PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK (by request): A bill (H. R. 14743) granting a pension to William Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 14744) granting a pension to Smith B. Nunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 14745) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 14746) granting an increase of pension to Francis Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 14747) granting a pension to Amanda Blackford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14748) granting an increase of pension to John Oran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 14749) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Heelan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14750) granting a pension to Thomas C. Kelsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 14751) granting an increase of pension to Regina F. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 14752) granting an increase of pension to Gibby Goodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14753) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14754) granting an increase of pension to W. M. Houchin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14755) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Ellen Johnson, widow of the late Capt. Oliver P. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14756) granting a pension to Robert P. Baker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 14757) granting a pension to Sidney N. Lund—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 14758) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Talbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14759) granting a pension to Margaret Herold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A resolution (H. Res. 273) to pay Rosa Nichols, mother of Charles C. Nichols, deceased, the expenses of the last illness and burial of said Charles C. Nichols in a sum not exceeding $250, and an additional sum equal to six months' pay—to the Committee on Accounts.

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. CALDERHEAD: Petition of North American Gymnastic Union of Hanover, Kans., in opposition to the passage of House bill 12199—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANNON: Paper to accompany House resolution to pay Rosa Nichols expense of last illness and burial of Charles C. Nichols—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CREAMER: Resolutions of United Garment Workers and Clothing Cutters and Trimmers' Union of New York City and vicinity, in favor of the proposed increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to William Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Petition of citizens of St. Clair County, Mo., for legislation concerning the Osage River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Francis Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Petitions of J. S. Redmon and others, of Minneapolis, and citizens of Bemidji, Minn., favoring the enactment of bill (H. R. 10793) forbidding railroad officials to separate passengers on account of race or color—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of E. F. Crawford and other citizens of Bemidji, Minn., favoring Senate bill 5002 and House bill 12940, designated as the "inquiry commission bill"—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of American Association of Masters and Pilots, to extend the lien for mariners' wages to the masters of vessels; to amend an act relating to injurious deposits within adjacent waters of New York City, and providing for investigation of the conduct of officers of steam vessels by jury trial—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MERCER: Papers to accompany House bill 12722, granting a pension to Mary A. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 1409, granting a pension to Charles A. Warrick—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: Resolutions of United Mine Workers' Union No. 1217, of Luzerne; No. 582, of Sandy Run, and No. 209, of Stockton, Pa., favoring the restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from the south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Jerome B. Cassavant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petitions of W. S. Edwards Camp, Spanish-American War Veterans, favoring the amendment of Senate bill 1220, so as to permit said veterans to place the name and number of their camps on the American flag—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of General Bell Post, No. 332, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, favoring a bill to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the board of supervisors of Sioux County, Iowa, in favor of indemnifying the State of Iowa and the counties thereof for the swamp lands granted under the act of September 28, 1850, and disposed of by the Government after the passage of said act—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WACHTER: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mary A. Talbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolutions of the Shoe Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of Senate bill 1118—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *May 28, 1902.*

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

Mr. GALLINGER called the Senate to order, and the Secretary read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1902.

To the Senate:

The undersigned, performing the duties of the Chair during the absence of the President pro tempore, names Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER, Senator from New Hampshire, to perform said duties during Wednesday, the 28th day of May, 1902.

O. H. PLATT.

Mr. GALLINGER thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer for to-day, and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

RECESS.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Acting President pro tempore is attending a funeral in his official capacity as a pallbearer, and the Senator who has the important pending business in charge is also there, and other Senators. I move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER). The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that in his opinion the Journal should first be read or its reading dispensed with.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Journal will stand approved.

Mr. HOAR. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m., at which hour it reassembled.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Do I understand there was an agreement that there should be no morning hour to-day?

Mr. LODGE. Two Senators gave notice that they are ready to speak to-day. I do not see the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] in the Chamber at this moment, but I understood that the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] is ready to go on. I should be glad, of course, to make progress with the bill. If the Senator from Wyoming has a conference report, I will yield for that.

Mr. WARREN. I have not only a conference report, but one or two other matters even more important which ought to be acted upon this morning. It will take only a few moments, of course.

Mr. LODGE. I will yield for morning business, as the Senator from Tennessee is not here, provided it does not give rise to debate.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] informs me that he will be ready to go on quickly. He has some notes that he expects in, and he says he understood that the Senator from Tennessee was to speak first.

