The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is that the Senate agree to the resolution of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to hear the resolution read.

Mr. FRYE. It is simply the correction of a name in a pension bill; that is all.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Very well.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DEPEW and others addressed the Chair.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think the motion to adjourn ought to be put to the Senate.

Mr. DEPEW. I wish to ask one question as a matter of privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York rises to a question of privilege. The Senator will state his question of privilege.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is on the floor on a question of privilege, which he will state.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I came in late, not knowing anything of what was before the Senate, and heard only the speech of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. Like all his efforts, it was exceedingly eloquent. I should like to know what was the question before the Senate for discussion. I was told that it was to be the ship-subsidy bill, but the Senator from South Carolina was not discussing that measure.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from New York had remained in the Chamber, as he was bound to do under his obligation to the Republican bosses here, who have asked this quorum to come here to-night, he would have known that nobody has discussed the shipping bill at all.

Mr. FRYE. I renew my motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 7, 1901, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 6, 1901.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MOUNT CARMEL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, ILLINOIS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H.R.13491) authorizing the Mount Carmel Development Company to draw water from the Wabash River at Grand Rapids, Wabash County, Ill., with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment simply strikes out the preamble. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ZIEGLER for one week, on account of sickness.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HOPKINS, will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13729) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, with Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] is recognized.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to discuss as briefly as possible some of the questions investigated by the commission appointed to investigate the postal service, known as the postal commission, if I may have a respectable number of gentlemen who are willing to listen to me, or even a sufficient number of respectable gentlemen will deign to listen to me. [Laughter.] I do not care, Mr. Chairman, to dwell long upon what I would term the incidental questions investigated by the postal commission; and what I term the most important incidental questions are, first, the question of the continuation under present conditions of pneumatic-tube service. The commission set forth in their report, very briefly, it is true, their views upon that question. The postal commission do not believe it wise, under existing conditions, to recommend a continuance or an extension of the pneumatic-tube service, and we have given briefly our reasons why it should not be continued or extended.

I concede that the pneumatic service would be of inestimable value to a city for local delivery if every station could be connected with the tube, but as the present tube is only 8 inches in diameter and will not successfully transport anything but first-class matter, we were of the opinion that if Congress, in its wisdom, concluded to continue the pneumatic-tube service a much smaller tube might be used for that purpose, and necessarily much cheaper; or, on the other hand, if the tube was to be continued for the purpose of expediting the incoming and outgoing mail, then we believed, necessarily, that a tube of larger dimensions than 8 inches should be adopted by the Government. In the uncertain and chaotic conditions, with the enormously large price paid for it in the city of New York, we thought it better to stop and reorganize, preventing the Post-Office Department from entering into any new contracts.

Now, the pneumatic-tube service had its inception in a very small appropriation of $10,000 put into another appropriation of a million dollars, permitting the expenditure of $10,000 for experimental pneumatic-tube service. No man believed when we increased it from $10,000 to $50,000 for a continuation of this experimental service that the Post-Office Department would contract for service the annual charge of which was $225,000; but such was the fact. We appropriated without investigation this $50,000, and the Post-Office Department entered into contracts to the extent of $225,000. I have said before that the Boston service is not extravagant; the Philadelphia service is not extravagant; but the New York service, "conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity," ought to be crushed out and give us a chance to look around; and if we want to adopt this service let us start in afresh and let Congress know something about what it is appropriating money for.

I do not care to dwell upon this special-facility provision. I have talked against that until I have come to the conclusion that there were other things that might be accomplished where my efforts might be better directed. The postal commission, after an investigation, have recommended its discontinuance. We believed it to be a disturbing element throughout the whole country. Now, it is not necessary for me to state to the many gentlemen gathered around here that there has been no expedition by reason of this subsidy. It is a waste of time, I say, but I can not refrain from just touching upon it, and to say to you that all the expedition that there has been accomplished by this so-called subsidized train is in the taking up by the Post-Office Department of the 4.35 a. m. train, which was established by the newspapers of this country, as a mail train.

Preceding the outbreak of the Spanish war there were a great number of newspapers transmitted throughout the country, a large number to Washington, Philadelphia, and cities along the way, and a number of the newspapers of the city of New York engaged a train leaving that city at 4.35 in the morning. Well, now, it is not necessary for me to say to the people of New England that this does not expedite your mails, because none of your mail goes on that train. The train that leaves New York at 12.15 a. m., and which has been leaving New York for years at that hour, makes the very same mail connections as the train leaving at 4.35 a. m., and there is no accumulation of mails in the city of New York between 12 midnight and 4.30 in the morning——

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LOUD (continuing). Notwithstanding the fact that the Second Assistant Postmaster-General has said to me in person and, I believe, in the testimony that it does catch some of the mail that leaves Boston late in the evening. Well, now, if he knew enough to be Second Assistant Postmaster-General he must have known that there is no train that leaves Boston after 6 o'clock in the evening until 11.30 at night, which does not arrive at New York until 7.30 in the morning, and it can not possibly catch this train leaving at 4.35 a. m. The train that leaves Boston at 7 o'clock in the evening makes the southern connection and escapes New York. Now, that is all there is in this expedition from the city of New York here. It expedites the morning papers of the city of New York from Jersey City to Newark, and there they catch, or should catch, what is known as the Federal express from Boston, because the trains are due at Philadelphia and arrive in Washington at the same hour.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The Colonial express.

Mr. LOUD. The Federal express coming this way, the Colonial express going the other way; and it has been running for years.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and it is this: Has the Southern Railway put on a train on account of this 4.35 train, or do they run the same train now that they did before that 4.35 train was put on?

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. LOUD. Well, I do not care to go into the history of that. Members of Congress at that time remember how they took up this subsidy. The Atlantic Coast Line had it for years. Our committee did not see anybody who wanted it, and it went out. Now, in regard to items that are not expended, I have had officials of the Post-Office Department tell me when I wanted to segregate the different appropriations, "If you appropriate in bulk, we can use all that money; but if you segregate it, we can only use so much for this purpose and so much for that. If we can not use it on one item, we can not on another, and it is wasted." The Government officials believe that if you do not expend every dollar it is wasted.

Now, that was the condition here. Here was $196,000 lying around waiting for somebody to take it up, and the Pennsylvania Railroad, this poor Pennsylvania Railroad, which has a motive power here, got the Southern to take it. I have no doubt about that. The Southern at that time contemplated extending one train, which run from New York to Atlanta, extending it to New Orleans, and no man can deny it. Business had grown to such an extent that they were compelled to have two trains to that city. They were about to put on this train when somebody suggested to them that they had better gather up that $196,000 that is floating around and which nobody seemed to want. The expedition of this train from Washington to Atlanta, which is a train that ran before I came to Congress, the expedition, permit me to say, is not real. It leaves Washington at the same time, it makes the same connections with the 12.15 train which left New York years before, and it does make a connection with a train which leaves at 4.35 in the morning, which brings nothing in the world but newspapers.

Permit me to say regarding the Pennsylvania Railroad that if there is any necessity for this train out from New York to Washington there can possibly be no necessity for it beyond Newark, because it precedes by three minutes or follows by three minutes the Federal Express, which leaves Boston at 7 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. SIMS. I wish to ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, the discontinuance of this subsidy would affect the Southern mail?

Mr. LOUD. No; nobody in the Post-Office Department believes it, either. The Pennsylvania Railroad gets about $30,000 a year out of this; it helps pay the expenses of somebody that they have to keep here, perhaps. But it is of no use for me to talk about it; we can not stop it. Our Southern friends, when it comes to an appropriation that goes into your country, seem to act as if you had been oppressed all your life by the United States Government; and when there is a chance to pull any plunder out of it, they say, "Well, this is for our country; we don't get our share; let us stand together."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How about the Northwest; do they not do the same thing?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman is doing the Southern Congressmen injustice. I think the majority vote against it. But the question I want to ask the gentleman from California is, Would it not be better for the Southern mail, as far as finance or commerce is concerned, if the train which carries the mail left at a later hour? Is not this hour too early for business letters, except letters that were mailed the day before; and is it not a fact that all that is expedited are the morning newspapers?

Mr. LOUD. That is all. Now, I say it is a waste of time. I do say to you that the only expedition there has been to Atlanta has been by reason of an imaginary train which has no existence beyond Newark. But the Pennsylvania Railroad is poor, as I have suggested. They have to keep people in Washington, and this $28,000 or $30,000 helps pay their expenses; and if we can get off that cheap, we ought to thank God we are doing so well. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask the gentleman one question more and then I will not interrupt him again. Is there any difference in principle in voting for the special-facility fund and voting for the pneumatic tubes? Is not the pneumatic tube a special facility?

Mr. LOUD. It is a special facility; yes. If subsidies are proper you can not restrict them. If there is any railroad in the country that earns extra compensation from the Government, that railroad is the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, from Chicago to Omaha, which runs a phenomenally fast train, carrying nothing but mail, but they do not ask for it. It has always seemed to me that if the president of this subsidized railroad had the ordinary commonsense that is given to a man just able to keep out of the insane asylum, he would insist that his friends do not continue this aggravating appropriation, because it reaches further than the $196,000, and an outraged people will yet rise and do a great injustice, I believe, to the railroad companies of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I turn my attention to a review of the postal-commission investigation of the railroad mail pay. I am not like my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] horrified at work upon the commission. While the work upon the postal commission has been one of labor, yet if I can ever solve a question that is of interest to me, upon which I am called upon to legislate, then it is a labor of love. I entered upon this investigation with some crude ideas, ideas that had prevailed in Congress and the country for some years, and I do not think there is a member here but that has had to unlearn many things that were accepted facts when he came here. I have, I know. I came here with the idea (because it was prevalent) that the railroad companies of this country were, to put it in a rough way, robbing the United States Government of a large amount of money every year. I believed it in a general way without investigation, because people in whom I believed said so. Now, the commission, I suppose, were substantially in that frame of mind. Congress had been complaining for years. You could not get a bill up here to reduce railroad mail pay, the chairman of the Post-Office Committee cruelly insisting upon a point of order whenever such a provision was offered on an appropriation bill, until our sense of right and justice had been outraged, and this commission was a natural and legitimate outgrowth.

The gentlemen composing that commission are known to Congress and the country. The bill for the creation of the commission provided that the chairman of the Post-Office Committee in the Senate and the chairman of the Post-Office Committee in the House should be members of this commission. I do not know what influenced the selection of the members in the Senate. I do know that a gentleman ranking next to Senator Wolcott on that commission is a gentleman who has the universal confidence, not alone of every member of Congress, but of everyone in this country—a gentleman ripe in years and rich in experience, having spent nearly forty years here in legislative work. I refer to Senator Allison, whose judgment, permit me to say, I am more willing to follow when it comes to a practical solution of a question than the judgment of that eminent, that great statistician whom we did employ, not to render an opinion to us—that is where the gentleman from Michigan makes an error—not to render an opinion to us, but to reduce statistics to a satisfactory basis.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LOUD. I have not gone far enough to answer questions.

Mr. GAINES. My question relates to the point you are now discussing.

Mr. LOUD. By and by, when I come to discuss anything that is worth asking a question about, I will cheerfully yield, but when I am eulogizing it is hardly the proper place to ask questions. [Laughter.]

Now, we had heard for years the ideas of Mr. Cowles and Mr. Spahr, and not for many years, but for the last few years, the ideas of Mr. Acker, an eminently successful business man and a very clever gentleman, of the city of Philadelphia, who, I think, would rather have the credit of being the man who passed through Congress a bill providing for 1-cent postage than be the President of the United States. It is an ambition that has seized him, and that fire is consuming him. He would sacrifice anything in the world to accomplish 1-cent postage, and he can not do it unless we cut down the expenses of the Post-Office Department.

Mr. Cowles you all know. He is sane enough to be outside of an insane asylum on this and kindred questions, and that is about all. Mr. Spahr has seen the error of his ways and says nothing more. He came down here before the commission and attempted to tell them what he did not know about railway mail pay. It did not take him long to do even that. He went back a wiser and perhaps a sadder man than he came, and he has quit what I might term his foolishness.

Mr. Ernst, another noted witness, was once assistant postmaster of the city of Boston. He is a student; he reads every word of matter that is issued by the Post-Office Department. He is a perfect worm; he eats it all up. But I think that members of the postal commission recognized that he had not the faculty of emitting any practical knowledge.

Well, now, we started out; and we had to prove either the truth or the falsity of the position assumed, not alone by these men, because it had permeated the whole body politic, and I might say the mind of everybody. We had to prove that the position assumed by all was true or false. I think in a general way we believed their position untenable, because these people, and Mr. Acker joining them, said that the railroad mail pay should be immediately cut 25 per cent, that cut to be followed by 50 per cent more, making, as he says, a net reduction of 75 per cent.

There are lots of things about railroad mail pay that Mr. Acker does not know and a good many other people do not know. It is a big subject to investigate when we consider the basis of that pay, which, in my opinion, is absolutely wrong. And, as I shall attempt to show later on, there is where, in my opinion, Mr. Adams got lost—in contemplating ton mileage. When you come to consider that we transport on an average but 2 tons of mail in a car weighing 40 or 45 tons, a too intense concentration of thought upon the subject of weight in comparison with other factors of the calculation is liable to lead us into thin air, as it did him.

I have contended for the last two years, although bitterly opposed to this idea when I first went upon this commission—I contend to-day, and have for the last two years—that the only reasonable basis is a basis of space—so plain a proposition that any man

can understand it. Where you have to carry so much dead weight—where the dead weight carried is as 20 to 1 with respect to the paying load—it is impossible to make a comparison with anything else that is transported. But if the question is reduced to feet—either square feet or linear feet—then it is a plain proposition for the ordinary man to understand and to know what similar space earns, either for freight or for passengers.

Now, as my friend from Massachusetts has said, we started out and floundered around. There is no other word that can express it. We floundered around for a year and a half. It might be said that we have floundered up to the present moment. I believe with the gentleman from Massachusetts that when this commission ceased its labors it was just in a proper frame of mind to solve the question, a question which had been so narrowed down that six months' more investigation by a body of men that were willing to work could have solved it beyond a possibility of doubt.

But I shall follow some of the comparisons that Mr. Adams has sought to make. We tried to make a comparison with freight. People tried to make the comparison for us. We tried to compare it with passenger transportation; we tried to compare it with express matter; and, in the opinion of the great majority, express matter was the fairest subject of comparison. I do not think so. But it has been urged on the floor of this House that because express companies carry newspapers at less than a cent a pound, *ergo* they must be making money. Well, now, railroad companies and express companies do a good deal of business on which they do not make any money. The railroad companies sometimes issue passes. I do not think they make any money out of it. The New York Central Railroad Company has carried the newspapers for years in central New York for nothing. Why? Because it is reciprocity. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company to-day carries newpapers, I understand, in some instances for nothing. Every railroad company in this country carried newspapers for nothing until the business began to be a burden, and a tax had to be put upon it.

The express companies want the good will of the press just as much as we do. We want the support of the press when we go before our constituents for reelection; and we ask their good will, as a rule; and the express companies want their good will also for the better promotion of their business interests. They do not want to fight the press in any way. And in order to secure the good will of the newspapers they carry them at less than the actual cost to themselves. The express agent, the baggage man, the station agent, every official that travels upon the trains and all their friends connected with the road take the newspapers or receive copies of the papers, and in that way reciprocity takes place between them, the newspapers securing the transportation of their papers at less than the actual cost to the express companies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider a comparison between the mail and the express. We found on the Illinois Central Railroad, for instance, that there is a contract with the express company for so much per foot space occupied, and so it was possible to make some kind of a comparison between the receipts on that road for the express and the mail. The express company on this road uses 16,785 square feet of space and paid the company—this was in 1898—$566,392.34. The United States mail uses 29,510 square feet and pays the same company for this service $680,315.27. Or, to take a different calculation, the express company paid $3.37 per square foot for space and the United States mail paid $2.30 per square foot for the amount used.

Now, there is not a man who understands the matter who will claim that it does not cost just as much to haul a square foot of mail matter as a square foot of express matter; and yet, in this instance, as you have seen, the express pays $3.37 and the mail $2.30 per square foot.

The next comparison was made on the Santa Fe road. The receipts from the mail on that road were, in round numbers, $1,065,000, and from the express company $1,016,272. There was also an addition on account of what is known as the "reciprocal service," which perhaps the members of the House do not generally understand. There is a reciprocal service between the express and the railroad companies. For instance, the contract is that the railroad company shall receive 40 per cent of the gross receipts.

The express company carries all of the packages, parcels, and transient business of the railroad company, and pays a portion of the salary of the baggage men and the station agents, and it is conceded that this will amount on the average to about 10 per cent more. The reciprocal service on the route I have named is estimated at $177,480.66. So that the receipts from mails are $1,065,000 in round numbers, and the receipts from express $1,193,000. The mail, by actual measurement, on the Santa Fe system occupied 12 per cent of the total passenger train space, and this I believe to be absolutely a correct estimate, while the express used only 10 per cent of the space. So that, in other words, the mail used 12 per cent and paid, as I have shown you, $1,065,000, and the express used 10 per cent of the space and paid the railroad company $1,193,000.

Now, let us take the Southern Pacific road as another basis of comparison. This is referred to in volume 1, pages 78 and 79, of the testimony; and reference to the Santa Fe will be found on pages 697 and 698, part 2.

The express paid the Southern Pacific Company $923,693, and the mail paid $1,165,953. Mail cars used were 60 in number. The express cars used were 31; and to the receipts from express should be added $66,923.64 for the reciprocal service.

On the New York Central the receipts from the mail were $1,653,779, as will be seen on page 705, part 1, of the testimony, and from the express, $1,285,779.07; incidental service, $220,665, or a total from the express of $1,506,247, as will be seen by reference to the printed testimony. The rates received for this service, which I shall present later, if I have time, will appear in a table prepared by Professor Adams, known as "Table P," and another by Mr. Julier, general manager of the American Express Company, to be found on pages 527 and 528 of part 2 of testimony. This has sometimes been denominated as the "celebrated Table P."

Professor Adams showed in columns side by side the rates per ton for mail, for express, and for freight. Now, there was nothing bad about the table, although people did misconstrue it, because they attempted to compare a ton of mail with a ton of express or a ton of freight, by weight, which was misleading, and that was the only harm that Table P ever did. Professor Adams, in that table, gave the 100-pound rate, as he called it, of 63 cents from New York to Buffalo. Well, that is the 100-pound rate, it is true; but Mr. Julier, the general manager of the American Express Company, showed the commission where those figures were absolutely incorrect, the amount received by the railroad company being $1.16 per hundred. The difficulty about this position is, that, though Professor Adams is a great statistician, he does not know everything.

The rate for a hundred pounds is 63 cents, that is true, but the railroad company receives 40 per cent of gross receipts and get the benefit of the reciprocal service; and, again, the typical package is not a hundred-pound package. While the rate on a hundred pounds would be 63 cents, 14 packages of 7 pounds each would net the railroad company $4.40. I have made some comparisons here myself of earnings, and that is the only safe place to land. You can not compare a pound of mail with a pound of freight, a pound of express, or a pound of passengers. It is impossible. The only way you can get at this question is to take the earnings of similar space; and I do not think any man will assume that it costs less to transport a ton of mail than it does a ton of anything else.

Now, there is the only safe place to land. The railroad company receives from express matter, according to Mr. Julier, at page 525, Volume II, $1.16 a hundred pounds, which is correct. Sixty-three cents is not. They keep the weight in the American Express Company. That is the only express company in the United States that does take the weight. They know the total amount that they transport. They know the amount of money that they pay to the railroad companies, and dividing the one by the other it shows that the railroad company did receive $1.16 per hundred pounds for all they transported from New York to Buffalo. Now, we pay for mail $1.58 per hundred pounds. If we transported mail as they do express the railroad companies would carry it for one-eighth what they do now; or, to explain myself, I will put this to you: An express car weighing 25 tons would carry 8 tons of load at $1.16 per hundred pounds from New York to Buffalo, and would earn from New York to Buffalo $185.50.

I do not think any person will claim that 8 tons is above the average load for express. The locomotive in this instance hauls 33 tons. Now, for a carload of mail, the car weighing 45 tons and the load of mail 2 tons, or 4,000 pounds, which Professor Adams admits by the testimony is the average load, the car would earn, at $1.58 per hundred pounds, $63.20, or if it had 3 tons it would earn $94.80. If it was 3½ tons, which seems to be the maximum on any road in the country, it would amount to $110.50. Or, again, on express matter for 33 tons dead and live weight the railroad company receives $185.50; for mail, 48½ tons, dead and live weight, it receives as a possible maximum $110.50 from New York to Buffalo.

Mr. MANN. Did you say mail costs more to transport or less than express matter; I do not mean in that case, but generally?

Mr. LOUD. Why, per pound of live weight mail costs more than anything else that is transported.

Mr. MANN. You said less a while ago.

Mr. LOUD. No; I could not have said that mail cost less per pound. The gentleman perhaps did not understand that I was taking the weight of the car and the weight of the mail, and the weight of the car and the weight of the express. Perhaps nobody grasped the thought. I made the statement that it costs as much to transport a ton of mail as it does a ton of express, or a ton of express as much as a ton of mail, taking live and dead weight—that is, the locomotive knows no difference between mail and express matter. It has not a human mind, and it can not determine what it hauls by anything else except the weight. It knows, however, whether it is hauling 50 tons or 1 ton. Now, permit me to say that the express matter with 15 tons less weight of car and

load will earn more between New York and Buffalo than 15 tons more of mail, including the weight of the car, will earn.

On pages, 114, 115, and 121, part 2. there is a comparison between mail and passenger service, and I will insert here a statement relative to commutation service on several railroads, which I secured very easily:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 25, 1900.*

Statement showing commutation passengers, passengers 1 mile and earnings, with average rate per passenger, and average rate per passenger per mile, during the year 1899.

Division.	Passengers.	Miles.	Amount.	Average rate per passenger.	Average rate per passenger per mile.
				Cents.	*Cents.*
Pennsylvania R. R	8,485,757	114,360,967	$1,674,763.95	0.20	1.464
United Railroads of New Jersey	5,461,025	75,276,151	718,963.10	.13	.955
Philadelphia and Erie	424,909	9,268,924	174,259.94	.41	1.880
Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore	3,425,964	49,267,514	603,845.49	.18	1.226
West Jersey and Seashore	1,338,249	25,668,312	174,155.15	.13	.678
	19,135,904	273,841,868	3,345,987.63	.17	1.222
Lancaster and Reading Narrow Gauge	14,435	81,877	1,257.54	.09	1.536
Total	19,150,339	273,923,745	3,347,245.17	.17	1.222

That was Mr. Acker's hobby, which I hope to refer to later on. There is something peculiar about Mr. Acker. If you knock him down once he comes up smiling again, stronger than ever. If he failed on comparisons with express he took something else. And there was another strange thing about Mr. Acker's testimony, in that it became public before it was presented to the commission. And when he went to make his comparisons with passenger service he spoke of the difficulty that he had in securing passenger rates, which are posted in every railroad depot in the country; but he did succeed in securing some commutation passenger rates that were nonexistent, and that not another man in the country ever could have discovered.

He could discover this, but could not discover that which is posted in the railroad stations. Mr. Adams settled brother Acker more effectively than I can, in response to a question by me, as shown on page 420, part 2, of the testimony, and I will read it:

Mr. LOUD. Have you examined Mr. Acker's testimony, professor? If so, of what value is it as a guide to our actions?

Mr. ADAMS. I can not think that Mr. Acker's testimony is of any very great importance. It is some time since I read it. I read it immediately upon its being published. In so far as his argument rests upon the average haul of passenger and freight it is not correct, because he misused the figures. And then this report on the weighings of mails has come out since then, and that shows that his estimate of the average haul of mail is also incorrect.

"But that is one question," said Professor Adams, referring to comparisons with passenger service, "we do not know, and until we get through we can not make a comparison, but the mail traffic and passenger traffic as a basis will be of slight assistance in determining the railway compensation.

Professor Adams, on page 239 of volume 2, in summing up this question (and I think it is well to understand the motive) made this statement, and it struck me as remarkable. Now, I did say that if Professor Adams's conclusions could be substantiated that the question must close. I do not believe they can be. I did not believe there was reason in it, hence I did not agree with him upon this question; and Professor Adams was brought here, and, as some gentlemen have stated, was subjected to a severe cross-examination by "the gentleman from California." In examining Professor Adams, as I thought it was my duty to do, I believed if he could sustain the position he had taken then we must necessarily follow him; but I was no more willing to follow Professor Adams blindly than I am willing to follow any member on the floor of this House blindly. I wanted to see how well grounded his views were.

I knew that Professor Adams was the most eminent statistician in the world, an honest and conscientious gentleman, and that he had reduced this question to a plain proposition, so any man could almost see the light of day, but I never before knew, and I do not know to-day, that Professor Adams is a practical railroad or railway mail service man. I know that he is not, and while he has reduced our testimony to a plain basis, to be understood by anyone, while he has culled it out and gone all over it, he himself says that it is a matter of judgment after all; and when it comes to following anyone in a matter of judgment, permit me to say that I am more willing to follow Senator WOLCOTT, Senator ALLISON, Senator MARTIN, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] than Professor Adams. What did Professor Adams say on page 239 of volume 2?

If, then, the reduction in railway mail pay is necessary or even desirable for the interests of the postal service—

Now follow what I say—

(and this may be assumed as the judgment of Congress, since otherwise this question would not have been formally raised).

Now, there is the mistake Professor Adams made. He assumed this commission would not have been appointed unless Congress wanted the railway mail pay reduced regardless of whether they were overpaid or underpaid, and there was the fatal thought that seemed to consume him. On page 445 of volume 2 he says:

I assumed that the purpose of this commission was to efface the deficit in the Post-Office administration.

And a little further on:

In viewing this entire matter I came to the conclusion that $3,000,000 was the limit that could be reasonably asked from railways, and that the remainder of the saving necessary to wipe out the deficit should come from economies in the postal administration itself.

Now, I would like to know where in Mr. Adams's testimony, from beginning to end, or even in his summing up, he could support the position that he assumes.

Mr. MCCLEARY. What does that $3,000,000 refer to?

Mr. LOUD. The total of mail pay. That we would cut $3,000,000 off the railroad companies—and he thought that was what we hired him for, to show us how it could be done—and then cut something off somewhere else. He had some good ideas, there is no doubt. He thought that second, third, and fourth class mail should be concentrated and transported in a cheaper manner; and so it should, but you can not do it.

You can not transport newspapers at a lower rate of speed than they are to-day being transported. You have a subsidy in this very bill for a newspaper railroad train. And the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy fast mail trains out of Chicago are newspaper trains. One of them could just as well leave, for all practical purposes as to first-class mail, three or four hours before it does leave; but it leaves at that late hour and makes that phenomenal speed in order that the Chicago newspapers may be delivered through the country. Well, now, transport them in bulk at a slow rate of speed? No; you can not do it. You put them ahead of the letters, because they have the *influence*—and note the accent—in our districts. They have got us, and that is all they want. Now, I have a small book here that I use simply for convenience in referring to the testimony. It is smaller than the printed testimony and more convenient for reference, but it is absolutely correct. I desire to refer to Mr. Adams's testimony briefly.

Mr. MCCLEARY. What is this book?

Mr. LOUD. It is an argument compiled by Mr. Kenna, the solicitor of the Santa Fe Railroad. He has put in here some quotations from my examination of Mr. Adams. Here is a question that Mr. LOUD asked Mr. Adams in the cross-examination:

Mr. LOUD. You have never investigated as to whether the payment at that time—

And that was for 1873—

was adequate, overpayment, or underpayment?

