Davis,	Livingston,	Ryan, N. Y.
Bartlett,	Denny,	McCall,	Ryan, Pa.
Bell,	Elliott,	McClellan,	Slayden,
Bellamy,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	McCulloch,	Sparkman,
Brantley,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	McDowell,	Stark,
Breazeale,	Fleming,	Maddox,	Sutherland,
Brenner,	Gaston,	Mann,	Swanson,
Broussard,	Gayle,	Meekison,	Taylor, Ala.
Burke, Tex.	Glynn,	Meyer, La.	Terry,
Burleson,	Gordon,	Miers, Ind.	Thayer,
Caldwell,	Griffith,	Muller,	Underhill,
Cooney,	Hay,	Naphen,	Underwood,
Cooper, Tex.	Jett,	Newlands,	Williams, W. E.
Cox,	King,	Polk,	Zenor,
Crowley,	Lamb,	Richardson, Ala.	Ziegler.
Cummings,	Lassiter,	Robinson, Ind.	
Davenport, S. W.	Lester,	Robinson, Nebr.	

NAYS—246.

Acheson,	Ball,	Bromwell,	Calderhead,
Adams,	Barney,	Brosius,	Cannon,
Aldrich,	Bartholdt,	Brown,	Capron,
Alexander,	Benton,	Brownlow,	Carmack,
Allen, Ky.	Bingham,	Bull,	Clark, Mo.
Allen, Me.	Bishop,	Burke, S. Dak.	Clayton, Ala.
Atwater,	Boreing,	Burkett,	Clayton, N. Y.
Babcock,	Boutell, Ill.	Burleigh,	Cochran, Mo.
Bailey, Kans.	Bowersock,	Burnett,	Cochrane, N. Y.
Bailey, Tex.	Brewer,	Burton,	Connell,
Baker,	Brick,	Butler,	Conner,
Cooper, Wis.	Hedge,	Miller,	Sibley,
Corliss,	Hemenway,	Minor,	Sims,
Cousins,	Henry, Conn.	Mondell,	Smith, Ill.
Cowherd,	Henry, Miss.	Moody, Mass.	Smith, Iowa,
Cromer,	Henry, Tex.	Moody, Oreg.	Smith, Ky.
Crumpacker,	Hepburn,	Moon,	Smith, H. C.
Curtis,	Hill,	Morgan,	Smith, Samuel W.
Cusack,	Hitt,	Morrell,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Dahle,	Hoffecker,	Morris,	Snodgrass,
Dalzell,	Hopkins,	Mudd,	Southard,
Davenport, S. A.	Howard,	Needham,	Spalding,
Davidson,	Howell,	Neville,	Sperry,
Dayton,	Hull,	Noonan,	Spight,
De Armond,	Jack,	Norton, Ohio,	Sprague,
De Graffenreid,	Johnston,	O'Grady,	Steele,
Dick,	Jones, Va.	Olmsted,	Stephens, Tex.
Dougherty,	Jones, Wash.	Otey,	Stevens, Minn.
Dovener,	Joy,	Otjen,	Stewart, N. J.
Driscoll,	Kahn,	Overstreet,	Stewart, N. Y.
Eddy,	Kerr, Md.	Packer, Pa.	Stewart, Wis.
Emerson,	Kerr, Ohio,	Parker, N. J.	Stokes,
Esch,	Ketcham,	Payne,	Sulloway,
Faris,	Kitchin,	Pearce, Mo.	Sulzer,
Finley,	Kleberg,	Pierce, Tenn.	Talbert,
Fitzpatrick,	Kluttz,	Pearre,	Tate,
Fletcher,	Knox,	Phillips,	Tawney,
Fordney,	Lacey,	Powers,	Tayler, Ohio
Foss,	Landis,	Prince,	Thomas, Iowa
Fowler,	Lane,	Pugh,	Thomas, N. C.
Fox,	Lanham,	Quarles,	Thropp,
Gaines,	Latimer,	Ray, N. Y.	Tompkins,
Gamble,	Lawrence,	Reeder,	Tongue,
Gardner, Mich.	Lewis,	Rhea, Ky.	Turner,
Gardner, N. J.	Linney,	Rhea, Va.	Vandiver,
Gibson,	Littauer,	Richardson, Tenn.	Van Voorhis,
Gilbert,	Littlefield,	Rixey,	Vreeland,
Gill,	Lloyd,	Robb,	Wadsworth,
Gillet, N. Y.	Long,	Roberts,	Watson,
Gillett, Mass.	Lorimer,	Rodenberg,	Weaver,
Graff,	Loud,	Rucker,	Weeks,
Green, Pa.	Loudenslager,	Russell,	Weymouth,
Greene, Mass.	Lovering	Salmon,	Wheeler,
Griggs,	Lybrand,	Scudder,	Williams, J. R.
Grosvenor,	McCleary,	Shackleford,	Williams, Miss.
Grout,	McDermott,	Shafroth,	Wilson, S. C.
Grow,	McLain,	Shattuc,	Wise,
Hall,	McRae,	Shaw,	Wood,
Hamilton,	Mahon,	Shelden,	Wright,
Haugen,	Marsh,	Sheppard,	Young.
Hawley,	Mercer,	Sherman,	
Heatwole,	Metcalf,	Showalter,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Adamson, Jenkins.