Mr. LODGE. I do not see the Senator from Tennessee here.

Mr. WARREN. I assume that pending the arrival of the Senator from Tennessee it will be agreeable for me to proceed with morning business.

Mr. DUBOIS. I will telephone to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LODGE. It is understood that when the Senator from Tennessee returns he will take the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside, and the Senator from Wyoming is recognized for morning business.

BILLS FROM COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Claims, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, and before the inquiry to make a statement.

The Committee on Claims reported certain bills early in the session, some of which passed the Senate and others were favorably reported and are now on the Calendar. Later an omnibus claims bill was made up. The omnibus bill included bills that had passed at this session and sessions heretofore.

One Senate bill (S. 173) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo and one Senate bill (S. 567) for the relief of H. B. Matteosian, after passing the Senate were favorably reported by the House and placed on the House Calendar. The members of the House Committee on Claims were informally notified of the fact that these claims were included in the omnibus bill, but for some reason it seems they overlooked the matter of Senate bill 173. Possibly the House feared that the omnibus bill would fail and therefore preferred to make sure of this one claim. Of course the Senate could offer no resistance or advice until the omnibus bill was approved. In the meantime the *Foscolia* bill (S. 173) was passed by the House, came back to the Senate, was signed by the Presiding Officer, and went to the President. Pending at the same time was the same matter, included in the omnibus bill. I discovered yesterday this dual condition of the *Foscolia* bill, and upon the signing of the omnibus bill communicated it to the White House, where the former bill is now awaiting some action.

Now, Mr. President, this arises through no fault of any member on this side of the Capitol; perhaps not on the other.

The Senate and House differ in modes of business. In the House they have one Committee on War Claims and another Committee on Claims. Furthermore, many bills which we handle at this end of the Capitol in the Committee on Claims are there handled by other committees, such as the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Indian Affairs, and others. Hence, from those four committees and from others come various bills and in great numbers to the one Committee on Claims on this side, and when we go into conference to consider an omnibus bill we meet conferees from only one committee, while the claims making up the omnibus bill come from numerous other committees.

If Senate bill 173 must be vetoed in order to dispose of it, it will come back to the Senate as a Senate bill vetoed, which would seem to indicate perhaps that the Senate was at fault. If there is any fault, it is on the other side, of course. I will ask the Chair if there is any prescribed way of withdrawing a bill thus situated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that if a concurrent resolution should be introduced, first in the Senate, and agreed to by the House of Representatives, recalling the bill from the President, it would bring the bill again before the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. I will prepare such a resolution and present it later on.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to suggest to the Senator that he prepare a resolution requesting the House to return to the Senate all the Senate bills which we passed and sent there and which were included in the omnibus bill.

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator, and I will do so, in addition to the resolution I have just mentioned.

Mr. COCKRELL. So as to cover them all.

Mr. HOAR. They ought to be named here. We ought not to require the House to pick out and see which were in the omnibus claims bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, let each bill be named by its number and title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest in this connection that that would properly be a separate resolution from the one recalling Senate bill 173 from the President.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. It will be entirely different. I wish to suggest that I intended to introduce a resolution to that effect in reference to certain bills I had presented so as to prevent the possibility of their being passed and sent to the President.

Mr. WARREN. Now, Mr. President, I should like to strike from the Calendar the bill (S. 918) for the relief of Alphonso M. Potvin. This claim was included in the omnibus bill. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. There are eight several bills on the Calendar under Rule VIII, commencing and running consecutively from Order of Business No. 368, being Senate bill 308, and I make the motion that they be indefinitely postponed, since they also have become laws through the approval of the omnibus claims bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be read by title.

The bills were severally read by title and postponed indefinitely, as follows:

A bill (S. 308) to reimburse the State of Wyoming for money expended by the Territory of Wyoming in protecting and preserving the Yellowstone National Park during the years 1884, 1885, and 1886;

A bill (S. 1516) for the relief of Richmond College, located at Richmond, Va.;

A bill (S. 2213) for the relief of George W. Graham;

A bill (S. 1680) for the relief of William A. Cowles, administrator of the estate of George Cowles, deceased;

A bill (S. 208) for the relief of Jeronemus S. Underhill;

A bill (S. 925) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood;