Mr. ADAMS. No, sir.

Mr. LOUD. It has been suggested that it—

The law of 1873—

was simply a neat arrangement of figures prepared at the Post-Office Department at that time somewhat in conformity with primary rates prescribed in 1845—that it was very largely a simple arrangement of figures. You have not investigated that question to determine it in any way?

Mr. ADAMS. No, sir.

Mr. LOUD. You are aware that immediately upon the adoption of the law of 1873 many railroad companies contended that the pay was inadequate and the rule inequitable?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir; that led to postal-car pay.

This, of course, is an error, for the postal-car pay was already in existence, having been established by the act of 1873.

These errors are liable to creep into anyone's testimony.

Mr. LOUD. Do you know whether there was any ground for that contention?

Mr. ADAMS. I had not investigated the condition in 1873 from the point of view of density and pay.

Now, I do not know that you know it, but Professor Adams revised his own testimony. Professor Adams came before the commission and was examined for a whole day by myself. You know, sometimes a judge's opinion is formed by what does not appear in the testimony, as judges are human, just the same as anyone else. Not that I am a judge, but I use the simile for convenience; and there are some things which occurred outside of the testimony here that I think tended to form our judgment. I am free to say to-day that I think the commission did not treat Professor Adams in the manner in which they should have treated him.

While I was in charge of the commission, which was at times with Mr. MOODY, Mr. FLEMING, Senator Faulkner, and Senator CHANDLER, and sometimes others, we closed the doors whenever we saw fit in taking testimony. When Senator WOLCOTT took charge of the commission in Chicago, the doors were opened, and everything that was testified to became public. We called Professor Adams in to advise with us, and not as a witness. He should have advised and consulted with us in secret, just the same as the commission consulted with one another. But his first testimony was given publicity. The wisdom of the commission determined that that was the best thing to do, that the whole country ought

to know what was transpiring. I am not as sensitive on this point as some people are, but his testimony was given in public and became public property, and it could not be withdrawn.

Now, I did not complete my examination of Professor Adams. I think I am betraying no confidence when I say that Professor Adams surrendered, and did not desire the examination continued further. He asked permission to withdraw that and certain other testimony, to which action the gentleman from Georgia—and I think very properly, too—objected. The testimony had been given in public, and it should have been printed, and it was suggested that he should have an opportunity to revise it, which opportunity we all take advantage of here in the House of Representatives. But the same difficulty occurred in Professor Adams's revision that occurs here once in a while.

A member of Congress takes his remarks home and revises them, and, as an illustration, sometimes where I have asked a question he takes his answer out, leaving us high and dry; that is, it would appear that I was asking about something that never occurred, and that is the trouble about Professor Adams's revision. He changed his answers in such a manner that had the answer been given originally to the commission as his revision shows it it would have provoked another question; and in some instances he struck the answer out and left me high and dry. I could not read it after it was revised. My clerk, who was the stenographer of the commission, could not read it. It was substantially obliterated and rewritten, and we could not determine what the original testimony was. I would not submit to have his revision appear to the country, leaving me suspended all along the line; and we did the only thing we could do, we went back to the stenographer's notes, and from his notes his testimony was printed.

Now, then, Professor Adams said, "Yes; that led to postal-car pay," let us see what his answer was after he had time to meditate and revise:

Mr. LOUD. You are aware that immediately upon the adoption of the law of 1873 many railway companies contended that the pay was inadequate and the rule inequitable?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOUD. Do you know whether there was any ground for that contention?

Mr. ADAMS. I have not investigated the conditions in 1873 from the point of view of density and pay. I have confined my investigations to the conditions of 1898. I have been inclined to accept the judgment of Mr. Bangs upon that point.

Now, when he had time to deliberate he was inclined to accept the judgment of Mr. Bangs, a man well known in the postal service during his life, having left a name honored after he passed away. He preferred to rely on his judgment, but he did not tell you what Mr. Bangs's judgment was, although he prefers to rely upon it. What was Mr. Bangs's judgment?

When this contention arose after the act of 1873 the Senate had a bill before it to increase the railroad mail pay, and Mr. Bangs was then the general superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, and he said:

In justice and equity the compensation for railway post-office cars should be increased about 50 per cent above what it is now.

Evidently Professor Adams had not read Mr. Bangs; or, if so, he had not read him with care.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I ask that the gentleman from California be permitted to conclude his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. May I ask the gentleman from California a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly; if it relates to this matter.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. From what did you read the testimony of Mr. Bangs?

Mr. LOUD. This testimony, from which I will read, is to be found in the Postmaster-General's Report for 1874, page 26.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. You have no idea, have you, that that is the testimony to which Mr. Adams referred when he said that he relied upon the judgment of Mr. Bangs?

Mr. LOUD. What did he refer to?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. You have no idea that it was that?

Mr. LOUD. I have; and I think and know it is what he referred to. I know that is what he held all the time; a careful examination of his testimony will show it. He maintained that Mr. Bangs held that the railroad companies were adequately paid in 1873 and 1874. And I know that men more familiar with the service than Professor Adams have so held for years as an absolute fact; and it shows how men can misunderstand what is written in plain English, because they never read it.

Now, Mr. Bangs held—

That the law of March, 1873, allows adequate compensation to the railroads for the transportation of mail in the ordinary manner (that is, the old way).

That the compensation for the additional space required by railway post-offices under the present rates of compensation for postal cars upon lines which are furnishing the space asked for and required by the Department is inadequate. * * *

That the mail service as performed by the railroad companies should be confined to the transportation of the same upon cars, and the necessary handling of the same at the depots, and should not in any way include what is known as mail messenger, lateral, or side service.

Mr. Creswell, then Postmaster-General, in transmitting this to the Senate said:

The conclusion to which Mr. Bangs arrives is, that in no event should the Government do more in the way of increasing compensation than to add 50 per cent to the rates now established for the use of postal cars and relieve railroad companies from the obligations to convey the mails from their several way stations to post-offices within 80 rods thereof, as now required by the regulations of the Department.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. In what year was that statement made?

Mr. LOUD. In 1874.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman can hear me, can he not?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. You are making a speech which everybody ought to hear.

Mr. LOUD. Now, I want to refer to something that Professor Adams was never able to discover—that Mr. Bangs, whose judgment as expressed in his report of 1874 he is inclined to rely upon—this occurred in 1873—immediately upon the adoption of that rate, held that the railroads should be paid 50 per cent more for car space; and the rate for car space, $25 per mile per annum for a 40-foot car—I can not carry the whole schedule in my mind—I have it here—but it runs up to $50 for a 60-foot car.

And he said further, that they should be relieved from this lateral or side service. Now, when I asked Professor Adams if he knew what this side or lateral service cost he said no; that he had never investigated it.

Mr. McCLEARY. The side service is the delivery of the mail to the post-offices within 80 rods.

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Professor Adams, as I have suggested, has concentrated his whole mind upon ton mileage and density. Now, the density of any traffic should tend to cheapen the transportation. That is a rule well known to all railroad men. But in order that this consideration may operate the conditions must necessarily be such as will permit the railroad companies to avail themselves of density.

The gentleman from Massachusetts yesterday told you that freight rates had been reduced 41 per cent, mail rates 39 per cent, and passenger rates 21 per cent, I think; that the increase of mail had been nearly double the increase of freight business on the basis of percentage. Professor Adams assumed that because the mail had been increased in a greater degree than freight, hence the railroads ought to stand a relative reduction in pay for transportation. That was a fundamental idea in his mind, that and ton mileage, and, in my opinion, he never got away from them.

Now, the railroad company is enabled to furnish cheaper transportation by reason of density, from many causes. One, of course, because they run more trains; but the principal reason why freight rates have been reduced is because the railroad companies have been enabled to avail themselves of the rule which properly applies with respect to density. In 1880 a 25-ton car would not transport more than 20 tons of live weight. To-day a 30,000-pound car is transporting with ease 60,000 and, in some instances, 100,000 pounds of live freight, they having been able to greatly reduce the amount of dead load to paying load.

Now, that rule does not apply to passengers, and it does not apply to mail. It is true that passenger rates have decreased; but there is not a man in the world—no, I will not say in the world—but there is not a man in the United States—the passenger rates in Europe being higher than here—there is not a man in the United States who knows anything about the railroad question who will assume that the passenger business, as a whole, is profitable to the railroad companies. I will show the reason. Let us take the passenger traffic and see what advantages the railroad companies have been able to take of density.

In 1880 the volume of traffic was in round numbers 5,000,000,000 passengers carried 1 mile. In 1890 the number of passengers carried 1 mile was 11,000,000,000, and in 1899 14,000,000,000. The average number of passengers in a train in 1880 was 41.5; the average number in 1890 was 41.4; the average number in 1899 was 41.2. Hence you see here the rule of density or concentration does not apply. In the carriage of freight the railroad companies, by reason of advanced knowledge and experience, are able to transport 2 or 3 tons of live weight to 1 ton of dead weight. But the passenger to-day is taking more space in the passenger car than he did in 1880, and exactly that same condition prevails in the carriage of mail. We are demanding year by year more dead weight and more space to the live pound of mail matter than before.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to read in this connection a little dialogue which occurred between myself and Professor Adams, and I wish to say in this connection that I learned to love and admire him. After his examination he came up and stayed with me all day Sunday—the Sabbath day——

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. If the gentleman will allow me to suggest, I hope he will not come up loving me. [Laughter.] I have had a superabundance of that kind of affection. I want to get at practical matters.

Mr. LOUD. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that I can love a man in the House of Representatives and still object to his bill or his scheme if I think it is not right.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. You do not mean to suggest that the amendment I have offered is a steal, do you?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, no; not by any means.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. It may be that the professor called on the gentleman from California to get him to go to church. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOUD. Oh, no; but on a very much more serious matter than that.

Professor Adams is a statistician. He makes his living in that manner, and he has a reputation, permit me to say, which he must sustain and to which, undoubtedly, he has a good right.

Now, so far as the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is concerned—and I do not see the gentleman from Illinois here who has made the point of order against it—I mean "the MANN from Chicago"—I want to say that I hope he will not insist upon that point of order. The commission has devoted two and a half years of investigation to this matter; and I believe I am warranted in saying that this is the only opportunity the House will have to vote upon it. All of the legislation that has been enacted heretofore upon this subject has been ingrafted upon the various appropriation bills. If I were a railroad man myself, I should beg the House to dispose of the question now once and for all time, to settle the matter without further controversy. We are in a serene frame of mind. We are not hurried. Some are retiring to private life at the end of this session. Others, two years away from election, feel strong in our faith.

Now, the House can take up this matter in a calm and judicial spirit and dispose of it upon its merits. This is the time. There may never come another opportunity. It is our duty to act intelligently and wisely upon it. The Post-Office Committee has not reported a bill reducing the railway mail pay, because they do not believe it to be right to do so. But the House can determine that matter for itself. There are men here who think that railroad mail pay should be reduced. Let them and let all others have an opportunity of expressing their sentiment by a vote. They should have the opportunity here and now after this two and a half years of investigation, to record their will by their votes and settle once and for all this question. And I say again it is but fair, it is but right, it is but just to the House, after the discussion that has taken place and that will take place, that we should be permitted to dispose of the question on its merits. I have faith in the judgment of this body. I have faith that the House will act wisely and for the best interests of all of the people without fear or without prejudice.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Why should we vote now upon this matter and determine it now, when the gentleman says himself that the work of the commission is not completed?

Mr. LOUD. It is completed as far as this commission can ever go.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. But you say they have not completed the work?

Mr. LOUD. I say that there should be a further investigation. The commission itself is dead. That is the point I was making; and we can not even say "Long live the commission."

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Then why not ask the appointment of another commission?

Mr. LOUD (continuing). Senator WOLCOTT retires from the Senate, Senator CHANDLER retires——

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. But there are other Senators who can take their places.

Mr. LOUD. Oh, yes; but this House is confronted with the question now. It is well understood by the members present. It could be determined, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], by another commission or by other men appointed for that purpose. I say let the House act upon it now. I believe for my own part that Professor Adams could determine the matter. I think he is a fair, honest man, and I would be willing to trust him in his conclusions if he would be willing to undertake to investigate the matter. But of course I know he would have to be paid for that. We could not expect him to give this subject the consideration and attention, without pay, that the members of this commission have given to it. I, for my own part, would not do the work again—if I charged a single cent for it—for less than $25,000. My wife has said to me over and over again: "Oh, you are figuring, figuring, figuring, from early morning until late at night. Will you never cease to work?"

Mr. Chairman, it has been a laborious work. I have done more figuring on my own hook—and I am not and do not pretend to be an expert, either—than I ever expected to do on any subject connected with my Congressional career. I have not been paid for it; but before recording my vote I want to know whether I have marked out a plain pathway which I could ask my associates on this floor to follow.

Now, just by way of relief to myself, here is a little controversy between Professor Adams and myself:

Mr. LOUD. You submit four questions (in your second formal statement) which you deem should be asked of the Post-Office Department regarding the economy of space in postal cars. Did you make any direct inquiries to familiarize yourself with the circulation system of the United States mails by means of the traveling post-office lines?

Mr. ADAMS. Did I make any investigation personally, do you mean?

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. I have investigated this question no further than appears in the testimony presented to the commission in the reports of the Postmaster-General. I think I got my impression very largely from the testimony of Mr. Bradley.

Mr. LOUD. Do you think those subjects should be investigated?

Mr. ADAMS. I should want to investigate them before I came to a final conclusion upon the subject.

Mr. LOUD. That is one thing I will say, Professor, that has rather mixed me up on this whole matter—that you have made recommendations that we should make certain investigations, and yet you have recommended a reduction of mail pay. I wanted to know how necessary you thought this line of investigation was.

Mr. Adams then makes a reply to that, which is quite long and not pertinent.

Mr. LOUD. Still subsequent investigation might entirely change your conclusions; that is, such is possible, is it not?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir; I admit that. I admit that if it be proved that it is not possible to introduce any greater economies in the Railway Mail Service than now exist my conclusions are false.

Yet, without a particle more of testimony before him, he went to his home, in the quiet and sanctity of it, without any further testimony or investigation, and reiterated the recommendations he had made to this commission, and that is what I blame him for. There are lots of things about this matter that do not appear in the testimony, which, if the gentleman only knew them, would make the subject as clear to him as the noonday sun.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I am waiting for light.

Mr. LOUD. Well, life is too short. It would take me two days to tell the whole story, and I propose, as far as possible, to confine myself to the testimony.

Mr. CATCHINGS then asked Professor Adams:

Mr. CATCHINGS. All of them?

Mr. ADAMS. My chief conclusion as to reduction of pay.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Your recommendation of a reduction of pay you would not make if that should be true?

Mr. ADAMS. Let me put it in this way: I would say that if it is not possible to introduce greater economy in the Railway Mail Service, then the Railway Mail Service is not under the law of transportation that says that economy follows density of traffic; and that being the case, my recommendation that there should be further reduction as density of traffic increases would not apply. For example, I have proposed a reduction of 12 per cent on the most dense routes and of 1 per cent upon the routes that receive 60 cents per ton per mile. If you can not introduce economies as you increase the density of traffic, then that recommendation is unjust.

Why, there was not a Railway Mail Service man in the country but knew that greater economies could not be introduced. I am afraid Professor Adams has not discovered it yet. Let me say again that Professor Adams rendered great service. He told us what the ton mileage was. He is a statistician whom everybody will believe; yet a friend of mine, poor, unknown, modest, a gentleman by the name of Bradley, superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, stationed at New York, receiving a salary of $2,500 a year, told me what the ton mileage was more than a year before Professor Adams worked it out with his large corps of assistants.

And Mr. Bradley never got paid a cent for it. Let me say to-day of that gentleman that he is the superior of any man in this country or the world, statistically and practically, as regards this question of railway mail pay, and he knows more about it in a minute than all the witnesses who were called during the two years and a half of our sessions.

Mr. Kruttschnitt, general manager of the Southern Pacific Company, also gave it months before Adams, yet I am glad Adams gave it, because everyone will credit his figures on account of his eminent reputation, while they might not credit Kruttschnitt's, because he is a railroad man, or Mr. Bradley's, because he has not yet attained the reputation he deserves.

Mr. McCLEARY. You refer to Mr. Bradley?

Mr. LOUD. I refer to Mr. V. J. Bradley, superintendent of the Railway Mail Service in New York, to whom I am indebted for what little I know about this subject myself, with what little industry I have displayed since I came in contact with the question.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Was this gentleman before the commission?

Mr. LOUD. Yes; this gentleman was before the commission, and I was struck by what my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] said. When Mr. MOODY went home to Massachusetts preceding the holidays he was about determined to join Mr. FLEMING in his report. When he came back he came to my rooms and said: "Mr. LOUD, I never realized the force and strength of Mr. Bradley's testimony until I got down home and read it over." He had heard it, he had read it before, but he took up my examination of Mr. Adams and Mr. Bradley and read them again, and he said the question was as plain to him as day.

Again, I asked Mr Adams a question. It is on page 417 of the printed testimony. I will not repeat the whole question; but Mr. Adams said:

Will you give that alternative conclusion again?

That was part of the question I asked him, which I here repeat.

Mr. ADAMS. Will you give that alternative conclusion again?

Mr. LOUD. Might there not be an alternative conclusion, that the facilities required and obtained by the Post-Office Department are essential for the prompt and expeditious sorting of the mail in transit, and that the contrary opinion is only developed by too intense concentration of attention upon the mere fact of ton-mileage?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, that is certainly possible. If that be true, then, of course, I am wrong. I regret an apparent contradiction between recommending a reduction of rates and recommending further investigation. I am conscious of that, although a strict reading of the report, I think, excuses me from any inconsistency.

* * * * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. But you reduce first and investigate afterwards?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. You state the argument both ways, but you let your recommendation stand irrespective of this argument you make against any change.

Mr. ADAMS. Still there is an apparent inconsistency there in recommending a further investigation, because my recommendation does include all routes. I am perfectly willing—

Now listen—

I am perfectly willing, if the commission thinks clearly to adopt either dilemma to bringing this report to a conclusion, to drop from my report the recommendation of reduction of pay and retain the recommendation for further investigation.

Mr. LOUD. I will call your attention to one other thing there before I forget it. I think, on carefully reading the report, and I will say that I have read it at least twenty times, on page 107——

Mr. CATCHINGS here interrupted with a question.

Mr. LOUD. On page 234 you express the conviction that all routes which carry 30,000 pounds of mail per mile per day can not justly claim underpayment and that probably the more dense routes are overpaid. How is that, having reached this conclusion in regard to 30,000 pounds being the dividing line, you apply the 5 per cent reduction to all mail routes, and apply the supplementary reduction to all routes carrying over 5,000 pounds and not 30,000? That is along the line of the question that preceded it.

Mr. ADAMS. There is possibly again an inconsistency. The justification of it is that you get such a large percentage of your mail over 30,000 pounds.

Mr. LOUD. Still, if it is not overpaid, it should not be reduced, should it, Professor? That is, I assume the commission is not going upon the assumption that mail pay must be reduced, whether overpaid or underpaid?

Mr. CHANDLER. You say a large portion of the traffic would not be reduced?

The CHAIRMAN. I think we ought to have that question answered.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wanted to understand the meaning of his last answer, that is all.

Mr. ADAMS. I have not investigated the effect of a 5 per cent reduction on the small routes—those that receive in excess of 60 cents per ton per mile.

Mr. LOUD. And as a matter of fact, it might be all eaten up by mail-messenger service, might it not?

Mr. ADAMS. Possibly; yes, sir. I have not investigated that.

Now there is where I find fault with Professor Adams. Theoretically, he knows as much about this question as any man in the world, but practically, he knows nothing about it. When I asked him the probable load of an express car, he said he did not know. When I asked him what was the average load of a mail car, he said he did not know. When I asked him what was the probable load, he said he did not know. He said that he had looked those cars over, and from the size of them he thought that they ought to be able to carry 4 or 5 tons.

I have spent more time upon this part of it than I intended to spend.

Mr. GAINES. Will my friend from California yield to me now?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. You were speaking in very high eulogy of the very distinguished senior Senator from Iowa, which I indorsed; but I want to ask you if Senator ALLISON and his associate, I believe Mr. CHANDLER, upon your committee did not report against this mail subsidy that is pending before the House?

Mr. LOUD. I will state that Senator WOLCOTT, Senator ALLISON, and three of the House members reported against the special facilities.

Mr. GAINES. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] is for it.

Mr. GAINES. He agrees to everything else except that.

Mr. LOUD (continuing). And Senator CHANDLER.

Mr. GAINES. That report is to be found on page 21 of the report filed in this matter, signed by Senator WOLCOTT and Senator ALLISON.

Mr. LOUD. Now, I have not time, and neither is the House disposed to listen, I think, to all we found in our investigation in foreign countries. It is true we found but little, yet enough to make a comparison; and I will, with the permission of the House, add to my remarks some portions of the report on foreign service that I think are pertinent. Mr. Bradley accompanied me to Europe. Of course, France, as an illustration, pays nothing for the transmission of mail. That is, there is a contract between the railroad companies, or an agreement, by which they are to transport one car on each train for nothing. If an additional car is put on the train, then they pay for it. We found that wherever they do pay for the service they pay a higher rate than is paid in this country.

Now, France does not pay her railroad companies anything for carrying the mail except for extra service, but the Government guarantees the railroads a net income above all their operating expenses, interest on their bonds, etc., a net income of 3 per cent, which I understand costs the French Government sixty to seventy and sometimes ninety millions of francs a year. The German service is substantially the same way, only Germany owns the railroads. We were enabled to get some information there because there is a contention between the railway management and the postal department. The railway management was demanding that the postal department should pay them for the transportation of the mail, and we found from certain deductions that, if we took the figures of the railway management, they were paying more for the service than was being paid in this country.

In England we found where they paid for the service they paid much higher than they do in this country.

Take as an illustration: It was said that when the special foreign mail was transported in bulk from London to Dover or London to Queensboro if the amount was over half a ton, the post-office department considered 1 shilling per 112 pounds an adequate rate, and would arrange the payment, if possible, on that basis. One shilling for 112 pounds would be equal to about 22.3 cents per hundred pounds, or $4.46 per ton. The rate for special mails over these two routes would therefore be as follows: London to Dover, 76 miles, 5.87 cents per ton per mile; London to Queensboro, 51 miles, 6.74 cents per ton per mile.

Contrasting these rates with the rate per ton per mile in the United States, viz, 5.8 cents, it will be observed that the United States rate is at least equal to the Dover rate and is very much exceeded in the Queensboro case.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from California repeat what he said about the French Government guaranteeing 3 per cent to the railroads?

Mr. LOUD. That is substantially what I said; they do guarantee to the railroads 3 per cent net income on the investment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In this country is it not a fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has construed the law to be that railroads can charge such tariff as will yield a net income on their investment, and any rates fixed by a State legislature or the National Legislature which would not permit of an income of that kind would be unlawful; in other words, we, in effect, guarantee that sort of an investment, because we prevent any State or National Legislature from fixing any rates which shall destroy that income on the investment?

Mr. LOUD. I think the gentleman misapprehends the situation. The United States Government does not guarantee anything to a railroad. In the fixing of rates, it is true, the courts have held that you can not fix a rate with which a railroad company can not make an adequate return on its investment, but in France the Government guarantees and does pay millions of francs annually to eradicate a deficit and guarantee 3 per cent profit; and this, I suppose, is in return for service performed. If the railroad is conducting business at a loss, then at the end of the year the railroad comes to the French Government and gets the balance to make up the 3 per cent on its investment.

Now, I shall print with my remarks a statement in relation to the Australian service, which clearly shows to my mind that Australia pays for similar service a much higher rate than is paid in the United States, and they do not get as good service anywhere. We have, permit me to say, without fear of successful contradiction, the best and cheapest railway mail service in the world, and passenger service, too. If gentlemen do not think so, let them go to Europe and travel in those boxes over there, where they will charge you at the rate of 8 or 10 pfennigs per mile.

We found in regard to the English postal service as follows. I quote from my report to the commission, as shown on page 870, part 1, of the testimony:

The total annual pay to the railway companies for transporting the mails, including the parcels post, was therefore $8,839,510.

Taking this on a basis of 20,000 miles length of route, the ordinary pay was $265 a mile, the parcels-post pay was $176 a mile, and the total pay was $441 a mile of route per annum.

Comparing this with the United States returns, we find that on June 30, 1898, the aggregate length of railway mail routes was 174,777 miles and the annual rate of expenditure was $34,706,847.56 (for transportation, $30,786,375.89, and for postal cars $3,917,471.67), and therefore that the cost of the Railway Mail Service in the United States per mile of route per annum was $198.56, which is about 45 per cent of the rate prevailing in the United Kingdom.

And the following comparisons regarding weight of mail in the United States and the United Kingdom:

Contrasting the weight of mail matter posted in the United States in the course of one fiscal year, 334,935 tons, with the weight of matter posted in the United Kingdom during the year, 183,530 tons, we find that postal matter in the United States is about 87 per cent greater than the amount for the United Kingdom. If we assume that about the same proportion of mail matter is carried on the railways of both countries, it seems evident that the railways of the United States carry considerably more weight for the compensation they receive than do the railways of Great Britain and Ireland; and the average length of the haul must naturally be much greater here than there, because of the greater distances to be traversed.

Or to sum up as follows:

Total pay:	
United Kingdom, per mile per annum	$441.00
United States, per mile per annum	$198.56
Number of postal cars:	
United Kingdom (average length, 33.44 feet)	235
United States (average length, 50 feet)	881
Mail apartments (average length about 20 feet) United States	2,635
Or a total in the United States of 3,516 cars.	
Postal-car space:	
United Kingdom (linear feet)	7,858
United States (linear feet)	96,750
Number of railway postal clerks:	
United Kingdom	683
United States	7,281
Weight of mail:	
United Kingdom tons	183,530
United States tons	344,935

These computations are made for the year 1898.

In regard to the German postal service, I will say that the Government owning the railways, no charge is made for the service, but the railway managers have contended for some years that payment or credit should be made, they placing the net cost of such service at 24,149,685 marks in Prussia and Hesse, from which we have made the following computation, to be found on page 885, part 1, of the testimony:

The railways of Prussia and Hesse are about two-thirds of the total length of railways in the German Empire. If the railway administration is right that it costs $7,741,184 to transport the mails in those States, it would be fair to assume that the total cost to the railway administration of transporting the postal cars and mails in the entire Empire would be about $11,611,776, or about $428 per mile of route, as compared with $198 per mile of route in the United States, where the Post-Office Department does not provide the postal cars nor perform all of the side messenger service and porterage. One might allow for much exaggeration in the calculation of the imperial railway administration and yet draw the conclusion that the cost per mile of route in Germany considerably exceeds the same cost in the United States.

If we also regard this estimated cost of performing the entire service—$11,611,776—in comparison with the annual mileage of railway mail trains—110,456,656—we find that the cost of the service per running mile was about 10.5 cents. The cost of the Railway Mail Service per running mile in the United States for the year 1898 was 10.93 cents.

I also beg to submit a letter from Mr. V. J. Bradley, superintendent Railway Mail Service, New York, in relation to the post-office system of Victoria, Australia:

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE, OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT,
New York, N. Y., July 23, 1900.

DEAR MR. LOUD: One or two interesting points of information have come to me since I saw you, and I thought you might like to know of them.