NOT VOTING—38.

Allen, Miss.	Crump,	May,	Stallings,
Barham,	Cushman,	Mesick,	Wachter,
Berry,	Dinsmore,	Norton, S. C.	Wanger,
Boutelle, Me.	Driggs,	Pearson,	Warner,
Bradley,	Foster,	Ransdell,	Waters,
Brundidge,	Freer,	Reeves,	White,
Campbell,	Graham,	Ridgely,	Wilson, Idaho
Catchings,	Lentz,	Riordan,	Wilson, N. Y.
Chanler,	Levy,	Robertson, La.	
Clarke, N. H.	McAleer,	Small,	

So the motion to recommit with instructions was rejected.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 133, answered "present" 4, not voting 48; as follows:

YEAS—171.

Acheson,	Davenport, S. A.	Hoffecker,	Mudd,
Aldrich,	Davidson,	Hopkins,	Needham,
Alexander,	Dayton,	Howell,	O'Grady,
Allen, Me.	Dick,	Hull,	Olmsted,
Babcock,	Dovener,	Jack,	Otjen,
Baker,	Driscoll,	Jones, Wash.	Overstreet,
Barney,	Eddy,	Joy,	Packer, Pa.
Bingham,	Emerson,	Kahn,	Parker, N. J.
Bishop,	Esch,	Kerr, Md.	Payne,
Boreing,	Faris,	Kerr, Ohio.	Pearce, Mo.
Boutell, Ill.	Fletcher,	Ketcham,	Pearre,
Bowersock,	Fordney,	Knox,	Phillips,
Brick,	Foss,	Lacey,	Powers,
Bromwell,	Fowler,	Landis,	Prince,
Brosius,	Gamble,	Lane,	Pugh,
Brown,	Gardner, Mich.	Lawrence,	Ray, N. Y.
Brownlow,	Gardner, N. J.	Linney,	Reeder,
Bull,	Gibson,	Littauer,	Roberts,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gill,	Littlefield,	Rodenberg,
Burkett,	Gillet, N. Y.	Long,	Russell,
Burleigh,	Gillett, Mass.	Lorimer,	Scudder,
Burton	Graff,	Loud,	Shattuc,
Butler,	Greene, Mass.	Loudenslager,	Shaw,
Calderhead,	Grosvenor,	Lovering,	Shelden,
Cannon,	Grout,	Lybrand,	Sherman,
Capron,	Grow,	Mahon,	Showalter,
Clayton, N. Y.	Hall,	Mann,	Sibley,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hamilton,	Marsh,	Smith, Ill.
Connell,	Haugen,	Mercer,	Smith, Iowa.
Conner,	Hawley,	Metcalf,	Smith, H. C.
Cooper, Wis.	Heatwole,	Miller,	Smith, Samuel W.
Cousins,	Hedge,	Minor,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Cromer,	Hemenway,	Mondell,	Southard,
Crumpacker,	Henry, Conn.	Moody, Mass.	Spalding,
Curtis,	Hepburn,	Moody, Oreg.	Sperry,
Dahle,	Hill,	Morrell,	Sprague,
Dalzell,	Hitt,	Morris,	Steele,