A bill (S. 1024) for the relief of Larrabee & Allen; and

A bill (S. 172) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 27th instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 99) fixing the time when certain provisions of the Indian appropriation act for the year ending June 30, 1903, shall take effect.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14018) making appropriations to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 7, 10, 12, 23, 33, 39, 42, 43, 47, 50, 57, 62, 63, 71, 73, 74, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89, 95, 96, 112, 114, 117, 124, 125, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, and 161.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 86, 92, 93, 94, 100, 105, 107, 109, 113, 115, 120, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 154, 155, and 157, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may exchange the present site for a new site without additional cost or expense therefor to the Government, and erect the said building thereon;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "value," in line 2 of the amendment, insert ", not exceeding $175,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 10, line 12, of the bill strike out the word "fifty-four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the amendment after the word "therein," in line 4 of the amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert "United States post-office and custom-house at Jacksonville, Fla., from $278,881.38 to $328,881.38;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert

"United States post-office at Kalamazoo, Mich., from $78,236.74 to $128,236.74;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "from," in line 2 of the amendment, strike out the words "fifty-eight thousand four hundred and fifty-seven dollars" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$71,807;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "drawn," in line 7 of the amendment, strike out the words "by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in section 5, page 25, after line 12 in the bill, the following: "United States post-office at Moberly, Mo., $5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in section 5, page 25, after line 16 in the bill, the following: "United States post-office at Columbia, Mo., $5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "fifty" in the amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "and ten" in the amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$65,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in section 5, page 25, after line 10 in the bill, the following: "United States post-office and other governmental offices at Crookston, Minn., $4,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "eighty" in the amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "seventy;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in section 1, page 4, after line 11 in the bill, the following: "United States post-office and court-house at Scranton, Pa., from $273,190.85 to $363,190.85;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert as a paragraph the following:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall not purchase a site in either of said cities until satisfied that the price therefor will permit the execution of all the provisions of this section in each of said cities within said limit of cost for site and building, respectively."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment strike out the words "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the site selected shall consist of not less than an entire block or square of ground in said city;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the site selected shall consist of not less than an entire block or square of ground in said city;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out insert the following: "United States post-office and custom-house at Traverse City, Mich., $6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the words "United States," in line 1 of the amendment, insert the words "post-office and;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the words proposed to be stricken out by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment and insert after the word "company," in line 16, page 27 of the bill, the following: ", and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the supreme court of the District of Columbia upon petition of said company to inquire into, hear, and determine the amount of the actual cost and expense to the company for the removal of its tracks from E street by reason of the provisions herein contained, and to enter judgment against the United States and the District of Columbia jointly, in such sum as may be so ascertained as aforesaid, and either party shall have the right of appeal from such judgment as in other cases;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 28, line 2 of the bill, after the word "he," insert the following: "and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia acting jointly;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

'That 'An act to provide for enlarging and improving the United States Government building at Macon, Ga., and to appropriate $58,000 therefor, approved March 2, 1899,' is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"'That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the post-office and court-house buildings at Macon, Ga., to be extended and enlarged so as to provide necessary accommodations for the post-office, courts, and other branches of the Government service, and to purchase additional ground on Third and Mulberry streets, in his discretion, for this purpose, and that the total cost of all said improvements, changes, and repairs, including the purchase price of such additional ground, shall not exceed the sum of $156,000: *Provided*, That the limit of cost of such additional land shall not exceed $31,000.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert "and seventy-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$675,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows; In line 2 of the amendment, after the word "settlements," strike out the words "is hereby appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be paid from the amount herein authorized;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in line 19, page 42, after the word "at," the following: "Honolulu and Hilo, Territory of Hawaii; Albuquerque, New Mexico; and" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment strike out the words "have prepared" and insert in lieu thereof the word "prepare;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Change section 25 to section 24, and in line 1 of the amendment, after the word "constructed," insert the words ", enlarged, or extended;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Change section 24 to section 25; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Change section 25 to section 26; and the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,
F. E. WARREN,
J. L. RAWLINS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAVID H. MERCER,
CHARLES W. GILLET,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I have a statement here which I wish to have printed in connection with the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement referred to will be printed, in the absence of objection. The Chair hears none.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT.