I had a call about a week ago from the superintendent of the traveling post-office system of Victoria, Australia. In the course of conversation he told me that the provincial government of Victoria operates the railroads as well as the postal system, and the post-office department makes payments to the railway administration as follows:

First, payment is made for the establishment of mail service, this representing £6 ($30) per mile per year for less than daily service; £9 ($45) for daily service; and £12 ($60) for more than daily service.

In addition to this, they pay 8 pence (16 cents) a running mile for postal-car service; and 4 pence (8 cents) per running mile for apartment-car service.

There is no special payment for closed mails carried, this being included in the original payment of £6, £9, or £12.

The postal cars used are about 40 feet in length, and the mail apartments about half that length.

The railway administration builds the cars, and the Post-Office Department furnishes the fittings and furniture.

They have very few lines on which more than 1 clerk is employed, and consequently the weights carried are light.

If our short railway lines, having apartment-car service, were paid for at this rate, our railway companies would be getting a good deal more money than they are under the present United States rates.

I have also received some information regarding the commutation business.

I have a statement from the Erie company that in local commutation business they average 60 passengers to the car, and the rate per passenger per mile is 5.16 mills, thus making the earnings per car mile amount to 30.96 cents. The average of 60 passengers to the car seems to me pretty high, but I give it to you as I get it.

On the Pennsylvania road I find that the suburban trains out of Philadelphia average 33 passengers to the car. I handed to you a tabulated statement which showed that the average earnings per passenger per mile from the commutation business on the Pennsylvania Railroad was 1.222 cents. You will therefore see that the earnings per car mile for local commutation passenger business on the Pennsylvania Railroad would naturally be 40.326 cents.

Very truly, yours,

V. J. BRADLEY, *Superintendent.*

Hon. E. F. LOUD,
San Francisco, Cal.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question.

Mr. LOUD. Very well.

Mr. MANN. I want to ask in reference to the rates of postage on second-class matter. The report of the commission, on page 43, states that the Government transported for the year ending June 30, 1899, 414,944,926 pounds of second-class matter. The commission also reports that the average cost of transportation per miles is 2¾ cents per pound, which would make for 415,000,000 pounds of second-class matter $11,420,000. On page 44 of the report they estimate that the Government pays for the transportation of second-class matter $20,749,000 and some odd dollars. As I understand, the 414,000,000 pounds does not include equipment?

Mr. LOUD. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Was it the opinion of the commission, then, that the difference, which is over $9,300,000, between the 2¾ cents a pound for the $415,000,000 and the $20,749,000 actually paid was for equipment?

Mr. LOUD. Yes. I will say in a general way that I have knowledge of these figures—although my colleague [Mr. MOODY] made the report, which I have not read for some time—and perhaps it is unfortunate that reference was made there; but he is only discussing the weight of the mail, and necessarily had to have his receipts balance with the weight, and he could not include the equipment, though the equipment weighs as much as the mail.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think if the second-class matter was eliminated from the mail that would eliminate that proportion of the equipment? In other words, is it now necessary to have such a large share of the equipment, such as mail bags, whether they contain second-class matter or not?

Mr. LOUD. I should say in the equipment in a car that of the pouches that hang around it probably three-quarters of them are made necessary from the fact that we have second, third, and fourth class matter, but mostly second-class matter.

Mr. MANN. I am asking these questions for information, not for the purpose of criticism. Are not most of the sacks used exclusively for second-class matter—light sacks, not the heavy leather sacks used for carrying letters?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, we are not using leather sacks any more. The sacks are all of the same kind. There may be here and there a leather sack remaining, but there has been none made for years.

Mr. MANN. Now, does the gentleman think that if second-class matter were removed from the mails, reducing, as the gentleman suggests, the amount that would be paid to the railroad companies—$20,000,000 a year—the railroad companies would then be paid as much as they ought to receive?

Mr. LOUD. I think so, because the less the railroad companies carry in weight the more they get per pound. It is a flexible rule, which, after long investigation, I believe is fair. When I first looked at the question it seemed to me the most cumbersome system that ever was adopted. Yet since examining the subject I have often wondered at the knowledge which must necessarily have been in the possession of the man who first introduced that system of computation, and I have felt that he must have had knowledge away beyond his time. It was a most admirable law for the Government. The more the railroad company carries the less it gets per pound; and if you will take off the second-class matter, which is substantially two-thirds of the mail, you will bring up the rate per pound on the amount remaining. But I believe that if second-class matter were eliminated from the mails, there need not be used necessarily in the whole United States more than 50 full railway postal cars.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will pardon one more question. I understood him to say that if second-class matter were eliminated from the mails there would be an increase of the rate of pay received by the railroad companies.

Mr. LOUD. The rate per pound.

Mr. MANN. So that the elimination of the second-class mail matter would not result in a reduction of $20,000,000 in the amount paid to the railroad companies. Is there any way of ascertaining just how much——

Mr. LOUD. Accurately, no—no more than there is a rule that will determine when the gentleman will die. This matter can not be demonstrated accurately. There is not a man in the world who can tell just how much it costs to operate any train, any car, or any service. Let me tell you of an experience in this matter, I do not know whether it will be interesting, but I had a kind of idea when I started in upon this investigation (because I had been a business man and I knew or thought I knew what every part of my business was costing me), I had an idea that a railroad company, with the expert assistance at its command, ought to know what each part of its service was costing. The commission had been floundering along for nearly a year when we got to Chicago, and there we had upon the stand a Mr. Kirkman—I think that was his name—of the Chicago and Northwestern road, who has written some thirty-odd works on railroad subjects——

Mr. MANN. He has also written novels.

Mr. LOUD. A man who has forgotten more in a minute, probably, than I ever shall know upon railroad matters. Other members of the commission had examined him, and the examination seemed to me to fall upon him like water on a duck's back. I said to myself, "Let LOUD get hold of him for a little while and he will fix him." I said, "Mr. Kirkman, how much does a certain train cost?" He replied substantially—I do not think the testimony is so recorded, but he replied substantially—"The man who assumes to know what any portion of railway service costs is a fool."

My vanity was shocked, if nothing else. I thought he was a fool; and I held the idea for some time that he was either a fool or was defying the commission. But it did not take me long after that, however, to discover that he was right in that statement. Anyone can readily see that where there are 100 trains run over a track one can not tell how much any particular car wears the track or just how much there should be charged against this or that train for the station agent's salary, or how much as interest on money invested or how much for wear of road bed and track and for betterment of track and of stations. To solve such a problem is apparently impossible, and anybody, when he realizes what the problem is, can see it. The only way we can treat this matter so as to arrive anywhere near an intelligent conclusion is to make comparisons with earnings of other service.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands that I have no desire to criticise him; that I fully agree with him on the subject of second-class matter. But he has made a report as a member of the postal commission, a sort of confession of faith. In that report he says that by the elimination of second-class matter we would reduce the amount paid for transportation over $20,000,000 per year.

Mr. LOUD. Does the gentleman want to know how we get at this calculation?

Mr. MANN. I would like to know if these figures were furnished by the "eminent statistician" to whom reference has been made?

Mr. LOUD. No; the word "about" should have been used. It was merely an approximation. I do not think we put it absolutely at that sum, but suggest that that would be "somewhere in the neighborhood of the amount."

Mr. MANN. He does not say absolutely that this is the percentage basis on which to make the calculation. In other words, that such a percentage is not absolutely accurate.

Mr. LOUD. No; not at all. In my own suggestion in reference to the matter I have used two-thirds as the amount of the second-class matter.

Mr. MANN. It is exactly 58 per cent.

Mr. LOUD. Very well, that does not vary greatly from two-thirds. I have only used two-thirds for convenience of calculation. It is not a great way from 58 per cent. That amount, however, is not absolutely correct, but only approximate. Gentlemen will understand, of course, that it is subject to a variation of 3 or 4 or 5 per cent either way.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. LOUD (continuing). Now, the transportation of the mails on the railroads costs the Government, in round numbers, $40,000,000. Two-thirds of that is $26,000,000—in round numbers—I do not care for the small sum of two or three hundred thousand dollars or even a million dollars. [Laughter.] The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads does not care any more for a few millions of dollars than a professional fighter for a black eye, if that is a proper illustration. [Laughter.]

Now, we said that we found if we eliminated from the mails the second-class mail matter we would effect a saving of this large amount—some $26,000,000—to the postal service. But in order to make it safe, and in view of the increase on the mail left to be taken on these railway post-office cars, we have made the computation on a basis that I believe to be correct. I am sure in my own mind that it will amount to more than $20,000,000; but in order to be absolutely safe, and reasoning from this standpoint, we call it $20,000,000, because the increase could not be more than $6,000,000 by reason of the reduction of weight, causing a certain increase in rate per pound for amount remaining.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman willing to assume, or does he assume, what proportion of the floor space used on the postal cars could be done away with if the second-class mail matter were eliminated entirely?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I care to enter into the field of prophecy. If there is a reduction of two-thirds of the mail by the removal of the second-class mail matter, there is no reason to assume that there would not be at least a two-thirds reduction of the floor space, and probably more.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think we could do away with two-thirds of the floor space by making this change?

Mr. LOUD. I think so.

Mr. MANN. And with how many cars—say one-half the number?

Mr. LOUD. I do not doubt it. If the gentleman is familiar with the Railway Mail Service——

Mr. MANN. I have been in the Railway Mail Service myself.

Mr. LOUD. Then, of course, the gentleman is familiar with the disposition of the space in the cars used for mail purposes. He knows that they may take one-third of the car at one end for letter distribution, while the rest of the car would be entirely unoccupied; that is now used for the distribution of the second, third, and fourth class mail. Letters are distributed, assorted, and handled at the end of the car back of the door. Is that not true?

Mr. MANN. On many cars that is the arrangement. My judgment would be that the ordinary car for the ordinary service—I mean the ordinary mail car, if it were used—would not reduce the floor space to such an extent as the gentleman imagines.

Mr. LOUD. I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I have run up against a railway mail expert, in endeavoring to make this explanation. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I make no such claim, Mr. Chairman. I am not by any means an expert.

Mr. LOUD. Well, the gentleman has had practical experience, which is refreshing.

Mr. MANN. But I am not a practical expert.

Mr. LOUD. Of course the gentleman must have obtained some experience when he was a poor man and working for Uncle Sam at a salary "of a thousand a year." [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. And the same condition prevails now. He is still a poor man and still working for Uncle Sam. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that the mail pouches are hung up on racks all around the car. Now, I assume that if there were no second-class mail matter, these pouches would be unnecessary and that this space could be occupied by other mail matter.

Mr. MANN. Still you would have to make provision for the third and fourth class mail matter.

Mr. LOUD. That is true; but it is insignificant in quantity as compared with the second-class mail matter. It would not average, I imagine, 10 per cent.

Mr. MANN. Yet, still a large amount of it must go through the mails of the United States.

Mr. LOUD. There is no doubt about that. But you abolish the second-class mail matter, if such a thing were possible, and you would find a great difference in a very short time.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman that the carriage of second-class mail matter is at a great loss to the Government.

Mr. LOUD. There is no question about that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I find that I am delaying too long the consideration of these matters. There are a few other questions to which I wish to call the attention of the committee. I want to ask your attention for one moment to an item in connection with the testimony. One Mr. Acker, who is in evidence in connection with this investigation and who has created considerable interest in the United States by reason of his treatment of the matter, has given some testimony.

I admire Acker. He knows what he wants and he goes after it. He wants 1-cent postage. But I was somewhat forcibly struck by a remark that was reported to have been made by a member of the National Board of Trade that recently met here in Washington, when they were discussing these various questions which Congress is dealing with—the subsidy bill, the Nicaragua Canal bill, postal rates, and so forth. He said he thought it was better for the National Board of Trade to act intelligently upon one or two things which it knew something about than to solve questions in an hour or two that Congress had been dealing with, or trying to deal with, intelligently for years.

Now, the National Board of Trade comes down here to Washington and resolves. I have a recollection of a board of trade. Once I wanted to get a little support from it for something I wanted here in Washington, and I spoke to a friend of mine one day, and said if I could get a resolution of the board of trade it would help us here. It was a matter in connection with the construction of a post-office. They wanted it constructed out of marble, and we thought our friends down in Vermont would have the best of it, because we did not have any marble. So I wanted to get a resolution in favor of granite. My friend said, "Why, we can fix that all right; come with me." We went down the street, went into a little back room, and he said to the secretary, "You write out the resolution that Mr. LOUD wants, indorsing granite for this post-office." He did so, and it went; but, unfortunately, a few days afterwards I met my friend again, and he said, "Mr. LOUD, I have got myself into trouble over that resolution. My brother is interested in a marble quarry down here, and I have resoluted in behalf of granite." So, perhaps, with our National Board of Trade.

Mr. Acker has made the statement that the railroad companies are overpaid. He has made many comparisons, and I will refer particularly to what Mr. Acker said regarding commutation passenger rates. That is where he made his final comparisons, and he presented some tables that were phenomenal. If they represented a condition in existence, they were phenomenal, I say; but no such condition existed. That was the difficulty about them practically. Mr. Acker, a good business man, ought to know what the average commutation rates are. When I endeavored to ascertain them I got them in a week. He says he took months in the effort to get them, and he could not find any but the tables to which he referred, which nobody else could find. He says:

> I tried to get published rates from all parts of the United States, but have succeeded thus far in getting but a few, but those are very suggestive.

And they are the ones which he presented. One was between Philadelphia and Atlantic City, in respect to a former rate, no longer in existence. There is a little history about that which Mr. Acker should have known at that time, or should have known much better than I did. The railroad companies running to Atlantic City for a number of years had been giving passes to the hotel men there. That had been the custom in use for a long time. When the West Jersey and Sea Shore Road passed into the hands of the Pennsylvania Railroad, passes were discontinued; but they made a nominal rate to these hotel men. If a man traveled 365 days a year, it was a phenomenally low rate; but they did not travel 365 days a year. That rate ceased to exist a long time ago, years before Mr. Acker presented it to the commission.

No. 2 is between New Orleans and Scranton, a distance of 101 miles, where not a single ticket was sold, notwithstanding this phenomenally low rate. The third is between St. Louis and De Soto, Pacific and Creve Cœur, where but four tickets were sold; so that Mr. Acker's testimony is built entirely on special cases that resulted in the selling during one year of four tickets, amounting in the aggregate to $113. Now, Mr. Acker must have known what the average commutation rates are in this country. They are easily ascertainable, and are about 1 cent per mile where there is any great amount of traffic.

These low rates are offered to induce people to go to certain points and to take annual tickets. No man can travel three hundred and sixty-five days a year. That is the impossibility of it.

It looks cheap, though, to look at it; but you buy one of the tickets, contemplate the number of trips you can make in a year, and you will find your ticket was not so cheap after all. That is why they give the phenomenally low commutation tickets, because they know it is impossible for a man to travel every day in the year, and they have the use of his money in advance for a year, and give him, perhaps, a slight reduction below the ordinary commutation rate, which prevails for thirty days.

Now, I will pass over Mr. Acker, whom Professor Adams dismissed with merely an observation, and take up Professor Adams's Table P, in which he gave, per ton of 2,000 pounds, the rate or mail pay from one point to another, covering many points. The rate of mail per ton from New York to Buffalo, as given, is $31.65; of freight, $7.80; of express, $12.50.

Now, Professor Adams wanted to withdraw that table, because he thought people would compare freight, express, and mail pound for pound, and he thought an injustice might be done the railroad companies; but we examined the manager of the American Express Company on this table, and the Professor could not withdraw it. Now, Table P is not a dangerous table to the railroad companies. I will put in my remarks a table here myself, that I might call Table Q, following Table P, and take the average amount of mail admitted by Professor Adams to be transported in a car, and I will take the low average of freight and express in a car, and that is the only way comparisons can be made.

From New York to Buffalo a car carrying 2 tons of mail would earn $63.30; carrying 3 tons of mail—and that is the maximum and more than the amount carried in a car to Buffalo—it would be $94.95. For freight I have given 12 tons as the loading. Twelve tons of first-class freight would earn $93.60; 8 tons of express—a proper loading, I think—would earn $100; and, finally, the fare of 10 passengers, which is given as the average number in passenger cars, $92.50. Then we will take it from New York to Chicago: Two tons of mail, $142.78; 12 tons of freight, $180; 8 tons of express, $200; 10 passengers, $200. To Union Pacific Transfer: Two tons of mail, $215.34; 12 tons of freight, $352.80; 8 tons of express, $360; 10 passengers, $325; and I assume that for live and dead weight of mail and car they transport more weight for mail than they do on either freight or express.

As suggested, certain deductions should be made upon this table. Professor Adams makes rates for express 63 cents a hundred. They should be $1.16.

I herewith submit Professor Adams's Table P; also some computations made by myself regarding earnings of cars upon the rates submitted in Professor Adams's table. It must be borne in mind, in connection with the table submitted, that Professor Adams's rate of 63 cents per hundred for express from New York to Buffalo is incorrect, hence all of his rates regarding express must be correspondingly wrong. But I have made my comparisons upon the rate he submitted.

TABLE P.—*Showing rates received by railways per ton and per hundredweight for the transportation of mail, first-class freight, and express, from and to the points named below via the routes indicated.*

From—	To—	Via—	Per ton of 2,000 pounds.			Per hundredweight.		
			Mail.	Freight.	Express.	Mail.	Freight.	Express.
New York	Buffalo	New York Central	$31.65	$7.80	$12.50	$1.58	$0.39	$0.63
	Chicago	New York Central and Lake Shore	71.39	15.00	25.00	3.57	.75	1.25
	Burlington, Iowa	New York Central, Lake Shore and Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.	87.26			4.36		
	Union Pacific Transfer	do	107.67	29.40	45.00	5.38	1.47	2.25
	Ogden	New York Central, Lake Shore, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, and Union Pacific.	192.85	75.40	105.00	9.64	3.77	5.25
	San Francisco	New York Central, Lake Shore, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, Union Pacific, and Southern Pacific.	265.63	60.00	135.00	13.28	3.00	6.75
	Philadelphia	Pennsylvania R. R	6.57	4.40	7.50	.33	.22	.38
	Pittsburg	do	33.25	7.80	15.00	1.66	.39	.75
	Columbus	Pennsylvania R. R. and Pennsylvania Co	49.71	11.80	20.00	2.49	.59	1.00
	Indianapolis	do	65.43	14.00	22.50	3.27	.70	1.13
	East St. Louis	do	87.52	17.40	30.00	4.38	.87	1.50
	Bismarck	Pennsylvania R. R., Pennsylvania Co., and Missouri Pacific R. R.	95.08			4.75		
	Texarkana	do	133.56	39.40	55.00	6.68	1.97	2.75
	Washington	Pennsylvania R. R	16.20	7.00	12.50	.81	.35	.63
	Atlanta	Pennsylvania R. R. and Southern Rwy	70.20	25.20	40.00	3.51	1.26	2.00
	New Orleans	Pennsylvania R. R., Southern Rwy., and Western R. R. of Alabama, and Louisville and Nashville R. R.	117.18	23.60	50.00	5.86	1.18	2.50
	Boston	New York and New Haven	17.89	7.60	10.00	.89	.38	.50
	Portland, Me	New York and New Haven and Boston and Maine	26.57	8.00	12.50	1.33	.40	.63
Chicago	Milwaukee	Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul R. R	6.88	5.00	6.00	.34	.25	.30
	Minneapolis	do	36.30	12.00	20.00	1.82	.60	1.00
	New Orleans	Illinois Central Rwy	105.48		42.50	5.27		2.13
	St. Louis	Chicago and Alton R. R	30.79		15.00	1.54		.75
	Denver	Chicago, Burlington and Quincy R. R	75.27	41.00	60.00	3.76	2.05	3.00
	Detroit	Michigan Central R. R	26.79	7.40	12.50	1.34	.37	.63
	Cincinnati	Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Rwy	23.92	8.00	15.00	1.20	.40	.75
	Pittsburg	Pennsylvania Co	41.29	9.00	17.50	2.06	.45	.88
Cincinnati	St. Louis	Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Rwy	32.20	8.00	15.00	1.61	.40	.75
	Chicago	do	23.92	8.00	15.00	1.20	.40	.75
	Cleveland	do	25.26	7.40	12.50	1.26	.37	.63
	Pittsburg	Pennsylvania Co	28.33	5.98	12.50	1.42	.30	.63
	Nashville	Louisville and Nashville R. R	28.24	10.60	27.50	1.41	.53	1.38
	Columbus	Pennsylvania Co	11.87	5.00	7.50	.59	.25	.38
Atlanta	Savannah	Central Rwy. of Georgia	63.38	12.20	17.50	3.17	.61	.88
	New Orleans	Atlantic and Western Pacific and Louisville and Nashville Rwys.	36.98	20.00	27.50	1.35	1.00	1.38
	Memphis	Memphis and Birmingham R. R. and Southern Rwy	72.74	20.00	22.50	3.64	1.00	1.13
	St. Louis	Louisville and Nashville R. R	68.94	27.00	32.50	3.45	1.35	1.63
New York	San Francisco	New York Central to Buffalo; Lake Shore and Michigan Southern to Chicago; Chicago, Burlington and Quincy to Union Pacific Transfer; Union Pacific to Ogden, and Southern Pacific to San Francisco.	254.76	60.00	135.00	12.79	3.00	6.75
	Texarkana	Pennsylvania R. R. to Pittsburg; Pennsylvania Co. to Indianapolis; Terre Haute and Indianapolis Co. to East St. Louis; Missouri Pacific to Texarkana.	125.04	39.40	55.00	6.25	1.97	2.75
	New Orleans	Pennsylvania R. R. to Washington; Southern Rwy. to Atlanta; Atlanta and Westpoint to Westpoint; Western Rwy. of Alabama to Montgomery; Louisville and Nashville to New Orleans.	109.07	23.60	50.00	5.45	1.18	2.50
	Portland	New York and New Haven R. R. to Boston; Boston and Maine R. R. to Portland.	26.50	8.00	12.50	1.33	.40	.63

Freight rate to Omaha:	
Eliminating effect of 276.22 miles land grant, mail, per ton	$112.38
Eliminating effect of 1,029.45 miles aided, mail, per ton, New York to Ogden	218.82
Eliminating effect of 742.61 miles aided, mail, per ton, New York to San Francisco	307.37
Freight and express rates to St. Louis:	
Eliminating effect of 324 miles land grant, mail, per ton, New York to Texarkana	140.70
Eliminating effect of 118.83 miles land grant, mail, per ton, New York to New Orleans	120.97
Freight and express rates to St. Paul: Eliminating effect of 364.80 miles land grant, mail, per ton, Chicago to New Orleans	113.43
Express rate, St. Louis to Chicago: Eliminating effect of 276.22 miles land grant, mail, per ton, Chicago to Denver	79.98
Mail rates from Kankakee only, proportionally from Chicago, mail, per ton	29.29
Mail rate to East St. Louis:	
Mail rate to Kankakee only, proportionally to Chicago, mail, per ton	29.29
Eliminating effect of 118.83 miles land grant, mail, per ton, Atlanta to New Orleans	40.77

Earnings of several classes of cars with average loading.

[Results obtained from rates submitted by Professor Adams in Table P, page 237, part 2, of testimony taken before the postal service commission.]

From—	To—	2 tons mail.	3 tons mail.	12 tons freight first class.	8 tons express.	Fare of 10 passengers.
New York	Buffalo	$63.30	$94.95	$93.60	$100.00	$92.50
	Chicago	142.78	214.17	180.00	200.00	200.00
	U. P. Transfer	215.34	323.01	352.80	360.00	325.00
	Ogden	385.70	578.55	904.80	840.00	617.50
	San Francisco	531.26	796.89	720.00	1,080.00	817.50
	Philadelphia	13.14	19.71	52.80	60.00	25.00
	Pittsburg	66.50	99.75	93.60	120.00	105.00
	Columbus	99.42	149.13	141.60	160.00	162.50
	Indianapolis	130.60	196.29	168.00	180.00	190.00
	East St. Louis	175.04	262.56	208.80	240.00	242.50
	Texarkana	267.12	400.68	472.80	440.00	373.50
	Washington	32.40	48.60	84.00	100.00	65.00
	Atlanta	140.20	210.60	302.40	320.00	240.00
	New Orleans	234.36	351.54	283.20	400.00	340.00
	Boston	35.78	53.67	91.20	80.00	50.00
	Portland, Me	53.14	79.71	96.00	100.00	80.00
Chicago	Milwaukee	13.76	20.64	60.00	48.00	25.50
	Minneapolis	72.60	108.90	144.00	160.00	115.00
	Denver	150.54	225.81	492.00	480.00	295.00
	Detroit	53.58	80.37	88.00	100.00	77.50
	Cincinnati	47.84	71.76	96.00	120.00	80.00
	Pittsburg	82.58	123.87	108.00	140.00	120.00
Cincinnati	St. Louis	64.40	96.60	96.00	120.00	90.00
	Chicago	47.84	71.76	96.00	120.00	80.00
	Cleveland	50.52	75.78	88.80	100.00	72.50
	Pittsburg	56.66	84.99	71.76	100.00	83.50
	Nashville	56.48	84.72	127.20	220.00	90.00
	Columbus	23.74	35.61	60.00	90.00	34.00
Atlanta	Savannah	126.76	190.14	146.40	140.00	83.70
	New Orleans	73.96	110.94	240.00	220.00	148.50
	Memphis	145.48	218.22	240.00	180.00	125.00
	St. Louis	137.88	200.82	324.00	260.00	186.00

I wish to refer to Professor Adams's testimony on page 233 and page 234, part 2; and it is the most important part of this whole testimony. Professor Adams says the Government pays $3,422 per mile per annum, or $93.75 per mile of line. He is now dealing with the Pennsylvania Railroad from New York to Philadelphia. Then he says if the mail car only carries 2 tons of mail, it will require eight trains to transport it, and on this basis of figures it would cost the railroads $3,796, including fixed charges, dividends, etc., to perform this service.

If, he says, cars carry 3½ tons, it would only cost $2,244 to earn $3,422, and if it could carry 5 tons, it would cost the railroads $1,766 per mile to earn $3,422. And it might be reduced by regular progression. If, he says, each car carries 3½ tons, it costs $2,244 to earn $3,422. It is better, I assume, to discuss this question from the testimony submitted than to trust to flights of fancy or to delve into unknown realms. Professor Adams too often seeks to ascertain earnings on a special railroad system by making a comparison with the average. For instance, the Professor, in ascertaining the cost of a train on the Pennsylvania Railroad, takes the average cost of all trains in the country.

I hope gentlemen will follow me. When he seeks to use a typical train he takes the average of five cars, but on this road, the Pennsylvania, he gives to each train nine and a half cars in order to produce the result which is referred to in his report. He makes a nine and a half mail car train, a train that does not exist. There are not exceeding six cars upon any mail train in the United States, yet he assumes that there are nine and a half cars here. Why, permit me to say that the mail from New York to Philadelphia could all be carried on one train, but the exigencies of the time demand that it be carried on 140.

Now, there were some facts that Professor Adams apparently lost sight of. Again, he insists on applying to this road the average cost of all trains in the country, while the Interstate Commerce Commission—and I assumed he compiled the figures, as he is the statistician of that Commission—gives the cost of operation at $1.13 a mile instead of a dollar, which he uses, while the average cost he applies to this in his argument. It must be borne in mind that the testimony shows that 2 tons is the average load. I have long assumed that that is an important factor, and yet no man has the right to obtain a result outside of the testimony, unless he shall be able to demonstrate conclusively that his assumption is correct.