Stevens, Minn.	Tayler, Ohio	Van Voorhis,	Weymouth,
Stewart, N. J.	Thomas, Iowa	Vreeland,	Wise,
Stewart, N. Y.	Thropp,	Wadsworth,	Wood,
Stewart, Wis.	Tompkins,	Watson,	Wright,
Sulloway,	Tongue,	Weaver,	Young.
Tawney,	Underhill,	Weeks,	

NAYS—133.

Allen, Ky.	Dougherty,	Lloyd,	Salmon,
Atwater,	Elliott,	McCall,	Shackleford,
Bailey, Tex.	Finley,	McClellan,	Shafroth,
Ball,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	McCulloch,	Sheppard,
Bankhead,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	McDermott,	Sims,
Barber,	Fleming,	McDowell,	Slayden,
Bartlett,	Fox,	McLain,	Smith, Ky.
Bell,	Gaines,	McRae,	Snodgrass,
Bellamy,	Gaston,	Maddox,	Sparkman,
Benton,	Gayle,	Meekison,	Spight,
Brantley,	Gilbert,	Meyer, La.	Stark,
Breazeale,	Glynn,	Miers, Ind.	Stephens, Tex.
Brenner,	Gordon,	Moon,	Stokes,
Brewer,	Green, Pa.	Muller,	Sulzer,
Broussard,	Griffith,	Naphen,	Sutherland,
Burke, Tex.	Griggs,	Neville,	Swanson,
Burleson,	Hay,	Newlands,	Talbert,
Burnett,	Henry, Miss.	Noonan,	Tate,
Caldwell,	Henry, Tex.	Otey,	Taylor, Ala.
Carmack,	Howard,	Pierce, Tenn.	Terry,
Clark, Mo.	Jett,	Polk,	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton, Ala.	Johnston,	Quarles,	Turner,
Cochran, Mo.	Jones, Va.	Rhea, Ky.	Underwood,
Cooney,	King,	Rhea, Va.	Vandiver,
Cooper, Tex.	Kitchin,	Richardson, Ala.	Wheeler,
Cowherd,	Kleberg,	Richardson, Tenn.	Williams, J. R.
Cox,	Kluttz,	Rixey,	Williams, W. E.
Crowley,	Lamb,	Robb,	Williams, Miss.
Cummings,	Lanham,	Robinson, Ind.	Wilson, S. C.
Cusack,	Lassiter,	Robinson, Nebr.	Zenor,
Davenport, S. W.	Lester,	Rucker,	Ziegler.
Davis,	Lewis,	Ruppert,	
De Armond,	Little,	Ryan, N. Y.	
De Graffenreid,	Livingston,	Ryan, Pa.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Adamson,	Denny,	Jenkins,	Norton, Ohio.

NOT VOTING—48.

Adams,	Clarke, N. H.	Lentz,	Riordan,
Allen, Miss.	Corliss,	Levy,	Robertson, La.
Bailey, Kans.	Crump,	McAleer,	Small,
Barham.	Cushman,	McCleary,	Stallings,
Bartholdt,	Davey,	May,	Thayer,
Berry,	Dinsmore,	Mesick,	Wachter,
Boutelle, Me.	Driggs,	Morgan,	Wanger,
Bradley,	Fitzpatrick,	Norton, S. C.	Warner,
Brundidge,	Foster,	Pearson,	Waters,
Campbell,	Freer,	Ransdell,	White,
Catchings,	Graham,	Reeves,	Wilson, Idaho
Chanler,	Latimer,	Ridgely,	Wilson, N. Y.