Net authorization by H. R. 14018 as passed by the House	$15,820,450
Net authorization by H. R. 14018 as amended by Senate committee	$19,391,150
Net authorization by H. R. 14018 as passed by the Senate	$19,889,150
Net authorization by H. R. 14018 as reported from conference committee	$19,425,450
Number of amendments made by the Senate	164
Senate receded from	39
House concurred in	82
Amendments were	43

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

The report was agreed to.

STATUE OF COUNT DE ROCHAMBEAU.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to introduce a joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it may now be put upon its passage. It is a resolution providing for the printing of the proceedings in regard to the unveiling of the statue of Count de Rochambeau.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator will yield to morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold the introduction of the joint resolution until that order of business is reached?

Mr. HOAR. I understood that my colleague [Mr. LODGE] had yielded, but that there was no regular order of morning business to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts introduces a joint resolution, the title of which will be read.

Mr. BERRY. Has the regular morning business been received, the introduction of bills, etc.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Irregularly that order is being executed.

Mr. BERRY. I want to know what disposition was made of the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON] which was offered yesterday? I inquire whether anything has been done in regard to it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator that that matter has not yet come up. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will now be read.

The joint resolution (S. R. 107) to provide for the printing of the proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of the Count de Rochambeau was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That there be printed and bound in the form such as is customary in the case of eulogies 20,000 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of the Count de Rochambeau, of which 6,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 12,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,000 to be delivered to the ambassador of the Republic of France for such distribution as he shall think fit, the remaining 1,000, of which 200 shall be bound in full morocco, to be distributed, under the direction of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, to the guests invited from the French Republic and the speakers who took part in said celebration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

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

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

USELESS PAPERS IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Ordnance submitting an additional list of papers not needed or useful in the transaction of public business and having no permanent value or interest; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Destruction of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

THE GATHMANN GUN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting further information from the president of the Gathmann Torpedo Gun Company in connection with the report of the joint board of officers of the Army and Navy appointed to make comparative tests between the Gathmann torpedo gun and the 12-inch Army service rifle, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, certain information relative to quarters rented by the War Department, giving the location, area of floor space occupied, and the annual rental thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, certain information relative to quarters rented by the Department of Justice, giving the location, area of floor space occupied, and the annual rental thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless objection be raised, the Chair will receive routine morning business, beginning with petitions and memorials.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Indians of the Cherokee Nation, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the allotment of their lands; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of E. E. Sturtevant Post, No. 2, Department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic, of Concord, N. H., and a petition of John G. Foster Post, No. 7, Department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic, of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and to increase the pensions of widows of soldiers to $12 per month; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the board of aldermen of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the compensation of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Associated Board of Trade of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. RAWLINS presented a petition of sundry oil-land owners of Price, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the manner of location of and doing annual or assessment work or labor upon placer locations for oil and hydrocarbons; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a petition of Local Union No. 140, Amalgamated Wood Workers' International Union, of Shelbyville, Ind., praying for the repeal of the duty on beef, veal, mutton, and pork; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Harrow Post, No. 491, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mount Vernon, Ind., praying for the passage of a per diem service pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of sundry miners of Clinton, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation limiting the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Prospect Lodge, No. 162, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Elkhart, and of Ashley Lodge, No. 586, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Ashley, in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called Grosvenor anti-injunction bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Charles Billings Lodge, No. 262, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Michigan City, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 949) for the relief of Charles H. Robinson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 621) for the relief of Daniel Cherry, reported it without amendment.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3508) granting an increase of pension to James M. Thomas, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3493) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Rose, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13278) granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Collins, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5094) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894;

A bill (H. R. 2494) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department;

A bill (H. R. 8769) for the relief of S. J. Bayard Schindel; and

A bill (H. R. 10279) to pay the claim of Stephen B. Halsey.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5140) granting an increase of pension to Dudley Cary, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5719) granting an increase of pension to Sidney V. Lund; and

A bill (S. 4709) granting a pension to Nelson W. Wade.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1980) granting a pension to William D. Stites, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BARD, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom

was referred the bill (S. 5212) granting to the State of California 640 acres of land in lieu of section 16, township 7 south, range 8 east, San Bernardino meridian, State of California, now occupied by the Torres band or village of Mission Indians, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SIMON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5774) granting a pension to Asa E. Sampson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 7679) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Snyder; and

A bill (H. R. 12420) granting a pension to Wesley Brummett.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7687) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Washburn, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5186) granting a pension to John Conter;