Now as to the probable loading of cars, and I will refer very briefly to the report of my friend from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING]. My friend estimated in his report that the car would carry 8,000 pounds, and that Mr. Bradley testified to that. That is true. I think you can put 10,000 pounds in a car; but there are other factors to consider, and many factors, permit me to say. First, the car starts for the West with more mail, as a rule, than it ever has again on its westward march.

The mail of one day is sometimes double the mail of another, as is shown by the tables prepared by the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. Going out of Chicago there was one day 312,000 pounds; another, 316,000 pounds; another, 288,000 pounds; another, 293,000 pounds, then 276,000 pounds, then 143,000 pounds, then 112,000 pounds, and this in one week. When Professor Adams or any other man attempts to say that the mail is steady and continuous he does not know what he is talking about, and while the maximum capacity of a car may be 8,000 pounds, it must have an average over the road from the point of departure back to that point again, and if it averages 8,000 pounds on a small day it must carry 16,000 pounds on a large day. There is something that Professor Adams never thought of. The trend of mail is westward.

Now, I have some weights over the St. Paul and Northwestern, showing the rates and percentage of mail going westward. I will not take the time to read it, but it is open to anyone, and I will insert it here. The first table shows the varying weights from day to day. The second table shows the percentage of mail to the westward over that going eastward.

Weight of mail originating in Chicago and dispatched by railroads from October 3 to November 6, 1899.

1899.	Pounds.	1899.	Pounds.
Oct. 3, Tuesday	312,718	Oct. 21, Saturday	242,545
Oct. 4, Wednesday	316,845	Oct. 22, Sunday	147,325
Oct. 5, Thursday	288,373	Oct. 23, Monday	195,516
Oct. 6, Friday	293,902	Oct. 24, Tuesday	239,944
Oct. 7, Saturday	276,844	Oct. 25, Wednesday	279,637
Oct. 8, Sunday	143,577	Oct. 26, Thursday	273,987
Oct. 9, Monday	111,273	Oct. 27, Friday	262,794
Oct. 10, Tuesday	250,196	Oct. 28, Saturday	257,172
Oct. 11, Wednesday	286,198	Oct. 29, Sunday	146,280
Oct. 12, Thursday	289,782	Oct. 30, Monday	241,868
Oct. 13, Friday	271,459	Oct. 31, Tuesday	313,586
Oct. 14, Saturday	238,458	Nov. 1, Wednesday	311,274
Oct. 15, Sunday	143,711	Nov. 2, Thursday	315,670
Oct. 16, Monday	197,274	Nov. 3, Friday	299,756
Oct. 17, Tuesday	270,080	Nov. 4, Saturday	279,490
Oct. 18, Wednesday	291,283	Nov. 5, Sunday	152,380
Oct. 19, Thursday	319,251	Nov. 6, Monday	225,758
Oct. 20, Friday	269,280		

Percentage of mail going westward over that going eastward.

Railway.	Route.	Percentage of the total carried northwest, west, or southwest.	Pounds carried northwest, west, or southwest.	Percentage of the total carried northeast, east, or southeast.	Pounds carried northeast, east, or southeast.
Northwestern	Chicago-Milwaukee	63	21,933	37	12,881
St. Paul	Chicago-Milwaukee	70	88,370	30	37,873
Northwestern	Chicago-Winona	72	10,899	28	4,239
St. Paul	Chicago-Kittridge	60	8,843	40	5,896
Northwestern	Chicago-Union Pacific Transfer.	70	34,614	30	14,834
Rock Island	Chicago-Davenport	73	23,635	27	8,742
Burlington	Chicago-Burlington	79	109,078	21	28,996
Santa Fe	Chicago-Kansas City	70	12,761	30	5,469
Total			310,133		118,930

The trend of mail to the westward is double on all of these roads what it is to the eastward. So, in order to get your average, if you have 8,000 pounds average in a car, it must necessarily start, in order to make this average, with 32,000 pounds or 16 tons on some days. No one denies what the capacity of a car is, and we must not lose sight of the fact that it must carry an average from the start to that point returning; and that the mail, as I said before, is not the same day after day, and working out your capacity of a car as 8,000 pounds, you will find, in order to make an average from that point back and forth, that the car must start with 16 tons of mail, which no one contends can be put in a car.

I have some statements here from Mr. Bradley relating to the Pennsylvania and other roads with which he is familiar that I will insert in the RECORD, which give the average amount carried in a postal car over the Pennsylvania Railroad, a trifle over 4,000 pounds, and in order to carry 4,000 pounds average some days it would have to carry 8,000. On this westward march it would have to start with 7,000 or 8,000 in order to maintain the average:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 19, 1900.*

DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith I return you Professor Adams's letter of May 12, which discusses the tables I made up at your request, showing the average load per car on the New York and Philadelphia and Philadelphia and Pittsburg lines; and also the other tables which I had compiled from the data submitted in General Superintendent White's tabulation, as representing the conditions on other main lines throughout the country.

As I said to you in my letter of May 3, I did not see much value in the results obtained, because the weakness in the whole calculation rests in the

fact that the weight of mail carried in postal cars or storage cars is a mere matter of estimate, which would probably vary in each division.

In order to make my position in the matter clear to Professor Adams I should explain that in my own territory are contained only the following mail routes, on which full postal cars are run, viz: Pennsylvania Railroad, New York to Pittsburg, New York to Washington, Elmira, N. Y., to Baltimore, Md.; Erie Railroad, New York to Buffalo, Hornellsville to Dunkirk; Lehigh Valley Railroad, New York to Buffalo.

On these lines, I could submit an estimate with a fair degree of confidence; but in making such estimate heretofore I have simply based the partition of the mail between the several cars according to the relative maximum capacity of each car. Hence it is only a rough approximation.

I do not know what basis of estimate is adopted in other divisions, and I call your attention to the wide discrepancies in the various estimates submitted as a reason for being chary about basing any conclusions upon those estimates.

For example, on the New York and Buffalo route (New York Central Railroad) I prepared for you some time ago a statement based upon figures submitted by Superintendent Pepper, of the ninth division, who has charge of the service running over that line. He stated that the average weight carried in 1897 over the whole line daily was 250,449 pounds, and of this, 94 per cent was carried on postal-car and mail-apartment trains, this equaling 234,062 pounds. He said this matter was carried by about 34 cars, thus making the average 6,884 pounds per car; but in these 34 cars there were 7 storage cars, with a maximum capacity of 10 tons each.

He then assumed that these storage cars might average 8 tons each, thus making the storage-car load 112,000 pounds; which, subtracted from 234,062 pounds, would leave a residue of 122,062 pounds for the equivalent of 27 postal cars, or an average of 4,520 pounds per car.

Now, if we analyze by percentage this estimate made by Superintendent Pepper, we find the following:

	Per cent.
Load in postal cars and apartments	49.2
Load in storage cars	44.8
Load in baggage cars	6

In contrast with this, in the large statement, based upon figures which General Superintendent White obtained from the various division superintendents, I find that Superintendent Pepper's estimate for the New York and Buffalo route is as follows:

Percentage of weight carried in—	Per cent.
Full postal cars (paid cars)	67.22
In full apartment cars	1.45
In storage cars	24.74
In baggage cars	6.59

So you will see that he guessed one time that 44.8 per cent of the mail was carried in storage cars, and another time that 24.74 per cent was carried in storage cars.

This confirms the opinion I expressed of the uncertainty of individual estimates regarding a matter upon which there are no exact available statistics, because the weight of the mail carried on railroads has never been ascertained on the basis of each individual car.

The large table which seems to meet the approval of Professor Adams is subject to the same criticism. Professor Adams has mistaken the meaning of the tonnage. The tons carried 1 mile in full postal cars on the New York and Buffalo route were 36,996, not 36,000,000; and the tons carried 1 mile in storage cars were 13,616, not 13,000,000.

If Superintendent Pepper's original estimate is correct, that 7 storage cars were used, this ton mileage on the basis of 439 miles would represent about 4½ tons to each storage car instead of 8 tons as he originally estimated.

Another element of uncertainty that arises in regard to this calculation is the number of cars accepted as the equipment of the line. This estimate I made for you originally for the New York and Philadelphia and Philadelphia and Pittsburg routes was based upon the then existing equipment of postal cars (1899), but it was also based upon the weight of mail as ascertained in 1897. It might be contended by some that this was not a fair way of making the comparison, because it would be assumed that the mail had considerably increased since 1897. We can not tell whether this was the case or not. We know of one important instance in the weighing of 1897 where the weight remained stationary, much to our surprise, viz, on route 110001, Philadelphia to Pittsburg, where the average weight was 183,000 pounds in 1897, this being the same as the average weight for 1893.

In the original estimate submitted on the New York and Buffalo route Superintendent Pepper worked out the present equipment as being 27 postal cars or their equivalent and 7 storage cars, or a total of 34 cars, this showing an average of 6,884 pounds per car. In the second computation, made in this office from Superintendent Pepper's figures to General Superintendent White, 22 postal cars were taken instead of 27, this apparently representing the number that were running in 1897, when the weighing was held. Hence the estimate of 7,652 pounds to the postal car, excluding storage cars.

I think you will see from these illustrations the reason for my impression of distrust in regard to these averages, which depend upon individual estimates.

Professor Adams is disposed to think that the average of 10,000 pounds per car on the Elyria and Millbury route may be correct. I still think it is a great overestimate, although, of course, I have no means of knowing absolutely the exact facts. I am simply employing my judgment on the case. I work it out in this way.

If the average is 10,000 pounds or 5 tons to the car, it is the average of the service both East and West. We know, in a general way, that the west-bound mail compares with the east-bound mail usually in the ratio of 60 per cent to 40 per cent. Hence the west-bound weight would be 60 per cent of 10 tons, or 6 tons to the car. We must also then reflect that the average of 5 tons first quoted is the average not only of the west-bound and the east-bound mails, but also the average of thirty-five days weighing. We know that the weights vary from day to day to the extent of 60 per cent. Hence the maximum weight on any one day per week may have been 30 per cent greater than 6 tons, which would make nearly 8 tons, or 16,000 pounds. This would far exceed the maximum storage capacity of a distributing postal car, and really represent the tonnage of a storage car, and fully justifies, I think, my comment.

You will of course remember that in this particular calculation relating to the Elyria and Millbury route we are simply speaking of the average weight in postal cars, as we have eliminated storage cars and their contents.

I believe the only way to obtain reliable statistics on this subject would be to have a special weighing for at least thirty-five days on all full postal car lines, and I suppose to obtain satisfactory results this weighing should be held not earlier than October, so as to make sure that the test would be made when an average amount of mail was being carried. Personally I do not think that the result would be as valuable as some consider it, because the average load excludes the idea of the maximum space, which is absolutely needed at initial points, where the greatest amount of mail is received; and, further, the average load treats the total problem as a mere transportation question, while all of my reflections and study of the subject have convinced me that the transportation side of the question is incidental and subordinate to the space that is required for the distribution of the mails in transit.

Respectfully,

V. J. BRADLEY, *Superintendent.*

Hon. E. F. LOUD, *Washington, D. C.*

Statement explanatory of postal car and mail service on route 109004, New York to Philadelphia, and route 110001, Philadelphia to Pittsburg, Pa.

Route 109004.—The statement is made upon the basis of through service, and shows 28 trains carrying postal cars or apartments, and which carry 80 per cent of the weight of mail. There were in addition to these 28 postal-car trains, 112 other trains—some through trains, but mostly local—which carried 20 per cent of the weight. On the 28 postal-car trains there were altogether 171 cars, of which 41 were postal or storage cars; thus showing that the ratio was 1 postal car to 4 other cars per train.

Of storage cars, there were 6 out of 41, or about 14 per cent. On the basis of space, the entire equipment of storage cars would be about 11 per cent of the equipment of postal cars. It is shown that the average load per car, including storage cars, was 6,029 pounds, and excluding storage cars, 4,320 pounds.

Of the 28 postal-car trains shown, 6 trains had a mail apartment, constituting about one-half a car each; 15 trains had 1 postal car each; 5 trains had 2 postal cars each; 1 train had 3 postal cars, and 1 train had 4 postal cars.

Route 110001.—The statement is made upon the basis of through service, and shows 17 trains carrying postal cars or apartments, and which carry 96.5 per cent of the weight of mail. There were in addition to these 17 postal-car trains, 94 other trains, some through trains, but mostly local, which carried 3.5 per cent of the weight. On the 17 postal-car trains, there were altogether 113 cars, of which 28 were postal or storage cars; thus showing that the ratio was 1 postal car to 4 other cars per train.

Of storage cars there were 5 out of 28, or about 18 per cent. On the basis of space, the entire equipment of storage cars would be about 13 per cent of the equipment of postal cars. It is shown that the average load per car, including storage cars, was 6,341 pounds; and excluding storage cars, 4,241 pounds.

Of the 17 postal-car trains shown, 5 trains had a mail apartment constituting about one-half a car each; 6 trains had 1 postal car each; 5 trains had 2 postal cars each; 1 train had 4 postal cars.

NOTE.—It is understood that the railroad company's computations show that between 9 and 10 per cent of all passenger-train space, including local trains, is used for mail purposes between New York and Pittsburg. Also, that the average number of cars per passenger train between New York and Pittsburg is 5.91.

OFFICE SUPERINTENDENT RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
New York, March 14, 1900.

Statement explanatory of postal-car and mail service on route 107011, New York to Buffalo, N. Y.

Route 107011.—The statement is made on the basis of through service, and shows 19 trains carrying postal cars or apartments, and which carry 94 per cent of the mail. There were, in addition to these 19 postal-car trains, 57 other trains—some through trains, but mostly local—which carried 6 per cent of the weight. On the 19 postal-car trains there were altogether 137 cars, of which 34 were postal or storage cars; thus showing that the ratio was 1 postal car to 4 other cars per train.

Of storage cars there were 7 out of 34, or about 20 per cent. On the basis of space, the entire equipment of storage cars would be about 23 per cent of the equipment of postal cars. It is shown that the average load per car, including storage cars, was 6,884 pounds, and excluding storage cars, 4,520 pounds.

Of the postal-car trains shown 6 trains had a mail apartment constituting about one-half a car each, 6 trains had 1 postal car each, 1 train had 2 postal cars, 4 trains had 3 postal cars each, and 1 train had 4 postal cars.

Now, taking this Pennsylvania Railroad, let us see what the railroad would earn, that being the heaviest mail route in the United States. There is a suggestion in the report of the commission that possibly some of the dense roads may make a large profit out of this business. That is an assumption I do not agree to. When we agree to a report, generally we do not always agree to every word spoken in it. There is a question in my mind as to whether the most dense routes are better paid than the small routes. As you know, the road carrying 200 pounds gets $42.37 per mile of work per annum, but when you get on the Pennsylvania road, which carries an average amount of 309,000 pounds daily, the pay falls down to 6.57 cents per ton per mile.

I say, as an abstract question, that the railroad companies carrying two to five hundred pounds of mail, as a transportation proposition, are the best-paid railroads in the country. But the difficulty about it is that there enters a question which, to my mind, is entirely outside of the mail transportation, and that is the mail-messenger service. Railroads are compelled to deliver the mail to the post-offices within a quarter of a mile from the station. What it costs I do not know. I know the Government performs the mail-messenger service to the offices beyond a quarter of a mile—about 7,000 of them—and pays a million dollars for it. There are twenty-odd thousand to which the railroad companies deliver the mail.

When I asked Mr. Kruttschnitt, of the Southern Pacific, if a million dollars would not cover it, he said:

Well, Mr. LOUD, 20,000 post-offices at $50 a year—do you think it is a large figure?

I assume, without pretending to know all about it, that the service is worth $2,000,000 a year; but that is simply a suggestion. Now, the difficulty is that a road carrying 200 pounds of mail per day will get $42.37, and it may be paying $50 for mail-messenger service. That occurs in quite a number of instances—small roads, where they pay more for the delivery of mail after it arrives at the station than they receive from the Government for all the services they render. If the maximum average capacity of a car is 2 tons, on that basis of transportation, with the mail-messenger service removed, the small roads are paid the best. I

think they are paid more than the express companies pay, but there is their collateral service which no man knows anything about. I will take the earnings of a mail train from New York to Philadelphia. I have worked this question out two or three ways. We will suppose this train to embrace 3 railway post-office cars and 2 storage cars.

This train would carry 22 tons at 6½ cents per ton per mile, according to Professor Adams. The train will earn $1.43 a mile, and 4 railway post-office cars and 2 storage cars would earn $1.56. The figures of the Interstate Commerce Commission give the cost of the operation of a passenger train—all the trains on the Pennsylvania Railroad—as $1.13, and to this Professor Adams adds 33 per cent for interest, fixed charges, etc., which brings the cost of a train on this road to $1.50. Now, Professor Adams proposes to reduce this rate 17 per cent. In other words, an average train, cited above, will earn $1.43—7 cents less than the actual cost, including interest, fixed charges, etc. Bear in mind we are talking now of the most dense road. Therefore, upon traffic paying a possible small profit he would cut off 17 per cent.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. They carry passengers besides, do they not?

Mr. LOUD. No; they do not. I am speaking now of a mail train. I am assuming the carriage of 22 tons of mail upon a train consisting of three railway post-office cars and two storage cars—a special mail train. I am giving the maximum capacity of the storage car; but the company must carry this average over the whole route both ways.

Mr. LLOYD. Does the gentleman mean to say that $1.56 is the whole expense of carrying the train, or is that simply the expense of carrying the mail cars?

Mr. LOUD. When I used the figure $1.56 I was giving the earnings of a train composed of four railway post-office and two storage cars—a larger train, I believe, than is used. The estimate of cost which I was applying to the Pennsylvania road was $1.13 per train mile, to which should be added 33 per cent for interest, fixed charges, etc.

Mr. LLOYD. Then there is enough paid for carrying the mail to meet the expenses of running the train?

Mr. LOUD. The mail occupies all this train.

Mr. LLOYD. Then the gentleman was speaking of trains which are only mail trains?

Mr. LOUD. I am speaking of the most profitable mail train that the Pennsylvania Railroad can possibly operate.

My friend Mr. Adams assumes that this mail train should carry on an average nine and one-half cars. I was suprised when Professor Adams made that statement. He holds to the theory that speed costs nothing. I said to him, "What do you know about that, Professor?" "Well," said he, "I went to Denver once on a train of 10 cars, and we went at the rate of 70 miles an hour."

Now, it is true that a train of ten cars, after it gets in motion, if it is going upon a level or upon a down grade, may attain that speed. But the question is, what is its average speed? Let me give you an illustration. Over in San Francisco a year ago the Southern Pacific wanted to reduce the time between San Francisco and Chicago, and they made up a limited train of four sleepers and a combination car, such as has come into use in recent years, where one compartment is assigned to the baggage and another assigned as a smoking apartment.

They figured out a time-table. They said, "With one locomotive we can, over ordinary grades, carry five cars and make the required speed." But no sooner had they put that train on than along came Uncle Sam and said, "We are going to put a mail car on this train." They said, "We can not put on that additional car and make the time." But the Post-Office authorities said, "You have got to make it;" and they had to make it. How? Upon a level they could make the speed with one locomotive, but when they came to the grades they were compelled to put on two. That is where speed costs. Why, sir, if you put an average of nine and a half cars on the Burlington route from Chicago to Omaha it would be impossible to make 50 miles an hour. Four cars are the maximum number that could make that time.

Now, I will take Mr. Bradley's figures. Mine were a little more liberal than his, although his judgment is much better than mine. Mr. Bradley has been superintendent of the Railway Mail Service for a number of years. Taking Mr. Bradley's tables of what the cars do carry, we have 5 cars, 30,000 pounds (15 tons), at 6.57 cents per ton per mile, and the train earns per mile 98.55 cents; or New York to Philadelphia, $98.55. But 6 cars, which is the maximum, carrying a total of 18 tons, would earn $1.19 per mile, or $119.26 between New York and Philadelphia.

I say the Interstate Commerce Commission gives the cost of a train on this road as $1.13 per train mile to which Professor Adams adds 33 per cent for fixed charges, interests, etc. Surely a mail train run at that speed costs as much as any other train, though I will not assume that it costs any more. You could continue to add cars and increase earnings, but 9½-car mail trains do not run.

Now, if the interstate commerce figures are correct it costs the company $1.50 a mile to operate each train, and the amount earned on the Pennsylvania Railroad, one of the most dense roads in the country, is only $1.19 per mile—that is to say, they receive $1.19 a mile—and it costs them $1.50 a mile! Where is the profit in this?

Professor Adams, in ascertaining the cost of trains on the Pennsylvania Road, takes the average cost of all the trains in the United States. When he wants to use one class of figures he resolutely says that these railroad trains run an average of but five cars, and when he wants to make a comparison with the Pennsylvania Road he makes the train consist of nine and a half cars. That is just where the difference comes in.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Do not you think it is a very strange thing that the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, managed as well as it is, continues to carry the mail at a loss, if it be a loss, as the gentleman claims it is?

Mr. LOUD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I started out with just such an idea as that myself. I think I am guilty on the floor of the House of uttering an exclamation of that kind on some occasions, and I think that in an unguarded moment I may have acquired such an idea. But, on the other hand, I believe that I am as conservative as the average man here. I said when I contemplated the fact that the Burlington and the Northwestern railroad companies, competing lines, and part land-grant railroads, which carry the mail at 20 per cent less than the rate paid the nonland-grant companies, and which could not in any event receive but 80 per cent of the total pay, were willing to accept the mail at that rate—I said to myself, if these companies are competing for 80 per cent of the mail pay our friends down here in the East who are not land-grant roads and get full pay are certainly receiving 20 per cent too much. That was a logical conclusion, and a reasonable conclusion to be reached by dull minds like yours and mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I thank the gentleman for placing me in the same category with himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOUD. But only temporarily, I will say. [Laughter.] Of course, there is no comparison. I am a plod. I plod along slowly. I have to learn, and I do learn by the hardest labor. What I acquire is by hard work. You would discover in five minutes what it would take me a whole night to learn.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Oh, no. But my friend has not yet answered the question.

Mr. LOUD. I was just looking at another matter that I have before me. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I asked the gentleman why it was that, under the circumstances, if this Railway Mail Service was so unprofitable, a great corporation like the Pennsylvania Railroad would still seek to obtain contracts for carrying the mails?

Mr. LOUD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I was just looking into another matter, but I will recur to this for a moment. It is hardly necessary that I should go over it again and again. The gentleman, I think, knows, and I know, that as an abstract proposition the passenger service of the railroad companies does not pay. We are so informed. Then why do they operate the passenger service? Simply because they are compelled to. That is the reason that they continue to carry the mails.

The most profitable part of the passenger business, as I am informed by witnesses, is the commutation business; yet it is the smallest individual paying business of the whole road. And why is it profitable? Because they can concentrate that business. They can not do that with the ordinary passenger traffic nor with the mails. When I was interrogating Mr. Acker in reference to this question—as to the average passenger rate, the mail rate, and the earning capacity of suburban trains, as compared with the ordinary passenger trains—he said that he had been on a passenger car in a suburban train in which there were but seven or eight people. I advanced the idea that the suburban commutation service meant full cars, because that is undoubtedly the reason why the business is profitable.

Now, Professor Acker—no; he is not a professor, but I think he ought to be—gave an explanation of this matter. For my own part, I never was a suburban passenger. I know that the roads running west from Chicago run phenomenally fast trains of sleepers—trains composed exclusively of sleepers. Now, if the passenger business in a Pullman sleeper is remunerative to the railroad company, why how profitable must be the passenger business! Why, then, do they run these trains? Let us see. It is competition. They run the trains because other roads compete with them.

Now, they want to carry the mail on the same ground. Whether it be profitable or not, it is a desirable service. The Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad system has carried

the mail over its line for a number of years past. I am satisfied that this road would rather sacrifice one-half of the million of dollars they receive as mail pay than to lose this service. How would it sound throughout the United States to have it said that the great Burlington system had lost the mail service between Chicago and Omaha? Why, that corporation would make great sacrifices to retain it. It is even worth something to the average man in the United States to drive a red wagon with the words "U. S. Mail" painted on the side of it.

We have not got a great way from savagery as yet. Take the average human biped and nothing pleases him better than to stick a red feather in his hat. We like pomp and glory and show. It advertises. This railroad company likes to run a finer and a faster train than another. Now, when I came to investigate the facts on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, I found that while their passenger trains, on an average, earn $1.26 per mile per train, yet the most phenomenal mail trains in the world, running over the Burlington, return to the railroad company but 92 cents per mile. These are stubborn facts.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. That train is a mail train.

Mr. LOUD. Yes. Now, these are stubborn facts that confronted me all along the line. Where I found that the passenger service of the Burlington railroad was averaging a return to them of $1.26 a mile per train, these mail trains were only returning to them 92 cents per mile per train, and it cost, in my opinion, twice as much to operate the mail train as any passenger train over their road. That brought me to think that the railroad companies expend a great deal of money for advertising. Otherwise, we would not see these cream-colored cars running in the Congressional Limited from here to New York, palaces on wheels, in which not to exceed an average of ten people travel per trip, if the statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission are to be believed. It is a business that they have, and it is a business that they must retain. They have the mail, they have got to carry it. As my colleague [Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts] said yesterday, they would be obliged to carry it if they had to carry it for nothing.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Then is it your position that the railroads lose money both on passengers and mail, but make it on express and freight?

Mr. LOUD. The express and freight business, in my opinion, is the most profitable business that the railroad companies have.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. But do they lose on both passengers and mail?

Mr. LOUD. Yes; I think as a whole, throughout the United States, and it is a judgment formed reluctantly, I admit; but I am forced to it, because I have had to contemplate facts in my investigations which have caused me to stop and consider. I am satisfied that the passenger business and the mail business are unprofitable to the railroad companies of the country.

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

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. RIDGELY. My question probably will take two to bring out the point. First, is it not a fact that as we have reduced the postage rate to the people, the receipts, and in fact the profits, to the Department in most years have increased?

Mr. LOUD. Well, I do not know; I would not say that.

Mr. RIDGELY. Then another question; I understood you a minute ago to say that the most profitable part of the passenger service of these railroad companies was their commutation traffic?

Mr. LOUD. In my opinion.

Mr. RIDGELY. Does not that suggest to us as well as to them that if they will make cheaper rates to everybody they will make more money from their passenger service?

Mr. LOUD. Well, that is a theoretical proposition that I do not care to enter upon. People will travel about so much, but they must devote some time to work to earn their daily bread.

Mr. RIDGELY. And the cheaper you make the rate the more they can travel, with the "so much."

Mr. LOUD. My friend Cowles, you know, of Connecticut, who is, I believe, an humble disciple of the Populist or Socialist party, advocated the theory of putting a 5-cent stamp on the most prominent part of the human anatomy, turning a man adrift and sending him over to San Francisco at just the same price that he would be sent from New York to Brooklyn; and the query of my friend seems to intimate that the lower you make the rate the more you will increase travel; though, after all, a human being must toil about so much in order to provide sustenance for the body, and he can not travel all the time.

Mr. RIDGELY. If you will permit me, the gentleman suggested the question that I asked, that by reducing the rate the railroad companies would make more money from their passenger service.

Mr. LOUD. No——

Mr. RIDGELY. The suggestion came from the gentleman's speech instead of from myself.

Mr. LOUD. No; I do not think I suggested it beyond a certain point. People can live probably 20 and possibly 25 miles from their place of business, but there is a limit, and the railroad companies, by providing low rates for suburban travel up to that limit, will encourage men to go out from the city to live, coming in and going back every day.