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. MESICK with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. CRUMP with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON, for this session.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. CHANLER, until Monday.

Mr. REEVES with Mr. DINSMORE, for this week.

For this day:

Mr. MCCLEARY with Mr. DRIGGS.

Mr. WARNER with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire with Mr. CATCHINGS.

Mr. BARHAM with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.

Mr. PEARSON with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. WATERS with Mr. WILSON of Idaho.

Mr. MORGAN with Mr. LENTZ.

On this bill:

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. LEVY.

Mr. FREER with Mr. RANSDELL.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. MCALEER.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas with Mr. LATIMER.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. DENNY.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the report from the Secretary of State and accompanying papers relating to the claim against the United States of the Russian subject Gustad Isak Dahlberg, master and principal owner of the Russian bark *Hams*, based on his wrongful and illegal arrest and imprisonment by officers of the United States district court for the southern district of Mississippi, and, in view of the opinion expressed by the Department of Justice that the said arrest and detention of the complainant were wrongful and without the authority of law, I recommend the appropriation by Congress of the sum of $5,000 to reimburse the master and owners of the vessel for all losses and damages incurred by reason of his said wrongful and illegal arrest and detention.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 6, 1900.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in relation to the lynching, in La Salle County, Tex., on October 5, 1895, of Florentino Suaste, a Mexican citizen.

Following the course pursued in the case of the lynching of three Italian subjects at Hahnsville, La., on August 8, 1896, and in that of the lynching of the Mexican citizen Luis Moreno, at Yreka, Cal., in August, 1895, I recommend the appropriation by Congress, out of humane consideration, and without reference to the question of liability of the Government of the United States, of the sum of $2,000, to be paid by the Secretary of State to the Government of Mexico, and by that Government distributed to the heirs of the above-mentioned Florentino Suaste.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 6, 1900.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a communication from the Secretary of State, inclosing the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of the American Republics, with accompanying documents.

The attention of Congress is called to the request of the Secretary of State that 2,500 copies of the report be printed for the use of the Bureau.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 6, 1900.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the House to Executive Document No. 58, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of the appropriation for third secretary of embassy, Italy, which by mistake was sent to the Committee on Appropriations, when it should have gone to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Without objection, this change of reference will be made. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PERSONAL REQUESTS OF MEMBERS.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FREER, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. DAVEY, for five days, on account of important business.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask indefinite leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. BRUNDIDGE, on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Arkansas will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes) adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and estimates of cost for treatment of that portion of the District of Columbia south of Pennsylvania avenue and north of B street SW., and for a connection between the Potomac and Geological parks—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting report of receipts and disbursements by the treasurer of Porto Rico for the months of May to September, 1900, inclusive—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Chattahoochee River, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the auditor of Porto Rico, submitting reports of receipts and disbursements for the months of May to October, 1900, inclusive—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of buildings for the construction of which the limit of cost should be extended—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of

Burlington Bay, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Mississippi River between Sandy Lake and Brainerd, Minn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the Quartermaster-General of the Army relating to suspension of certain provisions of law relating to the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriations for searchlights in New York Harbor—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Ashley River, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs to steamer *Gedney*—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Upper Illinois and Lower Des Plaines rivers, Illinois—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation for observation of the eclipse of the sun May 17, 1901—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation for employees of the Naval War College—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ernest L. Yourtee, administrator of estate of Barton Boteler, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of damage to fortifications at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of effect of storm on Galveston jetties—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of effects of storm on Brazos River jetties—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Buttermilk Channel, New York Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Appomattox River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Hay Lake Channel, St. Marys River, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Snake River, Idaho and Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Cleveland Harbor, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Great Pedee River, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Mississippi River in Kentucky and Tennessee, with the view to the construction of levees—to the Committee on Levees and Improvement of the Mississippi River, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Rock River, Illinois—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Beverly Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sandusky Harbor, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Scuppernong River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Savannah Harbor, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Trent River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Lake Erie entrance to Black Rock Harbor and Erie Basin, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

Report of the Librarian of Congress for the year ended June 30, 1900—to the Committee on Library, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12281) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the distilling of brandy from fruits, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2012); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 305) for reference of the several topics treated in the President's message, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2013).