A bill (H. R. 5273) granting an increase of pension to James Van Zant;

A bill (H. R. 6030) granting an increase of pension to William G. De Garis; and

A bill (H. R. 10752) granting a pension to Harriet T. Milburn.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4623) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Ross, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13450) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hunt;

A bill (H. R. 14241) granting an increase of pension to Peter Dugan;

A bill (H. R. 14146) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy;

A bill (H. R. 14184) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Fogg;

A bill (H. R. 11252) granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Gowdey;

A bill (H. R. 11052) granting a pension to Nelson Johnson; and

A bill (H. R. 2430) granting a pension to Lizana D. Streeter.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5836) granting an increase of pension to Jessie Nesbit Smith, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. BURTON), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5045) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Moore, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

JOHN JACKSON.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Claims, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1125) entitled "A bill for the relief of John Jackson," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

USE OF PUBLIC PRINTING BUILDING.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14189) to permit the occupancy of the public printing building by the Grand Army of the Republic, to report it favorably and without amendment. I ask unanimous consent for its consideration at this time.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Public Printer and the engineer officer in charge of the construction of the new public printing office building to permit duly accredited members of the Grand Army of the Republic to occupy the new public printing office building for sleeping purposes only from the 5th day of October, 1902, to the 13th day of October, 1902, both days inclusive; the officers of the Grand Army of the Republic or members thereof to furnish the same for sleeping purposes only at their own expense and properly police and protect the same and leave the building in as perfect state of cleanliness and repair as when they took it; the occupancy to be under the control and supervision of the Public Printer and the engineer officer in charge.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 6007) for the relief of the heirs at law of Isaac Johnson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEITFELD introduced a bill (S. 6008) granting an increase of pension to David Vickers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 6009) granting a pension to Philander C. Burch; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 6010) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Lyons, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 6011) for the relief of Nye & Schneider Company; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6012) granting a pension to Hattie Blanche Sears; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 6013) for the relief of the Atlantic Works; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 6014) for the relief of B. S. Johnson, administrator of the estate of Jacob Johnson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 6015) granting an increase of pension to Clara M. Gihon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. PETTUS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $14,443.93 to pay the Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company a balance for transportation, as ascertained by the findings of the Court of Claims, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12543) to enable the people of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico to form constitutions and State governments, and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

FRANCIS M. CHARLES.

On motion of Mr. WARREN, it was

Ordered, That the papers on file in the office of the Secretary of the Senate in connection with a bill (S. 215, first session Fifty-sixth Congress) for the relief of Francis M. Charles be withdrawn in accordance with clause 1, Rule XXX, of the rules of the Senate.

ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I yielded for the introduction of morning business, which I understand is now concluded. I therefore ask that the consideration of the unfinished business, which was temporarily laid aside, may be resumed.

Mr. WELLINGTON. If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield to me for a moment, I desire to say that I yesterday made a motion which involves a question before the Senate, and I ask that that motion may now go over until to-morrow without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HOAR. I wish to move an amendment to that motion. I wish to speak on it at length, and it will be impossible to do so in the morning hour, as it is a subject that ought to be fully dealt with. I should like to have my amendment read now, if there be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Then I think the matter should take the ordinary course.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I understand the motion yesterday submitted by me would properly come up to-day. However, I do not want to interfere with the unfinished business.

Mr. HOAR. I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Maryland that the matter go over until to-morrow, retaining the same place it had to-day, because I do not think it is fair that the recess, which has been taken for the grave reason which we all understand, should affect the right of any Senator in regard to business. I shall not, however, be willing to have the matter disposed of to-morrow or at any time in a brief morning hour. I wish to discuss it with thoroughness. I should like to have the amendment I proposed read.

Mr. BLACKBURN. May I ask whether the Senator from Massachusetts will be content to have his proposed amendment now read and printed, and then let the matter go over on the motion of the Senator from Maryland without prejudice until tomorrow morning?

Mr. HOAR. Yes, that it go over without prejudice until tomorrow morning; but I shall insist on having time for a full discussion of the matter whenever it is taken up.