I will tell you how the railroad companies are enabled to do that. The average number of passengers in a through passenger car is given by the Interstate Commerce Commission as 10. The average number of commutation passengers, as given to me on the Pennsylvania and its connections, is about 40. Or, to put it this way, a passenger car taking 10 passengers at 2 cents a mile, which is the average of the country, earns 20 cents upon them, and the cost of hauling the passengers is insignificant when considering their weight. With 40 passengers in a car at a cent a mile, the locomotive having to haul but little more, that car would earn 40 cents, and hence there obtains a more profitable business. I thought——

Mr. RIDGELY. Your argument contains the suggestion carried in my question. I am sure I propounded my question in good faith, and not for the purpose of raising any party question, but for the purpose of calling out a frank expression on the subject.

Mr. LOUD. I understand your question was in good faith; but the gentleman and I differ upon that proposition. I think there is a limit to everything; and you have some doubt about it. The gentleman and myself understand one another personally.

Now, another reference to Professor Adams and I am done. On page 417, part 2, when asked by the chairman if the testimony showed two or two and a half tons as the postal car loading he said this:

> Now, I may be wrong there, but my recommendation for reduction is—

Now mark—

> my recommendation for reduction is that in case we do have three and a half or four or five, if those routes exist, that they are getting too high pay now, and therefore you could now, under existing law, at present, reduce the rate.

Now, he makes his recommendation upon a condition which does not exist. Merely an assumption, an assumption similar to that of the gentleman's putting nine and a half mail cars in a train. Why, you could put in 50, but the question is how many do you use practically? It is not what you can do.

Why, let me say to Professor Adams, as I have said before, this mail could be carried by railroad companies for one-tenth the present cost if the roads could handle the business as they saw fit, and they would make a hundred per cent more than they do now. The difficulty with my friend, Professor Adams, is he was not familiar with the practical conditions and of the work required, and said that a car could carry 4 or 5 tons. So it could, but under our system it must carry it from New York to Chicago and back in order to make an average of 4 tons.

As I illustrated a few moments ago, in order to carry 4 tons every day, that car would be compelled to leave New York with 10 tons in it, by reason of the changes and varying conditions from day to day, and because of the enormous trend of mail westward above the trend of mail eastward. That is a condition that Professor Adams did not familiarize himself with. Gentlemen must understand that nominally a car, in order to have an average of 3 tons, must carry 4 tons west, because it only carries 2 tons east. Does the gentleman grasp it? It must carry an impossible amount west in order to attain the average that the gentleman assumes is carried. There is the whole question.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Do not you think the railroad companies, if they are losing money on it, ought to be paid a fair compensation?

Mr. LOUD. Yes; but I do not know positively whether they are or not. No man can tell. It is a matter of judgment, as Professor Adams himself said. We found on investigation that the mail trains earned less than the passenger trains. That is about all we know about it. We do not propose to pay the railroad companies any more. They do not ask it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Then, why are they complaining?

Mr. LOUD. I do not think they are complaining. The railroad companies, when we began to investigate this question, did not know any more about it than you or I. That is what surprised us. The mail business is only about 3 per cent of the total business they are carrying, which is a small amount. They know absolutely that it is the most expensive business they handle. How much it costs them they do not know. They are pursuing the even tenor of their way, some trains losing money and some trains making money. At the end of the year they know that they have made money, or know they have lost money. Some of these railroads made a profit, but where they made it they did not know; neither was there any reason why they should know.

Three per cent of their business was comparatively insignificant. The men who were managing the railroads in 1873, when this system of payment was adopted, have passed off the scene of life, and when we attempted to ask one of the witnesses—one of the officers of the New York Central—how the rates were originally fixed on freight his mind was a perfect blank to him. We asked him if the original idea of fixing the rate contemplated space; that is, that the light freight must pay more than the heavy freight. He said: "I do not know; I do know our rate is so much on iron, so much on coal, and so much on furniture. How it was adopted I do not know." The men who managed the railroads when this rate was fixed have passed away, and the railroad companies have performed the service, and they do not think and do not care how it was originated. Some of them know that they are making money year by year, and some of them know they are losing.

Now, my friends, just one thought and I will close—and I should have closed an hour ago. My friend from Georgia, I regret, has seen fit to differ with Mr. MOODY and myself as to our ultimate recommendation, but if the House only knew what a trifle separated us they would be surprised.

I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING] that the last thought incorporated in his report, if pursued a little further, will bring him to join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] and myself in the House. At the end of the gentleman's report (and I am betraying no confidence) he recommends that the Post-Office Department pay for the transportation of its agents, and that was undoubtedly the last thought in the gentleman's mind.

His report had been completed, and at the last meeting I suggested that this transportation of post-office inspectors, rural delivery agents, assistant superintendents, and post-office officials galore cost 2 cents per mile, amounting to $1,000,000 a year, and growing enormously, and that the railroads must carry these people in first-class coaches. The gentleman from Georgia, fair-minded as he is, as an afterthought, said that the Post-Office Department should pay for this transportation. Then, from the $3,000,000, which the gentleman proposes as his reduction, was taken off $1,000,000 for this transportation service. I think if the gentleman will carefully investigate further he must come to the conclusion—a conclusion which every commission has come to in the past—that the mail-messenger service is properly no part or parcel of the railway-mail transportation and should be stricken off; and there he would take off $2,000,000 more.

Mr. FLEMING. I can not agree to that.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman will not agree to it to-day, but sometime I think he will.

Let me say, in behalf of the members of that commission appointed from this House, that not a single person on the commission sought the appointment. It is true when this commission was created there were gentlemen, members of the House, who sought appointments on the commission, but no member who was selected—I know of my own knowledge—hoped, dreamed, or anticipated, or wanted to be appointed on that commission. They were free, absolutely free, independent men.

They have, I believe, the confidence of the membership of the House. I have great faith in the gentleman from Georgia. I regret that early in our investigation he was stricken by sickness. He is a genial companion outside of his eminent abilities and fairness, and I wish he could have been with us every day and every hour, and I have that faith in the gentleman's judgment now that he will not drop this question here, undetermined as it is, but will pursue it further, and I believe that he will yet return to the fold.

Mr. FLEMING. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. FLEMING. Is it not true that the gentleman from Georgia was present on every day and at every session of the commission, except at the sessions of the subcommittee that went to San Francisco?

Mr. LOUD. I think that is true.

Mr. FLEMING. It is true, and I will state that the gentleman from Georgia carefully read every word of the testimony taken before the subcommittee in his absence. There was never a meeting of the commission at which I was not present. I am much obliged to my friend for his complimentary reference, but I want to be put straight in the RECORD.

Mr. LOUD. I submit to the House that at the last moment the gentleman repented to the extent of a million dollars, after he had drawn his report and after it had been submitted. He surrendered a million dollars, and I think that I had a right to say that I hoped if the gentleman would pursue and find out some things which I am satisfied he does not know or fully appreciate now, he would join us, and come to the inevitable conclusion that the railroad companies are not being overpaid for transportation of the mail.

Mr. FLEMING. I did not intend to make any remarks, but now I think I shall ask for a few minutes.

Mr. LOUD. I have been trying to get the gentleman from Georgia to make some remarks ever since the debate began. If I have finally succeeded, I think the House will be glad to hear him.

I differ with the majority of the commission upon the basis of payment to railroads for the carriage of mail. It has become more apparent to me the further I have investigated that the only intelligent basis of pay should be space occupied. Weight is such an unimportant factor that it is almost impossible to make any intelligent comparison with any other character of service. If the basis of space were adopted, it would be more simple and much easier to understand in its application. We probably, in some instances, would be able to avail ourselves of increased density, more particularly on the lighter full railway post-office car lines; that is, the average weight on some lines I assume to be less than 4,000 pounds. Under this system no additional compensation would be given for any increase of weight up to the maximum amount of load.

One other reference to Professor Adams and I will close. I asked him the following question, as shown on page 446, part 2, of the testimony:

> Mr. LOUD. * * * This joint commission was established for the purpose of settling this question, with full regard to the interests of the Government, the economical administration of the postal service, and fairness to the railway lines. If after two years of investigation the subject were permitted to take the phase of a simple horizontal reduction, who is there competent, by general knowledge of all branches of this subject, to have his judgment respected and followed?
>
> Mr. CHANDLER. Do you want to ask that question?
>
> The CHAIRMAN (Senator WOLCOTT). I would like to have that question asked.
>
> Mr. CHANDLER. It is asking a very general question. I don't object to it. I wasn't certain whether Mr. LOUD was making it a question of his own, or wanted Mr. Adams to sit in judgment upon it.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have Professor Adams answer that question.

We have patiently waited for nearly a year for Professor Adams to answer this question. I believe when Gabriel blows his horn on the resurrection morn we will still be waiting for the answer. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 13575. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13437. An act providing for the construction of a bridge across the Yalobusha River in Grenada County, State of Mississippi;

H. R. 13255. An act to authorize Jefferson County, Ark., to construct and maintain a free bridge across the Arkansas River within 5 miles of Pine Bluff, Jefferson County, Ark.;

H. R. 12846. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902; and

H. R. 12284. An act authorizing construction of a bridge across Rock River, Illinois.

The message from the Senate also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the following title:

H. R. 10967. An act to authorize Arizona Water Company to construct power plant on Pima Indian Reservation, in Maricopa County, Ariz.

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

S. 5814. An act to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12904) making an appropriation for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. THURSTON, Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

> *Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5174) authorizing the construction of a bridge across Rock River, in the State of Illinois.

Also:

> *Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 5048) to confirm in trust to the city of Albuquerque, in the Territory of New Mexico, the town of Albuquerque grant, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9928) granting an increase of pension to H. T. Reed, alias Daniel Hull.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2799) to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FORAKER, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. MORGAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 10899) to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. THURSTON, Mr. QUARLES, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House has been under discussion the greater part of four days. And necessarily, Mr. Chairman, the discussion has covered every possible phase contemplated in the bill, or in the items, at least, now under discussion. When the bill was first presented to the House, by unanimous consent three items were reserved for general discussion. One of these items refers to the pneumatic-tube service, another refers to the pay of Railway Mail Service, and the third refers to the striking out of the subsidy proposed to certain railroads in the country for "expediting" the mails. These are the three items that have been reserved by unanimous consent for general debate on the floor of the House.

I can not hope, Mr. Chairman, to advance any new theory, or to present any new ideas, but having opinions on these subjects, and having reasons for those opinions, I claim the indulgence of the House while I express myself upon those matters.

Mr. Chairman, it should be a matter of both congratulation and regret by the country at large, congratulation in that we had appointed a commission of distinguished gentlemen known, honored, and respected throughout the land to investigate some of these questions which are now under discussion before the House, and of regret in that these distinguished gentlemen have not presented to the House or to the country a tangible remedy to relieve this discussion of some of the many differences of opinions that would naturally arise from investigating these questions. I propose to refer briefly to the pneumatic-tube service. An investigation by the Post-Office Committee last winter revealed the fact that that was a most expensive luxury. Why, sir, believe me when I state to the House that that investigation showed it cost more in the city of New York to place a pneumatic tube 8 inches in diameter, 1 mile in length, 4 feet underground—it cost the Government of the United States more to lay such a tube than it costs to grade, construct, tie, and iron a mile of the best railway in the United States. Looking at the thing from the standpoint that the committee adopted, we thought there should be no recommendation on the part of the committee in favor of the further continuance of the pneumatic-tube service.

Distinguished gentlemen from the large cities of the country refer to the fact that the greater part of the money paid into the Post-Office Department is paid by the post-offices of the large cities. That is true; no man can or will deny it. But let me venture to suggest to the Representatives of such constituencies upon this floor that while that is true, the citizens of those great cities receive the favors of the Government by way of the free-delivery service, oftentimes ten times a day, at public expense, while the rural portion of our country, or rather those persons not living within the large cities, oftentimes receive their mail only once a week, and then they have to travel from 4 to 6 miles to get it. So it is an equitable distribution all around. The cities contribute largely of their money to maintain the postal service, and they receive great favors from that service.

I propose now, gentlemen, to discuss to some extent this question of railway mail pay. Entertaining for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads [Mr. LOUD] the most profound respect, recognizing as I do his eminent ability, believing as I do to-day that he knows more about the postal service than any other member on the floor of this House, I must enter a dissent from many of the suggestions that he has made in his speech of nearly three hours' duration. Why, sir, if the ideas of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], both eminent members of this postal commission, are correct, every railway in the United States to-day is a fit subject for the appointment of a receiver.

The gentleman from California, in answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH], stated a moment ago that in his judgment the best pay that the railways receive is what they derive from carrying express matter; that the second best source of pay is their freight business; and in the third place they incur an absolute loss on carrying mail and passengers.

Before I read some statistics that I have here permit me to say that if I have learned anything in the course of my practice as a lawyer it is that a party presenting a witness to a court always vouches for the credibility of that witness; and no party is ever permitted in a court of justice to deny or challenge the statements of his own witness unless such witness has misled him. Now, my friend from California and my friend from Massachusetts present to the House of Representatives, or I might go further and say to the American people at large, two or three witnesses; and in the next breath, after presenting those witnesses to the public and complimenting them in the highest terms, they proceed to discredit or attempt to discredit every word that those witnesses have said wherein they disagree with the opinions the gentlemen themselves entertain. I have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with the gentlemen whom they have presented as witnesses before this House; but they vouch for them in presenting them, and I think they ought not to attempt to discredit their own witnesses.

Now, what do some of those witnesses say on the very points that were referred to by the gentleman from California? Of the two points to which the gentleman has particularly referred, the first is that the mail is carried by all the railways of the country practically at a loss. I do not know whether the gentleman's opinion is worth more than that of the Post-Office Department. It may be worth equally as much. But I submit to the House what the Department says on that subject. I propose to read the answer of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General to the direct issue presented by the gentleman from California. I read from page 458 of the second volume of the report of the postal commission:

Q. A good many roads testified at Chicago that they did not make anything by carrying Government mails. Some of them testified that they carried the mails at a loss—the Illinois Central, for instance. That would not be such a stimulus, would it?

To this question Mr. Shallenberger answers:

No, that would not be such a stimulus; but we doubt the statement. We believe the railroads do profit by carrying the mails. We believe that the desire on the part of the great lines for a large share of the mails is evidence of the fact that for one reason or another they find it profitable.

Does not that comport with common sense? Does not that comport with our ideas in everyday transactions? You gentlemen undertake to tell us that a railroad corporation seeks the privilege of carrying the mails, and at the same time knows that it is losing money by the operation. Railroad corporations act upon the same motives that influence individuals. In money matters they are inspired by the same desires. No individual would adopt such a course in his private business; nor, in my judgment, will any railway corporation do it.

Both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts stated yesterday that the most reliable results could be obtained by instituting a comparison between the charges for mail transportation and the charges upon express matter. They contended that these two branches of railroad traffic are more nearly on all fours than any other. Now, the gentleman from California has asserted, Mr. Chairman, in the course of this debate that the railways make more money from the express matter than from any other class of business done upon the roads, and next to the express matter as a paying business is the freight. Let us see what one of the gentlemen that the commission presented to the House and to the country says upon this very question. They present this man as a witness, and, as before said, in so doing they certify to his worth and to his credibility. Let us see what he says on this question. I refer now to a gentleman from Pennsylvania—I think from Philadelphia—whom my friend from California complimented somewhat highly as to his capacity.

Mr. LOUD. Let me ask the name of the gentleman to whom the gentleman refers?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I refer to Mr. Acker.

Mr. LOUD. The commission is not responsible, of course, for Mr. Acker in any respect. The duty of the commission was performed when they took this testimony——

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I understand that he was not regarded as an expert, as Professor Adams was; but yet I take it that your commission is bound by his statements. You have presented his evidence here. You certainly will not wish to discredit it yourself. You present him as a credible witness.

Mr. GAINES. Were these witnesses under oath?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I do not know as to that.

Mr. FLEMING. Oh, yes; all of them were sworn.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he would feel disposed to follow blindly the suggestion of a man whom he employed, without examining for himself as to the value of the suggestions made in such a case?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Undoubtedly not. I would prefer to follow the opinion of the gentleman from California upon a matter of this kind rather than any man in the United States that I know of.

Now, while I have my own convictions upon these matters, I would not profess to put them in competition with the convictions of the gentleman from California, who has examined the matter so thoroughly. Still, we have the evidence here of this witness, and we have not heard that it has been discredited by those who have presented it.

Mr. LOUD. If the gentleman will allow a brief suggestion, the gentleman possibly does not comprehend exactly the situation.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Possibly not. I think I do.

Mr. LOUD. Professor Adams did not contend that he knew anything of the practical operation of the railroads in the United States, and did not pretend to give testimony in reference to them.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I understand that. But I am not referring now to Professor Adams. I was saying, and I reiterate the statement, that the postal commission have presented certain men as their witnesses, and I claim that that commission now ought not to be here to discredit the statements of the men they have called to the stand.

Let us now go on for a moment as to this question of the express charges, and see what one of their own witnesses says upon the subject. Here is what Mr. Acker says—a witness that the gentleman from California excoriated to some extent this afternoon. Here is what he says, and I ask the attention of the House to the language:

Your committee believes that a comparison of express and mail charges is not only useful, but is one of the most practical ways of reaching a reasonable conclusion, and on pages 113 and 114 of the report some of these comparisons are made, which show that the Government pays for transporting mail matter from Washington to San Francisco $11.65 per 100 pounds, while the express rate is $14.25. The mail compensation rate to Ogden is $8.61, and the express rate $10.25.

There the express is more than the mail.

The mail compensation to Chicago is $3.51, and the express rate $2.25.

There the express rate is 100 per cent less than the mail rate.

From the above figures as quoted in the report it would appear that the Government was not paying an excessive rate for mail transportation. On the contrary, the comparison appears to be rather favorable to the Government. But this instance furnishes a graphic illustration of how easy it is for figures to be presented in a manner which disarms criticism and forces a wrong conclusion, for although at least one member of the Senate committee heartily favored a reduction in rates, he allowed the above presentation of figures to pass unchallenged at the time.

Is that all? No. We are told that while the Government pays $8.61 to Ogden, the express companies pay about $4.10, and while the Government pays $3.51 to Chicago, the express companies pay about 90 cents.

Those who have ever attempted to secure complete statistics from express companies soon realize how difficult a task they have undertaken; but fortunately we have the census report of 1890—and the report was prepared with the assistance of the president of the Adams Express Company—which shows that the express companies of this country sent out in one year 115,000,000 packages, and that the total weight of these packages, not counting 17,000,000 of them as weighing anything, because their weight was not given, was 3,292,000,000 pounds. For these 3,292,000,000 pounds, to say nothing of the 17,000,000 packages not weighed, they paid the railroad companies $19,327,000.

For these 3,292,000,000 pounds, to say nothing of the 17,000,000 packages not weighed, they paid the railroad companies in 1897 $19,327,000, which is less than six-tenths of a cent per pound, while the rate paid by the Government for the transportation of mail matter in 1897, according to Superintendent White's testimony, was 6.58 cents per pound. Think of it; more than ten times as much! The Government of the United States paid for the transportation of mails more than ten times as much as the express companies paid for the same period. And yet we hear it stated that the express business pays the railways a profit; that the railways make money out of the express companies, and that they lose money on the transportation of the mail for the Government.

Mr. LOUD. Now, will the gentleman permit me right there?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LOUD. I know the gentleman would rather be right than to win. The figures that the gentleman is using and commenting upon are wholly incorrect. The rate that is given there for the cost of transportation of the mail was the total cost of transportation and not the transportation upon railways, which many people confounded, and those figures have been proven absolutely false. They are a year or two out of date.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Yet they are incorporated in the report of this postal commission.

Mr. LOUD. So is a lot more rot, permit me to say. Nine-tenths of it is rot and has no bearing upon the case.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. That is the way my friend gets over the testimony of Professor Adams. He says that it is rot and that it is untrue.

Mr. LOUD. Oh, no.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. And that he does not know what he is talking about. I frankly say to the committee that I do not know; but I do know that there is a different idea presented in the report of this postal commission by gentlemen for whom the commission vouch, whether they be correct or not. The report is here; and in that connection I join my friend from California [Mr. LOUD] in the request that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], if he be here, will withdraw the point of order that he has raised on this question and let the House vote upon it. I think the Representatives of the American people have a right to vote upon the question and to say by their votes whether the compensation that was fixed and established nearly thirty years ago for transporting the mails of this Government is just and fair to the Government and to the railways themselves.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I would not if I could—and indeed, I could not if I would—take from the railway companies of this country one farthing which is justly due to them or to which they are entitled under the law for transporting the mails. I believe that Congress should act in a way that is just and fair, both to the people and to the railways of this country; and, as suggested by my friend from California [Mr. LOUD], never was there a better time presented than right now to have the question decided by the American people through their representatives on the floor of this House. So far as the suggestions that I have read from this report being rot and being entitled to no consideration, I know nothing about that.

I find these things here in the report of the postal commission. I take it that these men are honorable gentlemen, and being honorable men, if their position be correct, the position of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] is absolutely wrong. There is no escape from it, absolutely none. Which is correct; which is incorrect? I do not assume the province of determining; but I believe, sir, that the Representatives of the American people on the floor of this House should have the privilege of saying by their voice and by their vote which one is correct and which one is incorrect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this discussion has progressed for a long time, and I propose now to discuss what, in my judgment, is one of the main issues before this House, which is the subsidy proposed to be voted in this bill to certain railway companies going south from New York.

I do not know how other gentlemen may feel on this matter. So far as I am concerned, I have been educated in that school of politics which taught me to oppose all such legislation. "Equal and exact justice to all, special privileges to none," has always been my political creed in that respect. Gentlemen talk about this Southern subsidy. Why, to hear them talk, one would think that the South was a fawning, crouching sycophant here before the American Congress ready to "bend the pregnant hinges of the knee, that a 'subsidy' might follow fawning." I repel the insinuation, and I believe this afternoon that if it was submitted to the people of the Southern States they would with practical unanimity express their opposition, if not contempt, for such an idea as that.

I am opposed to it on principle. We want no subsidy. The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] on yesterday referred to the fact that it would amount to expediting the mails through Texas and over Texas roads. Speaking for that magnificent Commonwealth to-day, I say to this House that neither the railways of Texas nor the people of Texas want the Government of the United States to vote any gratuity or to make them any donation of this character. We are not built that way. Who is it that is clamoring for this subsidy? Gentlemen, let me refer you to it one moment. Some of the railroads want it, and some of them want it very bad. Let me read to this House, and to my Democratic brethren on the floor of this House, the names of those railways that are coming to you and having resolutions of boards of trade and resolutions of legislatures of States sent to you asking that you stultify yourselves as Democrats and vote for a subsidy for certain lines of roads.

Who are these that are so clamorous for this subsidy? Well, let me read the list of them to you. The Pennsylvania Railroad! Well, that is a poor, measly corporation, that really needs the fostering care of the Government to sustain it in these days and times! [Laughter.] The Pennsylvania Railway Company, which heads the list. Who is next? It runs from New York to Philadelphia. From Philadelphia to Washington—that is the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railway. As suggested yesterday here in debate, simply another name for the Pennsylvania Railroad. From Washington to Danville, Va., the Southern Railway. From Danville to Atlanta, the Southern Railway. From Atlanta to Westpoint, Ga., the Westpoint and Atlanta Railway. From Westpoint to Montgomery, Ala., the Western Railway Company of Alabama. From Montgomery to New Orleans, the Louisville and Nashville Railway. It seems to me I have heard of that last railway before. I think the gentlemen on the floor of this House from the State of Kentucky can bear testimony to the fact that that railroad has been in politics, so to speak, to its eyes in that State; and yet they come here as a mendicant before this Congress asking for an absolute bonus and absolute gratuity.

Mr. QUARLES. What is the amount of subsidy to be granted to each railroad?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I have not that in mind. I have got the amount of the whole.

Mr. GAINES. I would like to ask my friend a question, if it is not too much trouble to him. You have read the names of these great railroads which you say are asking for this subsidy. I was laboring under the impression—and I think that it was stated as a fact in the debate here yesterday—that the railroads did not want it; and as no people have been before the Post-Office Committee the people do not want it. On this question of subsidy, when the matter was under debate yesterday on page 2165, this colloquy occurred:

Mr. GAINES. Have any "people"—a great multitude, a half dozen, or even one—come before the Post-Office Committee asking for this subsidy?

Mr. BROMWELL. We have never had anybody appear before the committee to advocate it.

Now, then, if no one has been before the committee to ask for it, how are we to know or say anyone wants it—railroad or people? We have had no letters from any of them.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I will not violate any of the proprieties of the committee room. If the gentleman from Tennessee was a member of the Post-Office Committee, he would know very well without asking the question. So much for that. I hope I will not have anything to say upon what transpired in the committee on this or any other matter. It is not proper.

Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may say that for twenty years there has been no more animated discussion on the floor of Congress than has been going on for the past three or four weeks at the other end of this building—that discussion over the ship-subsidy bill. And in my judgment the position taken by the distinguished Democratic Senators in that body but emphasizes and sets out strongly the position of the Democratic party of this country on all such legislation.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, without any intention of becoming personal or offensive, that the Democrat who can vote for this subsidy now before the House for expediting the mails from New York to New Orleans ought not to raise objection to anybody's voting for the ship-subsidy bill when it comes before this House.

Now, I stand here in my place and I say to my Democratic brethren to-day that in my judgment the ship-subsidy bill is more defensible before the American people than is the subsidy proposed to be voted for this fast mail, as they term it. How much has the Government paid last year to these identical railroads for transporting the mail? They paid $1,720,446.97 under the law. Now, not satisfied with what the law gives them, we hear upon the floor of this House the suggestions coming from Democrats here that we ought in addition to give them an absolute donation, a subsidy, of nearly $200,000 more. For what? Does it expedite the mail?

I will refer to the testimony of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General in that regard in a moment. Now, this train, Mr. Chairman, known as No. 35, leaves New York. Another train—not a subsidized train—leaves there a little while before, bringing all the mail from New York south that is necessary to come at that time; and that train—not the subsidized train—reaches Danville, Va., thirty minutes sooner than the subsidized train does, and yet gentlemen suggest that this House should give that train a subsidy for expediting the mail.

Mr. ATWATER. May I interrupt the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. ATWATER. How much earlier does the subsidized train, No. 35, reach New Orleans than the train that is not subsidized?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I can not tell just at this moment. I have the figures with me, but I can not put my hand on them.

Mr. GAINES. I have it here. No. 35 gets there in forty hours and forty minutes, and No. 37 gets there in forty hours and fifty-five minutes?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Yes; a little over fifteen minutes.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. But they are both subsidized?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. No; No. 35 is a subsidized train and the other is not. The difference between these trains in reaching New Orleans is a little over fifteen minutes.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman from Texas will pardon me, General Shallenberger says, on page 455 of the report, that train 37 is not a special-facility train.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. No; there is no contention made that it is. It is expressly stated that No. 37 is not subsidized.

Mr. SHATTUC. Will the gentleman from Texas allow me an interruption?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. SHATTUC. Do they run the extra train especially for the mail?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. No.

Mr. SHATTUC. How near do they run together?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The train not subsidized reaches Danville, Va., thirty minutes ahead of the one that is subsidized.

Mr. SHATTUC. Do you think the business of the road justifies running two passenger trains as near together as that?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I am not prepared to say about that, for I do not know.

Mr. SHATTUC. Is it not evident that they run the second train in order to carry the mail?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Not at all, because the other carries the mail also.