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. 6725) to pension Mary E. Beaton—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12386) granting an increase of pension to William N. Hall—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10130) to increase the pension of James Moss—the Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on 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. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12400) to provide for the erection of dwellings for the keepers of the Grosse Isle, Michigan, light-houses—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 12401) to define the duties of the

Medical Department of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 12402) for the enlargement and improvement of the public building at Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 12403) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Ohio, Monongahela, Allegheny, Great Kanawha, Cumberland, Tennessee, and Illinois rivers, and the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Minnesota River and the city of Natchez, Miss., and to regulate the location, dimensions, and character of the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12404) to repeal an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 12446) for the erection of a Federal jail at Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 12447) to amend an act approved June 1, A. D. 1900, entitled "An act to create the southern division of the southern district of Iowa for judicial purposes, and to fix the time and place for holding court therein"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 12448) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and erection of a mint building thereon at Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 12449) to provide homes and employment for the homeless poor and make them self-sustaining home owners—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 277) to appoint Charles A. Boutelle a captain on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 278) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to employ an additional assistant to the attorney—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the purchase of Temple Farm and Moore House, at Yorktown, Va., by the United States Government—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the purchase of Temple Farm and Moore House, at Yorktown, Va., by the United States Government—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 12405) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Briscoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 12406) for the recognition of the military service of company officers and enlisted men of the First Union League Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers as emergency militia who served under the field and staff officers of the Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Militia and were mustered out as part of the latter regiment—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 12407) for the relief of George F. Brott—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A bill (H. R. 12408) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte D. Alden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12409) granting a pension to Choe E. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12410) granting a pension to Elmer Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12411) granting a pension to Catherine T. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12412) granting an increase of pension to James T. Maxfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12413) to correct the military record of Clark Brashear—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12414) to correct the military record of Henry Simmons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 12415) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Otis Wallace—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLEMING: A bill (H. R. 12416) for the relief of W. O. Donovan and the heirs of Lizzie M. Donovan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 12417) for the relief of the late Andrew S. Core—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12418) for the relief of Anna M. Mershon, administratrix of Daniel S. Mershon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 12419) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Pearce, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 12420) for the relief of Henry Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 12421) granting a pension to Mrs. Alice Asbury Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12422) to correct the military record of Hall P. Talbot—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12423) granting an honorable discharge to William Noble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12424) granting a pension to Henry Wascher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12425) granting a pension to Lizzie A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 12426) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson M. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 12427) granting an increase of pension to Michael Haley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 12428) for the relief of James M. Gullatt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12429) for the relief of Peter Crenshaw—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 12430) to correct the military record of Robert Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 12431) granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12432) for the relief of J. R. Claybrooke—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 12433) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 12434) granting a pension to Marie Barton Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 12435) granting a pension to Benjamin G. Page—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12436) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, of Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 12437) for the relief of William H. Crawford—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12438) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Schank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 12439) granting a pension to Elmira Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12440) for the relief of William Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12441) granting an increase of pension to Aaron R. Rohrbach—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 12442) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Starr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 12443) for the relief of Ann Gallois—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'GRADY: A bill (H. R. 12444) granting an increase of pension to John D. Cohler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 12445) for the relief of Robert Spring—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 12450) granting a pension to Charles Forrest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12451) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Nathan Trail—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12452) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of David Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12453) for the relief of the trustees of the German Reformed Church, Middletown, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 12454) to authorize Commander Frederick M. Wise, United States Navy, to accept a testimonial from the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12455) to authorize Capt. Bowman H. McCalla, United States Navy, to accept a testimonial from the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Friday Conversational Club, of