Mr. WELLINGTON. That will be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. BLACKBURN. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON] will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to report to the Senate its opinion upon House joint resolution 41, and, further, to report an amendment to said resolution to be incorporated therewith, if it should be adopted by the Senate, providing that Congress shall make all suitable regulations for the election of Senators, including such laws as shall provide for a full and free vote and an honest ascertainment of the result; and that such elections shall be held under national authority, and also that the qualifications for voting at such elections shall be prescribed by Congress; and, further, that the committee report to the Senate its opinion as to the propriety of so amending said resolution, if it shall be enacted; and, further, its opinion as to the wisdom of passing said resolve so amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion of the Senator from Maryland and the proposed substitute will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CULBERSON. I should like to have the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts again read.

Mr. LODGE. It has just been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas asks that the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts be again read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution proposed by Mr. HOAR as a substitute for the motion of Mr. WELLINGTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Maryland and the proposed substitute for it will go over.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. I now ask that the unfinished business, which was temporarily laid aside, may be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, I desire to move, on behalf of the minority of the Committee on the Philippines, the amendment which I send to the Secretary's desk, in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment has already been read and printed, I think. Does the Senator want in read again?

Mr. RAWLINS. It is substantially the same, with a slight change in it, as the amendment heretofore offered.

Mr. LODGE. Let the proposed amendment be printed in the RECORD as now offered.

Mr. RAWLINS. Very well; let it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] will be printed in the RECORD.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

Amendment, in the nature of a substitute, proposed by Mr. RAWLINS, on behalf of the minority, to the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. That, subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth, the United States of America hereby relinquish all claim of sovereignty over and title to the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands.

SEC. 2. That the United States shall continue to occupy and govern said archipelago until the people thereof have established a government, and until sufficient guaranties have been obtained for the performance of our treaty obligations with Spain and for the safety of those inhabitants who have adhered to the United States, and for the maintenance and protection of all rights which have accrued under the authority thereof, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. That ninety days after the President of the United States shall have proclaimed that all armed resistance to the United States has ceased in said archipelago the United States Philippine Commission shall make and promulgate rules and regulations for the holding of an election in the provinces of said archipelago for members of a convention, which convention when organized shall proceed to the adoption of a constitution for the government of said archipelago. That all male inhabitants of said archipelago 21 years of age and over who speak and write either the English or Spanish languages or any of the native languages of the said archipelago, and who shall have resided therein for one year, shall be qualified to vote for members of the convention, and any person so qualified as an elector shall be qualified to become a member of said convention. The members of the said convention shall number 300, and shall be apportioned by the United States Philippine Commission among the several provinces of said archipelago so that the distribution shall be in proportion to their population as near as may be; and when the said apportionment has been determined upon, the said Commission shall by proclamation order an election of the members for said convention, to be held throughout the said archipelago at such time as shall be fixed by the said Commission, which election shall be held not more than one year from the date of the proclamation by the President of the United States hereinbefore provided for, and ample time shall be given before said election to circulate said proclamation throughout said archipelago and arrange for the holding of the said election.

SEC. 4. That the members of the convention thus elected shall meet at the city of Manila on a day to be fixed by the said United States Philippine Commission not more than ninety days subsequent to the day of election, the time for which meeting shall be stated in the proclamation calling attention to the election aforesaid; and after organization the said convention shall proceed to form a constitution and organize such government as they may deem best adapted to promote the welfare and secure the peace and happiness of the inhabitants of said islands: *Provided*, That said convention shall provide by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States:

First. That there shall belong to the United States and continue to be the property thereof such lands and waters as the President of the United States shall designate to the said convention, and agreed to by it, for naval, military, and coaling stations and terminal facilities for submarine cables, the same to continue under the control and sovereignty of the United States.

Second. To carry into effect the treaty obligations of the United States with the Kingdom of Spain, and for the maintenance and protection of all rights and property acquired under the authority of the United States.

Third. That no inhabitant of said archipelago shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her adherence to the United States.

SEC. 5. That when the constitution and government shall be formed for and by the people of said archipelago in compliance with the provisions of this act, the said United States Philippine Commission shall certify the fact to the President of the United States, together with a copy of said constitution and ordinances, whereupon it shall be the duty of the President to issue his proclamation declaring the independence of the people of said archipelago, and that they constitute an independent state and nation.

SEC. 6. That the President of the United States is hereby requested to negotiate an agreement between the United States, the said Philippine Archipelago, and Great Britain, Germany, France, and such other powers as he may deem best, providing for its perpetual neutrality and inviolability from all foreign interference, and also for equal opportunities of trade to foreign countries with said archipelago.