Mr. SHATTUC. Then why could not they run them together?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. If they run them together, they could not get a subsidy for both, and a subsidy is what they are after.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does the gentleman believe that the passenger business for five months out of the year between the South and the North justifies running that equipment?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Well, the gentleman from Ohio asked the same question yesterday of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS]. I want to say this, that there is no section of our common country to-day that is prospering more, that is in a more prosperous condition, than the South. Its waste places are being built up and have been built up, industries are multiplying throughout the length and breadth of the country, and while it may not pay them at this time, I venture to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that it will pay as well as trains that run West.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the business ordinarily between the East and the West equalizes itself, and that the winter is the poorest season they have? The business of the South goes one way one season and back the other, but in the summer time you have no other travel in either direction, and it is purely commercial; and the commercial transactions are mainly between Chicago and the South rather than between New York and the South. I want to say to the gentleman that I have no interest in this matter except to get at the facts; but as between Cincinnati and the South and many other sections of the country, in the summer they take off the train. They do that on the line between Jacksonville and Tampa. Now, these roads would undoubtedly reduce the train service between this section and the South if they depended on the Southern business for the support of the trains, because the commercial business between the South and East is not enough to keep up the service.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Oh, we can find the same state of affairs existing between other sections of the country. So far as I am concerned, if Congress votes a subsidy to one road it ought to vote a subsidy to all roads.

Mr. SHATTUC. One other question and I am done. If you ask a road to perform a service which it would not otherwise perform, ought the road not to be paid for it?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. They would have to run trains anyway or forfeit their charter.

Mr. SHATTUC. They would not have to run trains an hour apart.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. No; but that matter could be arranged between the railway and the Post-Office Department. The train could leave New York, as it does, without any special subsidy. I will state to the gentleman that in the report here the Second Assistant Postmaster-General says such a subsidy was withdrawn from the railway that runs into Florida, which once had it, and it was said that the mails would not be expedited by reason of the subsidy being withdrawn. Now, he states that the fact that the subsidy was withdrawn has not retarded the mail over the road one minute—that is the Atlantic Coast Line—that it has not retarded the mails one minute, and he gives it as his opinion that if this subsidy is withdrawn from the Southern road from New York to New Orleans, it will not retard the mails one minute.

If he is right, Mr. Chairman, and I submit to the House now in a spirit of frankness and candor, who ought to know better than the Post-Office Department of this Government? Who ought to know? If he be right, no man, I care not who he may be, can find a defense for voting this subsidy on the American people.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I desire to ask the gentleman whether in all the Post-Office appropriation bills for years there has not been an appropriation of this kind, coupled with a condition that it should not be expended except when considered necessary by the Post-Office Department? And I would like to ask this other question: That appropriation being in these bills, and the discretion as to its expenditure being largely with the Postmaster-General, has he not on all occasions paid out the appropriation for the purposes indicated in the bill?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I am glad the gentleman from Louisiana has asked me that question, because, speaking as I do, extemporaneously, without notes, I might have forgotten it. Let me remind the gentleman from Louisiana of this fact: While a provision of that kind has been incorporated in this bill, as it has in all bills of similar character during past years, I ask whether it is right for the Congress of the United States to seek to shift the responsibility in matters of this kind upon the administrative arm of this Government? Is the gentleman willing to do that?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. The gentleman from Texas is not answering my question. He propounds another. I asked him whether, in the discretion of the Postmaster-General, this appropriation has not been considered necessary to the efficiency of the service?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. In answer to the gentleman, I will state that it has not been, and to establish this position I refer to the testimony before the postal commission. But the Post-Office Deparment has held that if Congress did not want to see the money expended in this direction it ought to withhold this subsidy to these railways and not leave it to the Post-Office Department to decide this question. In other words, the question is, Should not the American Congress assume the responsibility, meet the issue fairly as men, and not attempt to shirk it—not attempt to throw it on the shoulders of any administrative officer? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] has at hand the testimony before the postal commission, and I ask him to read the passage to which I refer.

Mr. GAINES. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, when before the postal commission, was asked the same question, substantially, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] has just put to the gentleman from Texas. I read from the report:

Mr. MOODY. Is not the matter discretionary with the Department, even after Congress makes the appropriation?

A. Well, the Department would have the power to withhold it, but, having recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding it, the Department is bound to assume that Congress desires the appropriation to be expended so long as it is made.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. That is substantially what I have stated.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. That is merely dodging the issue. The fact is that Congress does make these appropriations, and a discretion is lodged with the executive officer as to the propriety of the expenditure. The gentleman is aware of the fact that it is impossible for Congress to give attention to these details. A discretion in such matters must be lodged in some Executive Department somewhere. This is frequently done upon a great many questions. The discretion is so lodged by Congress in this case out of abundance of caution, and the action which has been taken by successive Postmasters-General in deciding this question shows beyond controversy that the appropriation is necessary to the efficiency of the service. The gentleman can not get away from that point.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The gentleman certainly misunderstood me if he thought for one moment that I contended that this matter has not heretofore been left to the discretion of the Post-Office Department. I stated that it was so left, but that I believed it to be the duty of the members of this House to shirk no responsibility. We should speak to the Post-Office Department in words that can not be misunderstood. We should vote out this appropriation and let it be known that the American Congress asserts itself—shirks no responsibility in this regard.

Mr. GAINES. The Department pays out the money because Congress appropriates it.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Of course; that is natural. Here is an appropriation made by competent authority. The Post-Office Department has held that it is the express legislative will of Congress that this appropriation should be made.

Mr. LANHAM. And the making of the appropriation is an indorsement by Congress of the policy of such expenditure.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Yes, as suggested by my colleague, the appropriation is an indorsement by Congress of the policy of subsidizing these various railways.

Mr. GAINES. The Department has protested again and again against such appropriations.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one line of railway situated just west of Kansas City. Where is my good friend from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD].

Mr. COWHERD. I am right here, waiting to hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I am glad the gentleman is here. Now, in this case we have another poor, insignificant, oppressed, broken-down corporation—the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe. Perhaps gentlemen who live west of the Mississippi know something of this poor corporation. But in justice to this corporation I want to say that the president of this company in the hearings before the postal commission expressly declares that his road does not want the measly $25,000 proposed to be given under this bill.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. COWHERD. Did the president or any other officer of that road ever say that they would give the service they now give without the $25,000?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Oh, no; I will speak of that.

Mr. COWHERD. Is it not a fact that by reason of this appropriation they put on an extra train, so that all the arguments that gentlemen have made against this subsidy have no application to this proposition?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. They repudiate the $25,000 proposed to be given to them in so far as they can repudiate a matter of that kind. But the American Congress, through its Representatives on the floor of this House, takes that railway by the lapel of its coat, so to speak, and absolutely forces into its coffers this $25,000 of the people's money. And gentlemen here say that it is right.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it may be so over in Missouri. That is the way they are doing now. But what are the exact facts? Let us take a little time to compare these things. These hearings show that there exists a condition of affairs there that is worthy of some attention on our part. The hearings show that the special mail service expedites, what? Certain newspapers published in the city of Kansas City, Mo., and practically nothing else.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the House will pardon me, I will tell them the difference between the Missouri way of doing business and the Texas way of doing business—at least in this particular line.

Here is a subsidy, sir, that is given, without any question under the facts, for the sole purpose of expediting the delivery of certain newspapers published in Kansas City.

In my own city of Dallas there is published one of the greatest newspapers in the whole Southwestern section of our common country—the Dallas Morning News. For twelve years or more the proprietors of that publication have chartered their own railway trains and paid for them out of their own pockets for the sole purpose of expediting their early morning publication to the northern section of the State as well as to the western section. No man ever heard a man from Texas—and especially the publisher of a newspaper in that great State—come knuckling down before the American Congress and asking to have a railroad subsidized for the sole purpose of expediting the sending out of their publications to their subscribers. As before said, the proprietors of the Dallas Morning News have been doing this for twelve years or more at their own expense, and every colleague of mine upon the floor of this House knows that I speak the truth. That is the difference, Mr. Chairman, between the conditions prevailing in Missouri and in Texas.

I say, Mr. Chairman, in all kindness, and with due consideration, but with all seriousness, as well as with common frankness to the membership of this House, that such things ought not to be allowed in the American Congress, and I hope they will not be.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will allow me, I think the New York papers and San Francisco papers also furnish their own trains.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I am informed by the gentleman from Tennessee that the great newspapers in New York and Chicago, and, I suppose, in San Francisco as well, just as the newspaper in Dallas does, pay for their own special mail service.

Mr. GAINES. That is according to the report of the special commission.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. That may be. But we do not come before the Congress of the United States and ask them to do violence to the traditions and to the Constitution of the country by granting special privileges to our people. We do not ask it. We do not want it.

Mr. Chairman, I have now consumed more time of the House than I intended to do when I began my remarks. I will state that I have some data to be found in the second volume of the report of the postal commission, growing out of the testimony of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General and others, which I would like to incorporate as addenda to my remarks, if the House will give me that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to incorporate with his remarks certain portions of the report. Is there objection to the gentleman so doing?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads is anxious to have this bill passed, if possible, this afternoon. Hence it is that I, knowing this fact, am willing and anxious to join hands with my friend in that matter. Having very much cut the remarks which I intended to make, I shall proceed as rapidly as possible to a conclusion. There is only one other point upon which I desire to address myself and I shall be as brief as possible.

I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] on yesterday, while he was on the floor, a question——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have permission to proceed.

Mr. LOUD. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question, but I do not rise for the purpose of making objection to the request. I hope the gentleman will have additional time.

But there are now pending on the Calendar the diplomatic bill, the Army bill, the sundry civil bill, and the deficiency bill immediately to follow. This is the 6th day of February, and all of these bills have to pass through the House, have to go to the Senate,

have to be examined by the committee there, amended, and afterwards sent to the committee of conference, and it will take considerable time to dispose of them. They ought to become law in a very short time if we are to avoid an extraordinary session of Congress. They certainly must become law before the 4th of March or else that will be inevitable.

Mr. LOUD. I understand the gentleman from Texas will not occupy more than five minutes more, and I will state to my friend from Illinois that I will try to close the general debate immediately after that.

Mr. CANNON. That is all I wanted to ascertain. Of course, the gentleman from Texas knows that I have no objection to his continuing his remarks.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I shall not abuse the courtesy of the House——

Mr. CANNON. My friend understands that I was not objecting to his talking.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I understand that, of course, Mr. Chairman. But there is only one matter that I wanted to talk about before taking my seat, and when I speak of that I know that the preconceived judgment and opinion of the House is against me. But that does not deter me or will ever deter me from pressing my convictions and honest judgment upon the House. I shall always feel at liberty, notwithstanding such a conviction as that, to express my honest judgment on all public questions with which I may have to deal as long as I am a member of this body.

And as I started to say a moment ago, I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] yesterday if he did not believe that it would be economy on the part of the Government to own its own postal cars and pay the railways for hauling them over their various lines. He is always frank and candid, and he replied that he could not give his opinion either for or against such a proposition. He was inclined to the opinion that it would be best not to do it, but expressed no positive opinion upon that subject.

Mr. Chairman, there are 600 postal cars in operation in the United States to-day. According to the Post-Office Department, these cost from $2,500 to $5,000 each. I put it at $4,000 each, on an average. The 600 cars, at an average of $4,000 a car, which is a high average, would cost $2,400,000, original cost.

The Government pays to these railways, in addition to what they are entitled to under the law for carrying the mail, the sum of $4,816,000 a year under this bill for the use of these cars. In other words, the Government pays $16,000 more than 100 per cent over the cost of all the cars each year. As I suggested to the gentleman yesterday, the Government owns its post-offices throughout the length and breadth of this country. A railway mail car is nothing but a transient post-office, subject to the same regulations, subject to the same laws in every regard, as are the post-offices located in buildings on the land. If the figures that I give be correct, and no man can doubt them or deny them, I submit to the membership of this House, in a spirit of economy and fairness and of justice to the people of this country, ought not the Government of the United States to own its transient post-offices?

I made that suggestion two years ago upon the floor of this House, and some gentleman suggested "Populism." I have never been accused of being a Populist, any more than I have of being a Republican, but Populists can advance good ideas and good propositions for the well-being of the Government, as well as Democrats or Republicans, and vice versa. And the fact that a Populist may have thought that that was a good policy would not deter me one moment from espousing such a proposition if I honestly believed it was just and right to the people.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Can the gentleman state how long these postal cars last when in use?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Well, the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General says that some of them may last five or six or seven years. There is no definite time at all. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have concluded all that I have to say, and I sincerely thank the House for its courtesy in extending my time, as well as for its courtesy in listening so kindly to the suggestions that I have made. Before I sit down I call upon the membership of this House, irrespective of political party, whether you be Republicans or whether you be Democrats, to come up to the proposition that I have discussed in my feeble way and to say by your votes, "We do not propose to subsidize any man or any corporation for doing a business that we already pay them well for doing." [Loud applause.]

ADDENDA.

Testimony of W. S. Shallenberger, Second Assistant Postmaster-General, given before the Commission to Investigate the Postal Service.

Q. Were you Second Assistant Postmaster-General when the fast mail train was put on from Kansas City to Newton, Kans.?

A. I was.

Q. Did you have anything to do with the designation of the rate upon which that—the amount being somewhere in the vicinity of $25,000—or I will state the unexpended balance of an appropriation of one hundred and ninety-six thousand and odd hundreds of dollars, was appropriated for trunk lines; and I will ask you if you had anything to do with the designation of the route upon which that should be used?

A. I had not. I accepted a statement of the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service that in conference with the then Postmaster-General it was decided that it should be so appropriated. The late Postmaster-General Gary confirmed the same in accordance with an understood discretionary act of his predecessor just before his retirement.

Q. And the language of that provision was that the unexpended balance of this money that had been appropriated to the line from New York to New Orleans might, in the discretion of the Postmaster-General, be expended on trunk lines. Now I will ask you if, after consultation, it was concluded that the line from Kansas City to Newton, Kans., was the line from which the Government would receive the greatest benefit in the expenditure of this amount of money?

A. I can not say as to what led up to the conclusion reached by the officers of the Department, as it preceded the time when I took control of the office.

Q. Have you understood that this amount of money was expended upon this road because it was an apparent understanding upon the part of certain members of one or both bodies of Congress that that was the place where the money should be expended? Do you know anything about that?

A. I was informed that it was in accordance with the decision of the then Postmaster-General, reached after conference with parties interested in the service.

Q. Well, who do you mean by "those parties interested in the service?"

A. Well, I am not prepared to say how many that would include. All parties would be interested in the service who would be in any way favored by the expedition of mail out of Kansas City to Newton, Kans., and through to the South and Southwest.

Q. Well, is it the general understanding in the Department that that money was devoted to that line of road because of the fact that representations were made to the Department that that was the general understanding in Congress that the money was to be used upon that line? Do you know anything about that?

A. I do not know as to what the conferences were.

Q. Do you know anything about whether that is the understanding in the Department now, that that was the purpose?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you believe that the Government receives greater returns from the expenditure of the money upon this road than it would receive had it been devoted to any other road in the United States?

A. I do not believe that it receives any greater returns from expenditures on this road than it would on any other in the country.

Q. Do you believe that it receives as great advantages as it would have received from some others?

A. I am not prepared at this moment positively to say so, but my impression is that there are roads in the country over which greater returns would have been received.

Q. A greater amount of mail could have been expedited, and mail could have been expedited to a greater extent than it is upon this road?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, I find here upon this table that you have submitted that train 115 is the fast mail train, is it not, from Kansas City?

A. Train 115, leaving at 2.30 a. m.; that is the train which receives special pay.

Q. Do you know the distance from Kansas City to Newton?

A. I can not state at this moment. It is in our published reports.

Q. Well, let that go; it is immaterial. Do you know what that train is composed of—how many cars?

A. I do not.

Q. There is a regular train leaving Kansas City at 9.30 p. m., with which this train subsequently connects at Newton. As a man familiar with the methods in vogue in large cities, would you say that there was any valuable accumulation of mail between the hours of 9.20 p. m. and 2.30 a. m. that should receive a subsidy from the Government in order that it might be expedited?

A. I would say that there is no accumulation of mail anywhere between those hours in any city that I think, under present conditions, would justify the Government in paying a subsidy to a railroad for carrying.

Q. This fast mail train does not expedite any Eastern mail, does it?

A. By making connections, I think, for mails to Texas possibly it does, but I am not prepared to say as to that. It is one of the details of administration with which I am not familiar.

Q. This fast mail train connects at Newton at 7.10 in the morning with the regular Santa Fe train from Chicago, does it not?

A. I think that is so, but I am not prepared to say.

Q. Have you kept any account of the increase of mail going over that road since the establishment of this train, as to whether it would warrant the additional expenditure of $25,000?

A. We have not kept an accurate account of the increase of mail with reference to determining that fact, but we assume in the Department that there is no such accumulation of mail, and I have requested recently, since this investigation was instituted, that the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service prepare me a statement throwing light on the subject of your inquiries. That statement was prepared by Alexander Grant, at the time Acting General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service.

Q. You might read that, if it is not too long.

A. Very well, I will read it. [Reads.]

"There seems to be no justification for the special-facility payments, judging from results obtained. If we treated all lines on this basis, then we should pay the Northwestern Railroad for running an early morning train from Chicago (at 2.45 a. m.) to Fort Howard, Wis.; also for Cedar Rapids from Chicago. We should also pay the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a train leaving Chicago at the same hour and running to Marion and the West; also the same road for a train from Chicago to Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for a train leaving Chicago at 3 a. m. and running to Burlington and Omaha; the Monon Route for a train leaving Chicago in the early morning for Cincinnati. The Illinois Central also has a train leaving Chicago about the same hour, as has also the Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago, and the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern. The Missouri Pacific runs a train out of St. Louis at 3 o'clock in the morning; so does the Iron Mountain; also the Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern; the Pennsylvania for Indianapolis and the East, and the Wabash for Toledo and the East.

"The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern also runs a train out of Cincinnati about the same hour. The Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton also has a train out of Cincinnati at about 3 a. m. The Michigan Central runs a train out of Detroit about the same hour; so does the Flint and Pere Marquette.

"From this it can be seen that the railroad companies can be induced to run trains at an hour not calculated to draw passenger traffic, but mainly for the interest of the mails. All of these early morning trains have been secured without special-facilities payments.

"In 1893 the Department discontinued the special-facilities appropriation for the Atlantic Coast Line from New York, by way of Washington, Wilmington, Charleston, and Savannah, to Jacksonville; but Congress, without

any recommendation from the Department, made an appropriation for improved facilities between New York and New Orleans, by way of Philadelphia, Washington, Charlotte, Montgomery, and Mobile. There is no question but that the service was improved between New York and New Orleans, but whether the improvements could not have been secured without the payment of special-facilities money is an open question. We can only judge by what has been accomplished in other directions.

"In 1894 the Department secured a special fast mail on the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railroad, leaving St. Louis at 3 a. m. and running on fast time to Texarkana, making connection with the Texas and Pacific, and thus reaching nearly all of the principal points in Texas. At that time the company was running two through trains daily, one leaving St. Louis at 10 a. m. and arriving at Texarkana at 8.15 a. m. the next day, the other leaving St. Louis at 8.15 p. m. and reaching Texarkana at 1.20 p. m. the next day. The new fast mail train left St. Louis at 3.05 a. m. and arrived at Texarkana at 9.30 p. m., and was clearly additional service. The speed of this train is about 30 miles an hour, including stops.

"In 1890 the Illinois Central, at the solicitation of the Department, put on a train out of Chicago, leaving at 3 a. m. and running through to New Orleans. This train was in addition to service then operated, and was secured solely on account of the additional business which would accrue from the improved facilities. This train makes a speed of 36 miles an hour, including stops, from Chicago to Cairo, and 30 miles an hour, including stops, from Cairo to New Orleans.

"As an evidence that special facilities money is not necessary to enable railroads in the South to operate fast trains, I would cite the fact that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad maintains two through trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, in addition to trains for local service. These through trains make a speed of 33 and 28 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

"The Queen and Crescent system, which competes with the Louisville and Nashville between Cincinnati and New Orleans, also runs two trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, which are run at a speed of 31 and 32 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

"The Florida Central and Peninsular, which competes with the Atlantic Coast Line for Florida business, runs two through trains a day between Columbia and Jacksonville. The Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its train service in consequence of the withdrawal of the special facilities payments, but still maintains two through trains daily, in connection with the Pennsylvania and other lines interested, between New York and Jacksonville, and during the heavy business in the winter time puts on a special fast train in addition."

I would state that this was prepared by Mr. Grant for the use of the committee, as he informed me, and I would ask that it be filed as a part of my remarks.

Q. Isn't the tendency where we give subsidies to one line for the others to ask or expect the same kind of payment?

A. The tendency is to produce a discontent and dissatisfaction, if not hesitancy, on the part of other roads in giving us similar service without a special appropriation. I will say that that has not interfered to prevent our increasing special mail facilities from east to west. We have been able, as this table indicates, in almost every instance to secure an early morning train leading out of the great cities, perhaps because it is easier for us to secure the mail service that we wish over roads that carry an immense volume of other traffic. Therefore we should find it difficult to secure through the southern section of the country as great speed, perhaps, as we are securing in the North; for instance, to Atlanta, and between Atlanta and New Orleans. But, as I have said in my testimony before, looking the country over, and knowing the dissatisfaction it creates, we are prepared to say that we think we can secure in general better service without the special facilities appropriation.

Mr. MOODY. Isn't the matter discretionary with the Department, even after Congress makes the appropriation?

A. Well, the Department would have the power to withhold it, but, having recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding it, the Department is bound to assume that Congress desires the appropriation to be expended so long as it is made.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I don't quite see why you should say that you could get better service without it than with it.

A. In this sense: That we could give due recognition to other roads, parallel roads especially, and divert from one to the other the volume of mail that we have to be transported, securing competition which we do not now find it possible to get.

Mr. CHANDLER. Competition in speed?

A. Yes.

Mr. CATCHINGS. What is the speed made on the Southern Railroad? That is a road that is subsidized, is it not?

A. I am not prepared to give exact figures.

Mr. CHANDLER. Just at this point let me ask him to explain on what principle they pay this out.

Mr. LOUD. I will be through with this Kansas City route in just a moment. There is only one other question that I desire to ask. Does this fast mail train from Kansas City to Newton, in your opinion, expedite the mail, other than newspapers—Kansas City newspapers—to any extent?

A. Not to any material extent. It expedites the mail that is collected between the hours of 9.20 p. m. and 2.30 in the morning.

Q. Which, as a rule, is a very limited amount of matter?

A. It is limited except in a city like Washington. We find our midnight collection in Washington is very large.

Q. What do you mean by your midnight collection—that arriving in the city at midnight?

A. Local mail originating in the city and collected at the hour of midnight for transmission to other points.

Q. The great bulk of your collections would arrive after the hour of 1.30; or are you familiar with that?

A. I am not sufficiently familiar, but in large cities, where very late collections are made, I should say that the heaviest night collections would be made before midnight.

Q. I am not familiar with the details, but the evidence shows us directly to the contrary—the evidence that we have taken before. The collectors go out at 11 at night, but between 7 o'clock in the evening and 10 o'clock at night there is a very limited amount of mail put in.

A. I understand by midnight collection a collection that has been made about 12 o'clock. The collector may start at 11 and return at 1 o'clock, but it is what is called a midnight collection.

Q. Is train 35 on the New York and New Orleans route the subsidized train?

A. Train 35, leaving at 4.30 a m.

Q. Leaving New York at 4.30 a. m. What is train 37, leaving at 4.30 p. m.?

A. It is a fast mail train.

Q. Does that train receive any portion of the subsidy?

A. It does not.

Q. Are these trains New Orleans trains?

A. These are through trains to New Orleans—train 35 and train 37.

Q. Is there not a New Orleans train leaving New York about 12.30 at night?

A. Covering the questions which I assume it is the desire of the committee to ask, I will file as a part of my remarks a statement in reference to these special-facility trains prepared by Mr. Alexander Grant, assistant general superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, at the request of the committee, as follows [reads]:

"The value of the special-facilities train 35, leaving New York at 4.20 a. m., has been lessened somewhat by the establishment of the early newspaper train out of New York (77), which leaves at 2.10 a. m., taking the bulk of the New York papers and arriving at Washington at 7.30 a. m., in time to connect train No. 9 on the Southern, leaving at 8.12 a. m., which carries a postal car to Danville, Va., and pouches ahead to points between Danville and Charlotte, N. C., by closed mails. This train arrives at Charlotte at 9.35 p. m., twenty-five minutes ahead of special-facilities train 35. Train 23, leaving New York at 9 p. m., takes the bulk of the business mail, reaching Washington at 4.05 a. m. This train, however, has no direct connection over the Southern road to the South. Another train leaves New York with express mail at 12.15 a. m., reaching Washington at 7.40 a. m. You will see, therefore, that these three trains leave but little New York mail for the special-facilties train 35, leaving New York at 4.20 a. m. It gets, however, the entire New England mail, leaving Boston, Mass., at 7 p. m., and arriving in New York in time to connect train 35 (train 27 from New York).

"As for train 37, leaving New York at 4.30 p. m., we have a train leaving New York at 3.30 p. m., arriving in Washington at 8.35 p. m., as against 10.20 p. m., the arrival time of train 37 (train 63 from New York). This 3.30 train could, of course, take the bulk of the New York mail forwarded on train 37, and its running time is forty-five minutes less. It would, however, miss all the New England mail which leaves Boston at 8.30 a. m., reaching New York at 3.30 p. m., in time to catch train 37. South of Washington there is but one through train at night; that is train 37.

"North bound there are no trains from New Orleans and Atlanta to compete with trains 36 and 38. From Atlanta train 12 leaves at 8.50 a. m., with a postal car, running through to Danville, Va., where it arrives at 11.25 p. m., twenty-six minutes ahead of 38. All mails centering at Atlanta in the morning would naturally take this train for local points. The through mail is held for 38.

"From Danville, Va., we also have a train leaving at 6 a. m., running through to New York with direct connection, arriving at 9.30 p. m., making connection with night trains for New England."

I would say that this paper, having been prepared by Mr. Grant from office data, is, of course, official and authoritative, and to be preferred to any statement I could make from memory.

Q. I don't see the time—the hour of the arrival of these two trains at New Orleans. Of course it gives the hours that they take to go there.

A. Do you wish the speed?

Q. I don't care anything about the speed, but I wanted to get the hours at which these two trains arrive at New Orleans, to see if I could make out why the people of New Orleans were so specially interested in fast mail trains. Of course a train arriving in New Orleans at 8.10 p. m., its schedule time, and frequently late, could not benefit the people of New Orleans to any extent in the delivery of their mails—could not expedite it much above the train that arrives at 7.40 the next morning.

A. It might make connections at New Orleans for Texas and California and other points.

Q. This train that arrives at 7.40 a. m. is, however, the train that makes the direct connections, is it not, and that is the old schedule train that has been on the road for a number of years; is that not correct?

A. I could not say how long the train has been on the road. We have learned from these statements that it gets New England connection at New York.

Q. You don't know what the western connections are?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you think that this system of roads from New York to Washington comes within the purview of a thinly settled country and poor roads that ought to receive extra compensation from the Government for running a train?

A. They do not certainly come within the classification of poor roads, but they come within the classification of roads which are required to make up a through route and to adjust their schedule so as to accommodate other roads that desire to connect with them. I am informed that before the subsidy was first given Southern roads there were perhaps ten different roads between Washington and Tampa, Fla., each making its own schedule, and it was extremely difficult for the Department to make any arrangement whatever for through mail service. When the special-facility fund was made applicable these roads came together and a through route was established.