Monongahela, Pa., for forestry reserve and national park in Minnesota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the United States Brewers' Association, praying for the reduction of the war tax on beer—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolutions of the Society of the Army of L. B. Miller, D. H. Horst, P. S. Brubaker, and others, of the State of Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of George H. Slaybaugh, department commander of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill No. 5499, for the relief of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of R. M. Taggart and other members of Post No. 214, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petitions of citizens of Clay Center, Acme, Enterprise, and Manhattan, Kans., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of M. O. and Carl Atterbery, of Oakford, Ill., for the repeal of the special tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROMER: Petition of Indianapolis Branch, No. 39, National Association of Letter Carriers, of Indianapolis, Ind., in favor of the letter carriers' salary bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of substitute letter carriers of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of House bill No. 1051, relating to grading of substitute letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of railway postal clerks of Indiana, favoring the bill for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Anderson, Ind., urging the passage of the post-office reclassification bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Indiana Bankers' Association, for the repeal of stamp tax on checks, drafts, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Evidence to accompany House bill granting a pension to Elmer Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Elmira Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petitions of S. Johnson and J. F. Kimble, of Jacksonville, N. J.; S. W. K. Emley, of Burlington, and E. A. Davis, of Wrightstown, N. J., in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the New Bedford (Mass.) District Ministerial Association, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Marshall L. Eldridge, H. F. Doane, J. H. Charles, and others, keepers of various life-saving stations on Cape Cod, to increase the pay of keepers to $100 per month—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Aaron R. Rohrbach, a veteran of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: Petition of retail druggists of Bellefonte, Pa., for the repeal of the special tax on proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Central Life Assurance Society, Equitable Life Insurance Company, Royal Union Mutual Life, National Life and Trust Company, Des Moines Life Insurance Company, Chicago Life Insurance Company, and the Bankers' Life Association, for the repeal or modification of the war-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of common council of Perth Amboy, N. J., asking for the erection of a public building on land owned by the Government in that city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Freehold, N. J., and Woman's Missionary Society of First Presbyterian Church of Metuchen, N. J., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: Petitions of J. M. Harrison and W. B. Harris, of North Carolina, favoring the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANN: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Hall P. Talbot—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, for the establishment of forestry reserve and national park in Minnesota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition of John Richards, J. C. Hanby, the Potomac, commending the work already accomplished on the National Military Park at Gettysburg, and asking that continued aid be given thereto—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MINOR: Petition of D. G. James, department commander of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, for action on House bill No. 5499, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: Petition of Albert B. Loebenstein, of Hawaii, protesting against the seating of Robert W. Wilcox as a Nebraska, in support of House bill No. 4742, amending section 1225 of the Revised Statutes, relating to military instruction in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolution of the Third Army Corps Union, of Gettysburg, Pa., commending the work accomplished by the Gettysburg National Park Commission, and asking for further appropriation to complete the work—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Lizzie A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Jefferson M. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of the estate of Thomas Murphy, deceased, late of Washington, D. C., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Hezekiah and Barton Boteler, deceased, late of Washington County, Md., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Resolution of Groton (N. Y.) Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, against island saloons and canteens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of H. L. Taylor, of Walcottville, and J. D. Butt, of Arcola, Ind., in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of Ekouk Grange, No. 89, Patrons of Husbandry, of Connecticut, and citizens of North Stonington, Conn., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of Mrs. O. G. La Rue and others, of Ypsilanti, Mich., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of J. C. Claybrooke—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany Senate bill No. 2161, granting an increase of pension to Eli F. Chittenden, of York County, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY: Paper to accompany House bill for the erection of a Federal jail at Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Benjamin Page—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of citizens of Niagara County, N. Y., asking for an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor at Wilson, Niagara County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of property owners and citizens of Oak Orchard Harbor, New York, for the improvement of harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. YOUNG: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Alonzo C. Schank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William H. Crawford—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of J. H. Musser, of Philadelphia, for the repeal of the war-revenue tax on legacies to educational, charitable, and religious societies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Society of the Army of the Potomac, in relation to the National Memorial Park at Gettysburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George H. Peace, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the anti-polygamy amendment and certain other reform measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.