SEC. 7. That immediately after the President shall have proclaimed that all armed resistance to the United States has ceased in said archipelago, he is requested to proclaim full amnesty to all the inhabitants thereof for or on account of political offenses and the bearing of arms against the United States, and all Filipinos or inhabitants of said archipelago who have been deported shall be returned to the place from whence they were so deported: *Provided*, That such amnesty shall not apply to any who have violated the rules of civilized warfare or were guilty of murder or torture. That the latter, if any, shall be afforded a speedy trial for their offenses in the civil courts of said archipelago and be punished or acquitted, as the facts and law may warrant.

SEC. 8. That within sixty days from the election of officers under the constitution to be formed by the said Philippine Archipelago and the inauguration of said officers the President shall cause the armed forces of the United States to be withdrawn from said archipelago as speedily as may be, except such forces as may be maintained in such parts thereof as have been retained by the United States for naval, military, and coaling stations and terminal facilities for cables; and the President of the United States and the Secretary of War shall make all needful regulations to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote the welfare and establish the independence of the Philippine Islands."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me for a moment, when this bill was first reported to the Senate I presented a number of amendments of various provisions of the bill reported by the majority. I did this because in criticisms which I made of the bill, if the amendments which I suggested and which I presented to the Senate for consideration had been adopted, several of the criticisms and objections which I made to the bill would have been obviated.

I simply rise now to state that as those amendments were designed to perfect the bill, and as they do not involve a difference in the matter of principle or policy particularly between the majority and the minority, and, as I well know that none of those amendments can be adopted unless they be accepted by the majority of the Committee on the Philippines, I simply desire to state that I shall not press any of those amendments. I proposed them, in fact, merely as suggestions for the consideration of the committee. If they had been accepted by the majority of the committee that would have obviated a number of the criticisms which I made upon the bill, especially upon those provisions relating to the judiciary. It seemed to me that the regulation of appeals and the jurisdiction of the courts mentioned in the bill are very inadequate and imperfect; and the amendments which I offered were, in my opinion, designed to cure those imperfections. I simply now invite attention to them merely for the purpose of having them considered, if so desired, by the majority of the committee. If they do not see fit to accept them I shall not move their adoption.

The amendment which I have now presented on behalf of the minority of the committee is the only proposition that is presented by the minority of the committee which involves the question of principle or policy upon which we differ in relation to this great question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hope that Senators on the other side are now ready to continue the debate, as I am naturally very anxious to go on with the general debate and finish it at the earliest moment. I would ask the Senator from Utah if any Senator on that side is now ready to proceed with the debate?

Mr. RAWLINS. There is no one on this side at present ready to proceed with the debate.

Mr. LODGE. If no one is ready to proceed with the debate, I ask that an agreement may be made as to the time for taking a vote.

Mr. CULBERSON. Before that is done, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines if he is prepared to give us some idea about the scope of the inquiry now being conducted by the Committee on the Philippines and when that inquiry will be closed?

Mr. LODGE. On that point I can give only my personal opinion. There has been no vote taken by the committee; but I have supposed from the list now in my hands of witnesses whom the committee has voted to call that the inquiry would continue as long as the Senate was in session.

Mr. CULBERSON. Unaffected by the disposition of the government bill?

Mr. LODGE. Entirely unaffected by the disposition of the bill.

Mr. RAWLINS. What suggestion has the Senator to make as to a time for a vote?

Mr. LODGE. Yesterday when we were discussing this matter Tuesday was spoken of. I shall be glad if we can agree to take a vote on the bill and pending amendments at 4 o'clock on Tuesday next.

Mr. RAWLINS. What doos the Senator say in regard to debate upon the amendments?

Mr. LODGE. My idea, as I said yesterday when we were discussing this matter, is that one day should be given to half-hour debate, and the next day, the day on which we vote, to fifteen-minute debate, for the purpose of considering amendments and giving opportunity to Senators who wish to address themselves to particular features of the bill to do so. I am not at all set on any arrangement of that kind.

Mr. RAWLINS. The general debate to close Saturday?

Mr. LODGE. Saturday of this week.

Mr. RAWLINS. If it be desired, would there be any objection to devoting the entire time from now until Saturday to the consideration of this bill, provided Senators should desire to occupy the time?