Q. You always had one through route from New York to New Orleans, which was the regular passenger train leaving New York some time near midnight?

A. I am speaking of the early history of the special facilities for a through route to Florida. I am stating the then existing service as the reason that the roads between New York and Washington had to be consulted as well as the roads between Washington and Tampa.

Q. Without any disrespect, I personally don't care anything about the early history, because the conditions that instigated its establishment have ceased to exist entirely.

A. We believe also that those conditions have long since been outgrown, and that we now have through lines between nearly all important points in the country, so that we have found it possible to establish service entirely adequate.

Q. The early history of this train was that it was put on for the accommodation of Cuban mail, but the road which took that mail has ceased some years since to receive a subsidy, and it has been taken off bodily and moved to another road.

Mr. MOODY. I would like to ask a question on this statement, which I don't quite understand. This Atlanta subsidy is paid to what road, the Southern or the Pennsylvania, or to both?

A. Both, and several other roads. The roads are specifically named in annual reports.

Mr. LOUD. It is what is known as the Southern Railway System, is it not?

A. The roads receiving the special-facility appropriation are given on page 17 of the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General for the current year, 1898. They are as follows: New York to Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania Railroad; Philadelphia to Washington, the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad; Washington to Danville Junction, the Southern Railway; Danville to Atlanta, the Southern Railway; Atlanta to Westpoint, Ga., the Atlanta and West Point Railway; Westpoint to Montgomery, Ala., the Western Railway Company of Alabama; and Montgomery to New Orleans, the Louisville and Nashville.

Q. How much of that appropriation is paid to that group of roads?

A. $195,722.50, less the amount paid to one other road.

Q. Less the amount paid to the Kansas road. Now, in return for these special subsidies you get two trains that leave New York for the South, and two trains that leave and go northward?

A. Yes; we get what we regard as one special-facility train each way.

Q. In the memorandum which Mr. Grant makes train 35 is spoken of as

leaving New York at 4.20 a. m.; then train 37 leaves New York at 4.30 p. m. Is that latter one a special-facility train?

A. It is not.

Q. That would remain anyway if the subsidy were removed?

A. Presumably.

By Mr. LOUD:

Q. Did the train exist before the subsidy was paid?

A. Not with the speed that it now has.

Q. I question that, and unless you are positive about it I question it.

A. I think I am safe in saying that. However, I will say that within that time almost every other leading road has increased the speed of its trains. I think the speed of the Southern is greater than that of any other train South that we have quoted in these communications.

By Mr. MOODY:

Q. If you took off the special-facility train No. 35, which leaves New York at 4.35 a. m., you would lose the connection with the New England mail which arrives at New York in time to connect with that train?

A. We might have to seek some other special arrangement to insure connecting routes. I am not prepared to say that it would not be disastrous if that train should be taken off and nothing substituted for it; but we assume that if the special-facility fund were withdrawn the natural volume of traffic would justify on competing roads sufficient facilities for us to utilize.

Q. Don't misunderstand me. I don't think anything should be paid by way of subsidy for New England mail. On the contrary, I think it is an outrage to do it; but what would be the train that the New England mail would connect with if this train 35 was taken off?

A. That I could not answer. We would have to cast about for another connection. We would at once appeal to the other roads.

Q. Have you any idea that it would in the end make very much delay to that New England mail in reaching Philadelphia, Washington, and the South?

A. I think not, for the reason that there are two great competing lines which would be extremely anxious for the business that we could give them.

Q. I understand that the position of the Department is this, then, that if Congress insists upon wasting the public money by increasing the pay of these specially favored railroads the Department thinks it is bound to comply?

Mr. CATCHINGS. That is hardly a fair way to put it.

A. I would not say that this money is wasted, because it is a question as to whether the increased speed of trains and the number of trains that we have secured by reason of this extra compensation would be maintained or not were it withdrawn. That is an open question.

When the reduction of 10 per cent was made in the railroad pay, the fast mail trains were to be withdrawn from the New York Central, and we were compelled to make a recommendation—or rather the Department was constrained to make a recommendation at that time—that some special-facility funds should be allowed in order that it might secure the necessary mail facilities to the great West over the trunk lines. Long since we have ceased to pay any special appropriation to those lines, because traffic is so heavy and competition so active that we have no trouble in securing the very best mail service. Our position is that while it did not seem reasonable to expect these Southern roads when they put on these fast trains to do so without additional compensation, it does now seem reasonable that that special appropriation should not be required. The Department assumes now that it has sufficient competition over all great routes to secure what it needs without that.

Mr. FLEMING. Is it not true that since that subsidy was first instituted there has been a very large and expensive consolidation of railroad interests all through the South; that there are now larger systems to accommodate the business than there were at that time?

A. Yes; and by reason of that consolidation we are also getting a much cheaper rate per ton per mile than we did before.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I see that Mr. Andrews, in his statement on page 97 of this Senate investigation, states that these two trains run from New York to New Orleans, one in thirty-nine hours and ten minutes, and the other in forty-three hours and fifty-nine minutes; that one of them runs 35 miles an hour and the other 31.2 miles an hour. I should like to ask you if any other road from New York to New Orleans makes as good time as either one of those trains?

A. I do not know of any other.

Q. How much faster are both of these roads than any other that you know of?

A. I do not know of any other through route over that territory.

Q. Do you know of any other Southern road which makes as good time as these two fast trains?

A. I have just stated that I think they make a little better time than any other trains.

Q. Does the Louisville and Nashville make as good time going south?

A. I am not prepared to say without consulting schedules.

Q. I want to know if any Southern roads going from anywhere to New Orleans make as good time as these two fast trains?

A. I will refer to Mr. Grant's statement; I think he gives the time from Cincinnati to New Orleans. I am not prepared to say that any other road makes the same or equal schedule time, but I still say that I have no reason to doubt the continuance of the service with such connections as we might be able to make.

Mr. LOUD. You do not know what time other trains do make?

A. No; I do not.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Why do you say, then, that if these subsidized trains that you choose to call them—that if they were taken away that you could still have the mails carried as rapidly from New York to New Orleans?

A. For the reason that the immense volume of business which is arising between these two points, passenger and freight, requires roads entering New Orleans to compete with each other in the most rapid service possible, and we might therefore be able to avail ourselves of schedules equally good. We would have the discretion of throwing to one or the other of these competing systems a large volume of mail, the transportation of which we assume is profitable.

Q. Well, if the competition between passenger and freight is as keen as you describe it, why do not these other roads put on as good time also? They do not compete with these fast trains in point of time.

A. I do not know that they do not compete so nearly as to make it an open question——

Q. If the competition for freight and passenger business is so sharp, why do not these other roads make as good time as the Southern?

A. Because they may not have quite as short a haul; may not be able to make the same speed.

Q. Those conditions would still exist if you withdrew the subsidy. What I am trying to get is, How do you expect to have the same fast train if you take away the subsidy?

A. It may be that the special-facility trains would still have the same reason for maintaining a quick schedule for the passenger and freight traffic, so that we could avail ourselves of the commercial requirements between these two points and secure service that formerly we were not able to secure.

Q. Do you mean to say that prior to the subsidy system these trains over the Southern road outstripped the trains over all other roads to such an extent as to secure from them the freight and passenger business?

A. No; I think these trains have been developed since the period when the subsidy became available.

Mr. LOUD. Which is the subsidized train?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I do not think it matters; I am willing for you to put in any other you please.

Mr. LOUD. I make the statement that the trains made the same time before the subsidy was granted that they do now.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I will ask you that question, Did the unsubsidized trains make as fast time before the subsidy was granted as to the Southern road as they do now?

Mr. LOUD. I assert that they made the same time in December, 1892, that they make to-day.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Well, I am asking for information.

Mr. LOUD. And by reason of that fact they secured the passenger traffic; and they made that time to make connection with the Southern Pacific which goes to the West, leaving two hours after this train arrives in the morning at New Orleans.

Mr. CATCHINGS. There are a number of roads going West that make as good time as these Southern trains. But you do not know of any other train going South that makes as good time.

A. I am not prepared to say that any other train South makes as good time.

Q. Mr. Grant in this statement attempts to minimize the advantage of these fast trains—of this special-facility train No. 35, as he calls it. He speaks of a postal newspaper train going out of New York, leaving at 2.10 a. m., which he says takes the bulk of the papers arriving at Washington at 7.30 a. m., which he says connects with train No. 9, which carries a postal car to Danville and pouches ahead to points between Danville and Charlotte. Then he states that this train arrives at Charlotte at 9.35 p. m., twenty-five minutes ahead of special-facility train No. 35. Now, I would like to ask if that train that he has described so minutely is available at all for use of the mails from New England or that section of the country to points south of Charlotte. I mean that train that leaves at 2.10. He limits the description of the performance of that train to Charlotte. Now, I ask if that train would be available at all for Southern fast mails going from New England or from New York to points south of Charlotte?

A. I am not prepared to say as to that.

Q. You know it does not, because at that point the fast mail passes it; he states that himself.

A. I am unprepared to state anything in conflict with what has been given in that paper.

Q. You are prepared to state, if the fast mail overtakes it at Charlotte and goes on ahead of it, that this train that you describe would not be available for fast mail purposes. So that particular part of his statement does not state the question fairly.

Now we take train 23. That leaves New York at 9 p. m. He says that that takes the bulk of the business mail, leaving Washington at 4.05 a. m. But this train has, however, no direct connection over the Southern road to the South. Therefore, that train cuts a very small figure in this problem; so we will eliminate that.

Now, another train leaves New York at 12.15 a. m., reaching Washington at 7.40 a. m., and you will see, therefore, as he says in his statement, that these three trains leave but little New York mail for the special-facilities train No. 35, leaving New York at 4.20 a. m. As I have stated, that cuts no figure in the fast-mail trains, because, suppose those trains bring the mail to Washington and to Charlotte, they don't take the fast through mail, do they, by his own statement? One does not go farther than Charlotte—that is to say, it is broken at Charlotte—and the other he only describes as coming to Washington, without any connection.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask right there, might not that be an argument why these subsidized trains should be taken off from New York to Washington, or at least to Charlotte, to which about $40,000 or $50,000 of this money goes?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I am just taking up this statement because I want to get at exactly what is needed. He proceeds, as to train No. 37, leaving New York at 4.30 p. m., and says, "We have a train leaving New York at 3.30 p. m., arriving in Washington at 8.35 p. m. as against 10.20 p. m., the arrival time of train 37. This 3.30 train could, of course, take the bulk of the New York mail"—but he admits that that would miss all the New England mail. What would be the advantage, I will ask, in bringing that mail down from New York so that it would reach Washington at 8.35, instead of 10.20, on the fast train, if it could not leave there until the fast train goes out?

A. For the other connections, perhaps.

Q. It would not, so far as this fast-mail Southern route is concerned. So that train may be eliminated. Bringing it here and getting it here to Washington is of no advantage.

A. No advantage in that case, perhaps.

Q. Now that, I think, brings it down to this point, that when you come to through mails from New York to New Orleans you have got nothing but these two fast trains on the Southern roads, have you, that can take mail and carry it through?

A. No, sir; we rely upon those two trains for our through mails.

Q. And they go faster than any trains you know of anywhere in the South?

A. On that through route. There are sections in which the same speed is maintained on other trains.

Mr. MOODY. I understand your opinion is that you could get just as good service without the subsidies?

A. I say that we could get substantially just as good service on all sections of these routes. We could in general get what I regard as better service throughout the country on other roads.

Mr. LOUD. It is a fact, is it not, that you could deliver this mail that goes on the subsidized trains in the city of Charlotte on an unsubsidized train quicker than you now deliver it on a subsidized train; that is, in other words, there is no possible necessity for a subsidized train from New York to Charlotte for anything except the accumulation of mail in New York between 2.10 a. m. and 4.20 a. m.?

A. Well, I am not prepared to say what effect it might have upon any one train. We take some risk when we say that we hope to have equally good service if the facility appropriation were withdrawn. I do not know what effect it might have upon the railroad interests. We simply speak from our experience in other sections of the country over roads of like character where the traffic is equally great. Up to this time we have been able to secure, in many cases, equally good service. Now, we assume that in this section we would be able to secure satisfactory service, but it remains, as I say, an open question.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask if there is a train leaving Boston at 9 o'clock in the evening which reaches Washington in time to connect with this regular subsidized train which leaves here at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, which is an unsubsidized train?

A. That I have not examined, and I am not prepared from memory to say.

Mr. CHANDLER. The strongest argument that was made in Congress

against the Southern fast-mail appropriation was that by which they showed that other trains came in very near on the same time, perhaps an hour or an hour and a half later; therefore it was assumed that that subsidy did no good. The answer to that was made that these trains that almost equaled in speed the fast mail trains did it in order to carry passengers as rapidly as those trains did and to compete with them, and if the fast mail trains were not stimulated by a subsidy all the trains would run back several hours in speed throughout the South. Was that argument a good one or not? What trains would fall back in speed if one were not specially stimulated?

A. That would remain to be seen. Some might. We do not think so, but we might be deceived.

Q. You have stated the case very fairly. It is a matter of opinion. But is there any doubt at all that, having established this one fast mail route throughout the South to New Orleans, carrying passengers, all the other roads would try to make as good time as that so as to carry passengers into New Orleans at the same time?

A. Yes; that is likely.

Q. Now, if you dispense with this special fund and stimulus, there will only remain competition between the railroads, none of them being specially stimulated; and yet you don't think that would lessen the time for mail and passenger transportation?

A. Not to an extent that would seriously cripple our service.

Q. How much time would it lessen the service between Washington and New Orleans?

A. I am of the opinion that it need not lessen it appreciably.

Q. Would the mail train go just as fast?

A. We assume that it would, substantially.

Q. What is the principle upon which the Department spends this money to expedite the Southern mail, and to what line does it give the money?

A. To those lines which have the facilities, by reason of roadbed or shorter distances, to give us the very best possible service.

Q. Presumably you would aid that road which could make the quickest time, if it was not made?

A. Yes.

Q. You would not think of using money to stimulate the longest road?

A. Not at all.

Q. Is there any doubt that when you make a contract that you will pay them so much money on such a schedule of time all the other roads try to come as near that as they can?

A. That is reasonable.

Q. And yet you think that you can get just as good service and quick speed out of this best line, without this extra money, as you can with it, or substantially?

A. Substantially as good; but I do not say that we could secure just as good. I say, in view of the evils attending the system, that in looking the field over we think the general interests of the service would be subserved. The facts we base it upon are these: Comparing the schedule time of these trains with the schedule time of other trains in the South or North, we believe that we have just as efficient service on roads that are not subsidized.

Q. You assume that because Congress appropriates this money that you are bound to spend it, but you are not relieved of the duty of saying to a railroad company that they must lessen their time so much, under improved systems of railroading. You do get more speedy transportation of the mails than those railroads would otherwise give?

A. Yes; that is expected.

Q. Would not the time of all the other railroads striving to compete in the transportation of passengers be maintained; but how can you say, if you take the stimulus away, the time would fall back?

A. We can not say that it would positively.

Q. A mere matter of opinion?

A. We say this, that the same conditions confront us in other sections and lead us to believe that the railroads will accommodate us and make proper connections. We have been able in recent years, through the natural competition of traffic, to secure what we required in the way of good facilities.

Q. Then you do not think that the rapidity of trains is increased by the extra mail pay?

A. I would not say that. I think they have been increased, but I think there is now no justification for the Department paying the money to secure reasonable service.

Q. You understand that these systems have reached that point so that you can get just as good speed without the money as with it?

A. That is the idea.

Q. That is the departmental position, is it?

A. Yes.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Do you think that if these subsidies were withdrawn you could distribute these mails among these different roads so as to secure the competition?

A. Not unless the special-facility roads would say to us: "We want to give this up; we want to reduce our schedule time; we want to avail ourselves of the opportunity to give less service." Then we would say to the competing roads, "Now is your opportunity."

Q. A good many roads testified at Chicago that they did not make anything by carrying the Government mails. Some of them testified that they carried the mails at a dead loss—the Illinois Central Railroad, for instance. That would not be much of a stimulus, would it?

A. No; that would not be a stimulus, but we doubt that statement. We believe the railroads do profit by carrying the mails. We believe that the desire on the part of all the great lines for a large share of the mails is evidence that for one reason or another they find it profitable.

Adjourned at 1.40 p. m. without day.

Mr. LOUD. I should like to see now, Mr. Chairman, if we can not make some arrangement whereby we can close debate some time in the near future. I should like to ask if half an hour longer of general debate will be sufficient?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I should like to have a few minutes, but not that long.

Mr. LOUD. I should like to suggest also, if we could reach any agreement, if consent were given to print remarks upon this bill or upon this subject, if we can close the debate in half an hour, and possibly reach a vote finally on the bill to-day, as there is nothing in the bill to vote upon except substantially one contested item. How would half an hour do?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want a few minutes, but I do not want half an hour, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LOUD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that general debate on this bill close in half an hour.

Mr. SWANSON. How is that time to be divided?

Mr. LOUD. I do not want any of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I should like about fifteen minutes.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like about that much time, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] would like some time. The time to-day has been consumed in opposition to the proposition which I desire to speak in favor of.

Mr. LOUD. Then I will ask that general debate close with to-day's session, and that the time may be equally divided.

Mr. SWANSON. As I have already suggested, all the time to-day has been occupied on the other side. They have had four hours to-day.

Mr. LOUD. I did not take five minutes on this special-facility matter. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that general debate close with to-day's session, which will probably be half past 5, and that the time be equally divided between the two sides represented by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and myself.

Mr. SWANSON. After consultation with gentlemen around me, I suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi have ten minutes, and that the debate then close.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; I want fifteen minutes.

Mr. LOUD. I thought you were objecting to half an hour.

Mr. SWANSON. All right; we will take half an hour—fifteen minutes on a side.

Mr. LOUD. Well, you might as well take to-day.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CANNON). The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] asks that general debate close to-day, and his proposition is modified by the gentleman from Virginia that the debate close in ten minutes and that that ten minutes be given to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Is there objection?

Mr. HAY. I object.

Mr. SWANSON. The Chair misunderstood the gentleman. I said thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that debate close in thirty minutes.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand the proposition of the gentleman from California is that debate close with to-night's session, and that to-morrow we do nothing but vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Virginia asks that it close in a shorter time.

Mr. SWANSON. I said I had no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks that debate close with the session of to-day.

Mr. MANN. That is, general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes; general debate. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PAYNE. Move that the committee rise.

Mr. LOUD. No; I do not want to move that the committee rise. I think that debate had better run on to-day, and then we can make some arrangement whereby we will vote to-morrow at 1 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair refers to me, I desire to be recognized, and will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, reserving the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized and yields fifteen minutes of his time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that the appropriation contained in this bill for these special railway mail subsidies will not be voted by the House. I have, perhaps, district reasons for supporting the proposition to make this appropriation. Part of the subsidized line passes through my district, and I have received requests from various parties in the district to support this appropriation. I notably received from the Cotton Exchange of the city of Meridian, the largest town in my district and queen city of Mississippi, a request to support this appropriation, upon the ground that it would be of special benefit to a part of my district. Among the members of that body I count some of my best and truest friends, politically and personally.

I would feel inclined, therefore, to support it if I could do so in accordance with my ideas of fundamental general principles, and if, moreover, at the same time it seemed to me it would secure special facilities for that section of the country. I could not, however, vote for it, Mr. Chairman, even if it were proven to me that it did give a special benefit for a part of my constituency, at the expense of the general public, unless at the same time it seemed to me to be in accord with those general and fundamental principles that ought to be precious to every American citizen, and especially precious to Democrats, who have *contended* all the time, at any rate, in and out of season, that they were in favor of "special privileges to none and equal rights to all;" that they were

opposed to any legislation which obtained special benefits for a few at the expense of the American citizenship at large.

I want to sound here a note of alarm to Democrats, and Southern Democrats especially, upon the sort of precedent they are establishing here. I will give a chromo to any man who will find one single difference between the principle underlying this special subsidy appropriation and the principle underlying the ship subsidy bill, that we all pretend, at any rate, to oppose upon great and general Democratic principles. [Applause.] I hope that the time has not yet come when we are willing to surrender the birthright of fundamental Democratic principle for a mess of pottage, especially when the pottage is to be consumed chiefly, if not altogether, by three or four railroad companies, and when it is exceedingly doubtful whether our constituency will get a single sup of benefit from the consumption of the soup.

I could not support this kind of legislation, as I stated a moment ago, even if it did give special benefit to my constituency, as many of them think it does. But, Mr. Chairman, it does not. I find that a train leaves New York City at 4.30 a. m. How in the name of common sense that is to benefit the business men of our section through which it runs I do not know. How does it expedite the mail for them? It leaves so early in the morning that nothing of the day's mail goes upon that train except the newspapers leaving Greater New York, and those papers have done greater harm, in my humble judgment, than good in the world, and I am not anxious to scatter the multifarious misinformation contained in them. It would, as far as Southern merchants and bankers are concerned, be much better for the train to leave New York at 8 or 9 or 10 o'clock, because it could then carry all the correspondence that goes out on the morning of the train's departure to the commercial men of the South. The financial correspondence and everything else could then be written up in the early morning and go out on that train. This train can carry only the mail of the day before.

On yesterday my colleague [Mr. CATCHINGS], for whose judgment I have the highest regard, said that we have more business with Chicago than we have with New York. In a certain sense that is true, and in another sense it is not true. We do buy our corn, meal, provisions, and our mules from the Western country. But we buy our boots, shoes, and other things in the East. They come down from New York, Boston, etc., along those roads, and moreover our financial relations are nearly altogether with New York and almost to no extent at all with the city of Chicago.

Quick mail is more needed by the South with the Northeast than Chicago, owing to the character of our relations with the two. Nearly all of our cotton business is with the Northeast, except when cotton is for export, and that goes mainly to the Gulf ports. There is therefore as valuable—indeed, a more valuable—business over our railroads to New York and Boston as over those to Chicago, and therefore as much or more reason to expect fast and constant service, independently of any payment of special subsidies to special railroads and without such payment.

Mr. Chairman, I find in my own district there are two general lines of roads, the Illinois Central road in the West and the lines that radiate from the Southern Railway system in the East. The Illinois Central is not a subsidized road and the other is; and yet I find that the trains, starting out from Chicago even as early (if that were an advantage) as they do from New York, make just as good or better time. I find that the connection is as close or more so, so that, speaking for myself, having the choice of two roads when I leave home, I always come by the Illinois Central, because it lands me in Washington quicker than the other system. Not being a free-pass Congressman, I have nothing to determine my choice except the time taken.

Mr. Chairman, when we came to investigate this thing, although the train leaves at an unconscionably early hour—too early for commercial and financial purposes—I found that it beats the other train from New York to New Orleans only fifteen minutes in that immense stretch. Why, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] asked a question here yesterday leading up to the would-be conclusion that but for this special subsidy we would not have trains to-day to do this work; and yet I find what I shall in a moment read in the report of Mr. Lane adopted by the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. Gentlemen will tell you that the Atlantic Coast Line once had this subsidy and for some reason or other gave it up. It was expected at that time that they would cease to run fast trains and that the mail South would be left "unexpedited."

But the report is made that the Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its service in consequence, but still maintains two through trains daily and the very train on which the mail went when that line was subsidized. The gentleman wanted it understood that for five or six months of the year these lines could not run two trains. Here is what the report says:

The Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its train service in consequence of the withdrawal of the special-facility payment, but still maintains two through trains daily, in connection with the Pennsylvania and other lines interested, between New York and Jacksonville, and during the heavy business in the winter time puts on a special fast train in addition.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; but the two trains keep on daily, and one of them is the train that used to receive the subsidy. The special winter traffic train is in addition. The very train which now carries mail daily, winter and summer, is the one that was formerly subsidized.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does the gentleman pretend to tell me that this line which is subsidized would run two trains within a half or three quarters of an hour of each other if they had no mail?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not pretend to tell you that, and I see no reason why they should, and I see no advantage to the Southern people growing out of it when one of them gets to New Orleans only fifteen minutes behind the other. One train will do as well as two when they start within thirty and arrive within fifteen minutes of one another.

Mr. SHATTUC. Is not this road giving special facilities on account of the subsidy?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; I think not. I will read something more.

Mr. SHATTUC. I care nothing about that, because it is not instructive to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It may not be to the gentleman from Ohio, but it may be to other members of the House. It has succeeded in instructing me.

Mr. SHATTUC. What I want to know is if the gentleman thinks these two trains would be run so close together if the subsidy was done away with?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have answered that question by saying that nobody is advantaged by their running so close together, and as the other train gets to New Orleans only fifteen minutes later there is no governmental reason for making this appropriation from the fact that they are run so close together. That is no argument in favor of this subsidy. If the other train carries their mail, it would be as good for all practical purposes, and a little better, because the train would leave New York a little bit later, and it would come nearer the public need. The train which leaves at 4.30, every man of common sense will see, can not carry any of that day's mail. The mail that it does carry is the mail that was mailed the day before.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does it not take the New England mail that was mailed the night before?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It may do that, but the train that leaves a half an hour after will have the same connection.

Mr. SHATTUC. Which train leaves first, the subsidized train or the other?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The subsidized train, as I understand, leaves a half hour earlier.

Now, there is a great deal of nonsense talked about the necessity of such miraculously close connection in all of this mail business. When men are "up against" a half hour in business contracts, they do not write letters; they telegraph.

Now, let me call the gentleman's attention to this testimony. I should have read it all. The gentleman seems to think the Department can not secure the special facilities without special subsidies; yet on page 2168 of the RECORD I find this quotation from Mr. Grant, in which he tells, not what he *thinks* they could do, but what they *have* done, and they have secured it all over the country. I find there is a train leaving as early as 3 o'clock from other and nearly all the great cities, and I expect they leave thus early because they want to serve the interests of great newspapers published in those towns.

We find on pages 448 and 449 of the report that Mr. Grant is indorsed in his statement fully by Mr. Shallenberger. Mr. Grant says:

There seems to be no justification for the special-facilities payments, judging from results obtained. If we treated all lines on this basis, then we should pay the Northwestern Railroad for running an early morning train from Chicago (at 2.45 a. m.) to Fort Howard, Wis.; also for Cedar Rapids from Chicago.

We should also pay the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a train leaving Chicago at the same hour, and running to Marion and the West; also the same road for a train from Chicago to Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for a train leaving Chicago at 3 a. m. and running to Burlington and Omaha; the Monon Route for a train leaving Chicago in the early morning for Cincinnati. The Illinois Central also has a train leaving Chicago about the same hour, as has also the Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago, and the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern. The Missouri Pacific runs a train out of St. Louis at 3 o'clock in the morning; so does the Iron Mountain; also the Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern; the Pennsylvania for Indianapolis and the East, and the Wabash for Toledo and the East.

The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern also runs a train out of Cincinnati about the same hour. The Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton also has a train out of Cincinnati at about 3 a. m. The Michigan Central runs a train out of Detroit about the same hour; so does the Flint and Pere Marquette.

From this it can be seen that the railroad companies can be induced to run trains at an hour not calculated to draw passenger traffic, but mainly for the interest of the mails. All of these early morning trains have been secured without special-facilities payments.

In 1893 the Department discontinued the special-facilities appropriation for the Atlantic Coast Line from New York by way of Washington, Wilmington, Charleston, and Savannah, to Jacksonville, but Congress, without any

recommendation from the Department, made an appropriation for improved facilities between New York and New Orleans, by way of Philadelphia, Washington, Charlotte, Montgomery, and Mobile. There is no question but that the service was improved between New York and New Orleans, but whether the improvements could not have been secured without the payment of special-facilities money is an open question. We can only judge by what has been accomplished in other directions.

In 1894 the Department secured a special fast mail on the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railroad, leaving St. Louis at 3 a. m., and running on fast time to Texarkana, making connection with the Texas and Pacific, and thus reaching nearly all of the principal points in Texas. At that time the company was running two through trains daily, one leaving St. Louis at 10 a. m. and arriving at Texarkana at 8.15 a. m. the next day, the other leaving St. Louis at 8.15 p. m. and reaching Texarkana at 1.20 p. m. the next day. The new fast mail train left St. Louis at 3.05 a. m. and arrived at Texarkana at 9.30 p. m., and was clearly additional service. The speed of this train is about 30 miles an hour, including stops.

In 1890 the Illinois Central, at the solicitation of the Department, put on a train out of Chicago, leaving at 3 a. m., and running through to New Orleans. This train was in addition to service then operated, and was secured solely on account of the additional business which would accrue from the improved facilities. This train makes a speed of 36 miles an hour, including stops, from Chicago to Cairo, and 30 miles an hour, including stops, from Cairo to New Orleans.

As an evidence that special-facilities money is not necessary to enable railroads in the South to operate fast trains, I would cite the fact that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad maintains two through trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, in addition to trains for local service. These through trains make a speed of 33 and 28 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

The Queen and Crescent system, which competes with the Louisville and Nashville between Cincinnati and New Orleans, also runs two trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, which are run at a speed of 31 and 32 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

The Florida Central and Peninsular, which competes with the Atlantic Coast Line for Florida business, runs two through trains a day between Columbia and Jacksonville. The Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its train service in consequence of the withdrawal of the special-facilities payments, but still maintains two through trains daily, in connection with the Pennsylvania and other lines interested, between New York and Jacksonville, and during the heavy business in the winter time puts on a special fast train in addition.

I know of my own knowledge that the service upon that unsubsidized road—the Illinois Central—which runs through the western part of my district is as good, and in my opinion better than, and as continuous as upon the line that runs through the eastern part of the district and which has been subsidized.

Mr. SHATTUC. Has it occurred to the gentleman that if you run a through train between the extreme West and the East you must pass some point at 3 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. SHATTUC. Is it not a fact that if you run a through train, for instance, from Denver or St. Paul to New Orleans, you must pass Chicago or some other point at 3 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That may be. I do not care when a train happens to move out of New Orleans or out of Chicago. The aim of my argument is to show that we could have the mail carried just as well without this subsidy as with it. I do not care whether it "just happens" or not. It will continue to "just happen."

Mr. SHATTUC. When the train was started from New York originally the New England roads ran so as to connect with it; but in the absence of this arrangement the New England roads would not connect with that New York train for the purpose of facilitating the mail transportation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not know whether they would or not. They do so run; and, as a matter of fact, another train leaves half an hour later. So that the connection would now be made.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not stated distinctly by the Post-Office Department that the entire train from Chicago was run at the request of the Department and not at the solicitation of private interests?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, yes; it is stated that the train was run "at the request" of the Post-Office Department. It is stated in another place that the Post-Office Department did by negotiation succeed in "securing such facilities."

A few more words and I am through. It appears that the Postmaster-General does not want this appropriation. My friend from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] put to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURKE] a few moments ago a question, which was answered, as it happened, by the Postmaster-General himself when examined under oath before the postal commission, and answered very properly, too. The Postmaster-General said in effect: "Congress not having withheld the appropriation after the Department had recommended that it be withheld, I considered that Congress wanted the money spent." It is foolishness to respond to that by saying that the Postmaster-General has "the discretion" to stop this expenditure if he chooses. Suppose I am an executive officer. Suppose I protest against the making of a certain appropriation. Suppose that Congress makes it in spite of my protest. Would it not be an act almost of arbitrariness on my part to refuse to carry out the express legislative intent of Congress, declared against my protest and in spite of my recommendation to the contrary?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like a little more time.

Mr. LITTLE. How much?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Probably not more than five minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. I yield the gentleman ten minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Postmaster-General does not think this appropriation necessary; and it is his official business to know whether it is necessary or not. The Postmaster-General does express his opinion—what he "thinks." He would be a fool to say that he knows, because no man can know anything in the future. But the Postmaster-General is the man best entitled to do a little thinking on this matter, and his thinking is best entitled to a little consideration from us. And he says, that viewing the entire situation, he thinks he could get the same facilities without this appropriation.

It appears, further, that the Second Assistant Postmaster-General does not think the appropriation necessary. It appears, too, that a special joint commission, which was brought into being for the express purpose of studying this and other problems affecting the postal service, has come to the conclusion that this appropriation is unnecessary. Now, I ask, in the name of God, who wants the appropriation? Nobody, except a few railroads and a few members of Congress. I appeal to Democratic members, especially from the South: Are you going to stand here and heap up for use against you by your enemies in the future a precedent like this, to be hurled into your teeth—a precedent that will assuredly return to plague its inventors when the ship-subsidy bill comes up, a precedent which *ought* to return to plague you, because your vote in favor of this appropriation will prove that while you are opposed to these subsidies in the abstract, you are in favor of them when you imagine they help your particular constituency or you yourselves. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. LITTLE. I believe, Mr. Chairman, I have some little time remaining, and I desire to reserve that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman from Illinois desires to ask a question, and, if permitted, I should be glad to answer him.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Mississippi refers to the time that these fast mail trains leave New York and the fast mail trains leave Chicago, in the hours of the early morning. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that all of the fast mails out of the great cities of the Union are run primarily for the benefit of the daily newspapers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think I said so, Mr. Chairman. They will be continued to be run in that interest whether there is a subsidy or not. It is a benefit to the newspapers themselves, and they are able and willing to pay for it; and when the trains run, no matter for what reason, the Government can make them carry the mails.

I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas, as the Chair understands, is entitled to the floor.

Mr. LITTLE. I have reserved my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is recognized.

[Mr. SWANSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWANSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take any further time. I will yield my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD].

Mr. SIMS. I hope the gentleman will take that time and answer questions.

Mr. SWANSON. I reserve the rest of my time for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD]. How much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twenty minutes.

Mr. SWANSON. I reserve that for the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the House a minute to see if we can not make some arrangement about closing this debate. I will make this proposition: That all debate, general debate and debate under the five-minute rule, shall close to-morrow at 12.30, and that these separate provisions shall then be voted upon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have an amendment I would like to offer at the end of the bill, with reference to the mail service to Cuba, that my constituents are interested in. It will take no time, but I would not like any arrangement to be made so I could not offer the amendment.

Mr. LOUD. That would not cut off any amendment, but would cut off the debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. With that understanding I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all debate, both general and under the five-minute rule, close to-morrow at 12.30, and then the bill be voted upon.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have some time remaining, which I have promised to yield to my colleague on the committee [Mr. MOON], and if it be understood that I can have twenty minutes of that time to-morrow I shall not object.

Mr. LOUD. I thought the gentleman would naturally take that time. I supposed the gentleman had exhausted his time.

Mr. LITTLE. If I can take it, naturally, then, I have no objection.

Mr. LOUD. That is my understanding, that the other side will have it.

Mr. LITTLE. With this understanding, that my time may be reserved, there is no objection here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD].

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I have never stood upon this floor to advocate a subsidy to a railroad, or a gratuity, and I am not advocating one now.

The CHAIRMAN. One moment. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Virginia yields twenty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SWANSON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. COWHERD. I have said, Mr. Chairman, that I have never advocated a subsidy or a gratuity to a railroad or any other corporation, and I am not going to do it now. I do come here asking that out of an appropriation bill carrying $120,000,000 a small portion of it be used to put the people of the district I have the honor to represent upon an equal footing with the other districts in the United States; and I do not have to apologize to gentlemen from any district for doing so.

If special facilities are given and mail is expedited between New York and any of the other great cities in the country, either by direct appropriation or by bunching the mail, I want my city to have that same privilege, and I stand here to ask it as a matter of fair and even-handed justice.

Now, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have talked a great deal about subsidies, and said they hoped no Democrat would vote for a subsidy. So do I. I hope none will advocate them. I want to say that this is no more a subsidy than free rural delivery in your district is a subsidy, and is no more a subsidy than the star route in your district is a subsidy. What is a subsidy? It is the Government giving aid to a private enterprise with the expectation of the public being benefited thereby.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman pardon a question?

Mr. COWHERD. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman says that this is no more of a subsidy than the free rural delivery or star route. Is it not true that rural free delivery is granted under a general law, and all parties have an equal right to it, upon a proper showing?

Mr. COWHERD. Is it true that every special law is a subsidy?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is it not true that they have an equal right to them upon a certain showing? Is it not true that this particular thing is an appropriation to a particular company by name, that it is not a general law to which all people can be entitled?

Mr. COWHERD. Does that make it a subsidy? I want the gentleman to go to a dictionary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will define it without going to the dictionary.

Mr. COWHERD. There is not a single dictionary that will give that definition. I want to say now that a special facility is not a subsidy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to say——

Mr. COWHERD. Oh, the gentleman has had his time and I do not want him to take up my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thought the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. COWHERD. I did, but not for a speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I only wanted to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentlemen answered my question, and now he wants to make a speech. I want to say that every part of the mail appropriation ought to be for the public benefit, and if it is for the public benefit, then is not a subsidy for carrying of mail a Government function? You have nine or ten free deliveries in New York every day, and you have none in some country districts.

Is that a subsidy in New York because you get a facility that you do not have in the country? You have free rural delivery in many districts and expect to establish more, and I hope that we shall have one in every well-settled district in the United States. But there are territories out in the West which never can have it. Are the free deliveries in your district subsidies because some man living in the arid lands of the West can not have the same privilege?

Now, I want to consider the question in which I am specially interested in this debate, and I only represent one portion of it, and that is the special facility from Kansas City to Newton, Kans. Gentlemen say that these grants are made for the benefit of the railroads. I call their attention to the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], on the floor of the House yesterday, stated that the testimony before the postal commission showed that the railroad company receiving this appropriation did not want this appropriation made, and never had asked for it.

That is the testimony of the gentleman that represented the railroad company that gets this particular appropriation. Why? Of course they want the $25,000 if they render the service, but they do not want to put the train on and give the service, because they say the compensation given is entirely inadequate to the service rendered.

Is that a subsidy, demanding service of a railroad company to benefit a million and a half people of the United States, paying them less than they get from every route in the East for similar service? But gentlemen come up and say, "Oh, that is a subsidy, and it is undemocratic to support a subsidy." I want gentlemen to sustain their arguments with facts and not employ vituperation.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Does the Postmaster-General give that particular route less than other routes in the country?

Mr. COWHERD. No; but, my friend, they put on a particular train that never was put on before, and never will be put on if you take the grant away from that road, unless it become a portion of a through train. This particular train would not be run except for this appropriation.

Mr. SIMS. Entirely dissimilar from the other?

Mr. COWHERD. I do not know about the other. I am not arguing about the other. Gentlemen have argued it to the House, and I hope the House understands it. I know there was never a fast mail train that left Kansas City to the south over this line until the appropriation was given. I know that we wanted the train run over the Rock Island, and tried to get them to put on a train, and they absolutely refused.

The facts are these: The mail is expedited to a great many cities by bunching the mail, holding it until you get enough to pay for putting on a fast train. That magnificent train, alluded to by the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], from Chicago to Omaha, making the fastest time of any train in the world, carries all that mail because they agree that, although starting after other trains leave at night, they will beat them into Omaha, so that they hold all mail until 2 o'clock in the morning and let it go out on that train.

Now, they do the same thing on the mail out of St. Louis. They gather up the mail and hold it until the train gets into Kansas City, at 10.30. What is the result? In order to hasten the overland mail they hold back our morning trains. The Post-Office Department holds them until the mail can reach there to be carried to the West, and the result is that St. Louis commercial mail, although seven to ten hours east of us, goes into the territory tributary to Kansas City on identically the same train as ours.

That is not fair; it is not right. When you are expending $120,000,000 in appropriations for the mail service, I have a right to ask that this small appropriation be made for the benefit of a city that turns into the post-office fund in net revenue nearly half a million dollars a year.

Gentlemen have said that the mails are not expedited by these trains. No gentleman has dared to say that in regard to the train running from Kansas City to Newton, and no gentleman can say it in the face of the testimony taken before the postal commission. This testimony, which you will find at the bottom of page 458, shows that the train which this appropriation enables to run does expedite the mail practically twelve hours.

According to the report of Mr. Grant, approved by the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, this train expedites the mail to nearly all points in southwestern Kansas east of Dodge City; over almost the entire Indian Territory; over Oklahoma; over northern Texas; and, I may add, although it is not so stated in the testimony, that it expedites the mail on through to Arizona, and clear across to the Pacific coast.

Why do we appropriate $40,000,000 to carry the mails? The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. LOUD] has told you to-day that if you will let the railroads carry the mails the way they want to carry them they will carry them practically for 10 per cent of what you are paying to-day. You can have the mails carried for $5,000,000 if you will let the railroads carry them the way they want to do it.

Therefore, I state to you, adopting the argument of gentlemen who have been on the floor this evening, that out of $35,000,000 appropriated for mail transportation $30,000,000 is a subsidy under their definition of subsidies. You pay what you are now paying because you know that the commercial interests of the United States could not be supported for twenty-four hours if you should return to the old system of low rates and the transportation of the mails in coaches.

Why, sir, if you will cut down the time on every railroad to 10 or 15 miles an hour—if you will take the mail off of every fast train in the United States—there is hardly a business interest that will not go into bankruptcy in less than thirty days. Gentlemen say that the train on the Kansas City and Newton road is only for the benefit of the newspapers. I am informed—I can not state this upon official information, but I am informed that the receipts from a single source at the telegraph offices in Kansas City fell off more than the amount you appropriate immediately after this train was put on.

Telegrams that had been sent all over Kansas, all over Oklahoma, all over the Indian Territory, announcing the price of cattle and beef at the great markets of Kansas City went out upon this train and reached the people that were served by it the next morning, so that the telegraph tolls were saved.

Now, gentlemen, I submit that if this railroad thus serves the people of the country—if it serves those people to their great benefit—this is a legitimate post-office appropriation and is no more a subsidy than the difference you make in the sums paid for carrying mail between roads carrying small amounts and those on which the mails are heavy. You have to make these discriminations.

You say to a road running through a sparsely settled district, "We will pay you such an amount for carrying the mails;" and you say to a great road running from New York to Philadelphia, "We will pay you only about one-fifth as much as we pay the other road." Why this discrimination? Because the great road carrying a vast body of mail earns enough to make the amount of the Government pay a fair compensation, while the road running through a sparsely settled district must receive an increased price in order to render the service. This is not a subsidy; it is a legitimate appropriation to secure needed mail facilities.

The train of which I have particularly spoken, according to the testimony of the officers of the road, who appeared before the postal commission, is not a paying train, even with the $25,000 added to the ordinary pay. The people whom I have the honor to represent—the people of the great State of Kansas, the people of Oklahoma, the people of the Indian Territory—believe that this train renders them a great service in a commercial way, and I join in that belief; therefore I believe this is a legitimate appropriation for Congress to make for their benefit.

One word in closing. We have been endeavoring to have trains that would serve the purpose now served by the train of which I have spoken. Such a train has been put on, running through from Chicago to San Francisco, and making a schedule out from Kansas City to the Southwest about the same as the special-facility train.

It has been running for about a month, but not long enough to become established.

As a matter of fact, the regular train has been so much delayed during a large part of the time that this special train had to be put on in its place. If this road can maintain that train so as to make it a part of its regular service, running regularly from Chicago through, it would take the place of the train of which I have spoken.

In that case, Mr. Chairman, I would not stand here to ask for this appropriation; more than that, I would be one of the first to go to the Postmaster-General next July, when this appropriation becomes available, and ask him to exercise his discretion by withholding the payment of this appropriation to that railroad company.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] during the course of his remarks first said he had never advocated a subsidy, then denied that this was a subsidy, and then said that everything was a subsidy, and then he asked me to give a definition of "a subsidy," and finally refused to allow me to do so. [Laughter.] I will undertake to do so before I sit down.

A subsidy, in the legislative sense of the term, in which we are speaking, is an appropriation of money for a special and particular or else for a class benefit at the expense of the general body of the people. Originally it was a voluntary payment made by one power to another to secure the aid of that other.

Now, whether that is a correct definition of a subsidy or not, the definition fits the thing at hand. It fits the proposition the gentleman advocates, and a stinkweed by any other name smells just as bad. [Laughter.]

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman has neither defined the subsidy nor explained it. Anything that does not come from his country smells bad.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have tried to define it. Moreover, it is contended that a part of this "subsidy" would accrue to the special benefit of a part of my people. At any rate, I have defined the job which the gentleman has advocated.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LOUD. If the gentleman from Illinois desires time, I should be glad to yield him.

Mr. MANN. I should like a few minutes.

Mr. LOUD. I hope there will be no objection to the gentleman proceeding for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOUD. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes, or more if he desires it.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to take up the time of the House at this late hour in the discussion. I have been appealed to, both by the chairman of the committee and by other gentlemen on the floor, to withdraw the point of order which was reserved upon the amendment to reduce the railway mail pay. It will not, in my opinion, be proper for me to withdraw the point, and I shall at the proper time insist upon it. I shall give briefly the reasons for this action.

In doing this I wish to state that I am not influenced by any interest whatever in the railway companies, but simply because I think the greatest subsidy that we now vote to any company in the United States is that paid for second-class mail matter and its transportation over the railroads.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who has just declined to answer a question, voted against the Loud bill in this House, in favor of the $35,000,000 subsidy in behalf of second-class postal matter; and so far as I am concerned if we may swallow the camel of the $35,000,000, it strikes me that we might quite as easily take in the extra $200,000 which is covered by the items in this bill.

The worst thing, in my judgment, that we have connected with the postal service is this gross and extravagant subsidy in behalf of the newspapers and the various periodical publications, which amounts to at least $35,000,000 a year of expense. I say that before many months have passed this Congress or the next one ought to do away with that evil, and when that is done away with I believe that the railway mail pay will be sufficiently cheap to meet the idea of every man of progressive thought or of economy in the United States.

The appropriation to the railroads for carrying the mails is shown not to be excessive. The utmost reduction now proposed is 5 per cent. If we do away with the abuse of the second-class mail matter we save, according to the report of the commission, at one sweep, $20,000,000 from the railway companies. Now, let us cut out this $20,000,000. Let us save that. These gentlemen who have been contending about this matter with reference to the pay of the railway companies for carrying the mails can very easily take away from them $20,000,000 by reducing the compensation, or refusing to allow them to carry second-class mail matter at a loss to the Government.

And, Mr. Chairman, because of these reasons I shall, at the proper time, insist upon the point of order.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CANNON reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the Post-Office appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the District appropriation bill and ask unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Some time subsequently the Speaker pro tempore announced the appointment of Mr. GROUT, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi as conferees on the part of the House.

MEMORIAL SERVICES TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CLARKE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Saturday, February 23, 1901, at 4 o'clock p. m., be assigned for the consideration of resolutions of respect to the memory of the Hon. FRANK G. CLARKE, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Hampshire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ALBUQUERQUE (N. MEX.) LAND GRANT.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California suspend for a moment to allow the gentleman from Iowa to present a matter?

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill on the Speaker's table—House bill 5048—which I should like to call up just for a moment. It is the same matter that we considered the other evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 5048) to confirm to the city of Albuquerque, in the Territory of New Mexico, the town of Albuquerque land grant, and for other purposes.

Mr. LACEY. The Senate has called attention to the fact that in the opinion of the Senate Committee on Rules the amendment made in the House could not be made until this bill had first gone to them to have their action in enrolling it reconsidered, and therefore that it is necessary to reconsider the amendment attached to the bill by this House.

Heretofore these matters have been arranged by unanimous consent, but as the question of procedure has arisen, they referred it to the Committee on Rules in the Senate, and have sent the bill back to the House in order that we may reconsider the action of the House in amending the bill, until it can be sent to the Senate and they get rid of the enrollment of the bill. I offer a resolution to that effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the vote whereby the House agreed to the amendment to the bill (H. R. 5048) to confirm to the city of Albuquerque, in the Territory of New Mexico, the town of Albuquerque land grant, and for other purposes, be reconsidered, and that said amendment be withdrawn; and that the bill be transmitted to the Senate with the request that they reconsider the vote whereby they passed the bill, in order that the said bill may be open to amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa, how can we with propriety request the Senate to reconsider its action?

Mr. LACEY. That is the suggestion made by the Committee on Rules in the Senate. My own judgment has been that by unanimous consent the Senate can do anything.

Mr. LOUD. We have no right to request the Senate to take such action. Does the gentleman think that is proper?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I ask that the latter part of the resolution be reported again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be reported again.

The Clerk read as follows:

With the request that they reconsider the vote whereby they passed the bill, in order that the said bill may be open to amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I suggest that you strike out the words which have just been read. Let the bill simply be transmitted to the Senate.

Mr. PEARRE. That will be satisfactory if the bill is simply sent back to the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment striking out the words which have been read will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

H. R. 971. An act to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 5814. An act to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for said District—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for payment to settlers on Des Moines River lands—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 chief of the division of Revenue-Cutter Service submitting an estimate of appropriation for deficiencies—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for operation of pneumatic tubes for public buildings—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, relating to the urgent need for a new revenue cutter—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HEPBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13707) authorizing the Citizens' Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2730); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13574) fixing the rate of pension for persons eligible under section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, who require constant care and attendance, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2731); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAPRON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12614) to amend the national banking law so as to permit national banks to consider and treat their surplus as capital in the restrictions on loans, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2732); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13973) to amend section 14 of the act approved June 28, 1898, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2733); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHANLER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13731) to provide an American register for the steamer *Enterprise*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2734); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MERCER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13776) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to deliver to the mayor and city council of Baltimore, Md., Ionic columns, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2736); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS 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. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5506) granting a pension to Mary Fryer, now Gardner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2708); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5560) granting an increase of pension to James W. Harden, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2709); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7713) granting a pension to John S. Boerum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2710); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5507) granting a pension to Mary Priscilla Allen, now Barry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2711); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to James M. Munn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2712); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4518) increasing the pension of Alfred Botton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2713); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5171) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Fairchild, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2714); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2104) granting an increase of pension to William L. Aten, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2715); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3865) for the relief of J. E. Dickey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2716); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4237) granting a pension to Frances Helen Lewis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2717); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5187) granting a pension to Corinne R. Strickland, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2718); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHAW, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3112) granting a pension to Lydia Sampsell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2719); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1786) granting an increase of pension to Fielding Marsh, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2720); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Philetus M. Axtell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2721); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1769) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Duval, of Wellsburg, W. Va., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2722); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4630) granting an increase of pension to James H. Bellinger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2723); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5559) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Richardson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2724); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5031) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Potts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2725); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3400) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Shaw, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2726); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2232) granting a pension to Frederick Sien, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2727); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1698) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hegwer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2728); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4531) granting a pension to Harriet S. Richards, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2729); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7056) granting an increase of pension to A. G. Beer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2735); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13998) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. B. Parsons; and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14066) to provide an American register for the barkentine *Hawaii*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14067) to reopen and readjust the accounts of certain registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and for other purposes—to the Commiteee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOON (by request): A bill (H. R. 14068) to change the boundaries between the southern and central judicial districts of the Indian Territory and to establish a United States commissioner's court at Durant, Ind. T.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 14069) for closing up the affairs of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 14070) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a duplicate certificate of discharge when the same has been lost"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 14071) for the establishment of a light-house at the entrance to Cape Channel, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 14072) for the construction of public works regulating the flow of the rivers of the arid region of the United States, storing the water, and continuing surveys—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14088) to authorize the construction of reservoirs for the storage of water and for other hydraulic works for the reclamation of the arid public lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

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. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 14073) granting an increase of pension to Benj Howard—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 14074) for the relief of Eberhard Giebler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 14075) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 14076) granting a pension to Eliza J. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 14077) granting an increase of pension to James T. Chalfant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 14078) for the relief of Capt. Sylvester B. Truesdell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 14079) for the relief of the heirs of Mark S. Gorrill—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 14080) granting a pension to Kate Howard—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 14081) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Frank Ferrin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 14082) to correct the military record of John Hammond—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14083) for the relief of the estate of Reuben Street, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14084) for relief of Mrs. E. L. Raney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also a bill (H. R. 14085) for the relief of the trustees of the Missionary Baptist Church at Gravelly Springs, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 14086) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of C. L. Gallaway—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 14087) for the relief of Henry Peal—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 14089) granting a pension to Amos Strauser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 14090) granting a pension to Marie Bosslet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, favoring a commission to consider certain improvements in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of Benjamin W. Howard for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of 46 citizens of Allen County, Kans., for construction of dam across Gila River, San Carlos, Ariz., for purposes of irrigation for Pima Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Coatesville, Pa., favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from Africa and all countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CONNER: Petition of 25 citizens of Burt, Iowa, urging the banishment of the liquor traffic in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CROMER: Petition of Rev. C. G. Miller and others of Bluffton, Ind., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Resolutions of the Commercial Club of Sturgis, S. Dak., favoring the passage of House bill No. 1439, amending the act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of Journeymen Bricklayers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of Senate bill No. 727, known as the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the American Trade Press Association, for better mail facilities at the New York post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Josiah Strong, president of League for Social Service, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters of W. M. Garrett, E. A. M. Lawson, and others, of Washington, D. C., in relation to discrimination to Census employees of the printing division in depriving them of their annual leave, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of keeper and surfmen of life-saving station at Caskata, and citizens of Massachusetts, asking for increase of pay for keepers and surfmen in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Hon. Dwight Loomis, in behalf of the Gillett and Littlefield bills—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Mrs. Cornelia B. Forbes, president Connecticut Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the passage of the Gillett and Littlefield bills for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KAHN: Statement of C. E. Creecy to accompany House bill granting American register to barkentine *Hawaii*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petitions of Isaac B. DeVoe, R. B. Douglas, H. V. Condict, and others, of Jersey City, N. J., for construction of dam across Gila River, San Carlos, Ariz., for purposes of irrigation for Pima Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of Nancy E. Edwards, widow of John B. Edwards, deceased, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of the National Board of Trade, favoring the passage of legislation to promote the development of our maritime position—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Orphanage of Philadelphia and citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: Memorial from the Choctaw Nation, relative to the status of the lands of the Wichita Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Raney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of the trustees of Missionary Baptist Church at Gravelly Springs, Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Petition of Mrs. S. M. Holman, of Fayette, Tenn., advocating the passage of the Gillett and Littlefield bills, for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SALMON: Petition of H. E. Scott and others, favoring provision for an adequate and permanent supply of water for the Pima and Papago Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Presbytery of Newton Synod, of New Jersey, and letter of E. C. Cline, stated clerk; also petition of citizens of the Fourth New Jersey Congressional district, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of James S. Kenneally and 8 other employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry at Boston, Mass., in relation to the employment and salary of taggers in that department—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of the heirs of Avis Hardison, of North Carolina, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Petition of the governor of Idaho and other State officers in favor of an increase in the appropriation for irrigation investigation under the Agricultural Department—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 7, 1901.*

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

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

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

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

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

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law and the opinion of the court filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel brig *North Carolina*, Richard West, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoilation claims relating to the vessel sloop *Fox*, Samuel Stocking, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. McLAURIN presented the credentials of BENJAMIN RYAN TILLMAN, chosen by the legislature of the State of South Carolina a Senator from that State for the term commencing March 4, 1901; which were read, and ordered to be filed.