Mr. LODGE. From now until Saturday?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Devote the entire time?

Mr. RAWLINS. With the exception of Friday.

Mr. LODGE. That would be my understanding, of course.

Mr. BERRY. Not to interfere with conference reports.

Mr. LODGE. Conference reports are privileged. With that exception I hope the agreement would cover an understanding that all the time should be given to this bill——

Mr. ALDRICH. If required?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, if required. I trust no objection will be made to the request.

Mr. RAWLINS. And, if required, that we meet at 11 o'clock?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. RAWLINS. So far as I know, there is no objection to the proposition.

Mr. CARMACK. What am I to understand—that the general debate is to close on Saturday?

Mr. LODGE. That was the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, to which I am happy to agree, if he prefers it.

Mr. CARMACK. I understand that there will be fifteen-minute speeches——

Mr. LODGE. On Tuesday; and a half-hour limit on Monday.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee why we can not now take up these amendments, to which I am inclined to think the committee are going to agree, and dispose of them?

Mr. LODGE. This afternoon?

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I should be very glad to do it. I want to offer some amendments about which I have not consulted the majority of the committee; some I am sure the committee will agree to, and I can offer those this afternoon.

Mr. TELLER. From what the chairman said I suppose some of them are practically formal; for instance, reducing the quantity of land from 160 to 40 acres.

Mr. LODGE. That is one.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to see those disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. I will dispose of those this afternoon. I do not suppose there is any opposition to them.

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator will do that.

Mr. LODGE. I will.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to interfere in any way, but to facilitate the final vote upon this bill. However, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts in charge of the bill that there ought to be two full days for the consideration of amendments.

Mr. LODGE. That was my offer.

Mr. ALLISON. I understood the Senator to propose a vote at 4 o'clock. Now, I know there are some amendments which ought to be considered by the committee that have not been considered, and I think they would be agreed to.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In committee meeting?

Mr. ALLISON. In committee; and I think that would facilitate the final action as respects the bill.

Now, I should like the Senator to allow certain amendments to be debated briefly—not a half hour. I would suggest, unless there is some special reason for a half hour on Monday, that it be made a shorter debate—a fifteen-minute debate.

Mr. LODGE. The suggestion of the Senator from Iowa is that we apply the fifteen-minute rule on Monday and Tuesday for the consideration of amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that would be better.

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. TELLER. I believe that would be better.

Mr. RAWLINS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CARMACK. How is that—a half-hour debate on Monday?

Mr. BERRY. No; fifteen-minute debate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. RAWLINS. Fifteen minutes instead of a half hour.

Mr. ALLISON. I also suggest to the Senator that we meet at 11 o'clock on Saturday.

Mr. LODGE. And that we meet at 11 o'clock on both of those days.

Mr. ALDRICH. And on Saturday?

Mr. LODGE. And on Saturday.

Mr. DUBOIS. And on Thursday.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, then; if I may restate the request, it is that we meet on Thursday, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday at 11 o'clock; that general debate close on Saturday——

Mr. CULLOM. That we shall adjourn over Friday.

Mr. LODGE. I said Thursday, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday.

Mr. CULLOM. I know the Senator did, but he did not say there would be no session on Friday.

Mr. LODGE. It is understood we are not to sit on Friday. The request is that the Senate meet on Thursday, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday at 11 o'clock; that the general debate close on Saturday; that on Monday and Tuesday the debate shall be under the fifteen-minute rule, and that the vote be taken on the bill and all pending amendments offered or to be offered on Tuesday at 4 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. Without further debate.

Mr. LODGE. Without further debate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, there is not a Senator on this floor, I believe, who wishes to shorten this session and to shorten the debate on the grave subjects that are left, including this one, as much as I do. I am staying here now at some personal inconvenience on account of this particular measure. But it seems to me there are two things we ought to understand, if we can, before unanimous consent is given. Of course with respect to no bill can you tell what the Senate will do with amendments that may be proposed, and you can not help the bringing in at a late hour of amendments that are of a good deal of importance. You have to run the risk of dealing with them briefly. But I think we ought to know the attitude of the two sides. We ought to know in general in what shape the majority of the committee wish to leave the bill to be presented to the Senate to vote on, or to have such modifications as they have determined to make proposed now before we agree to fixing a time for a vote. Then we ought to have what I understand we have just got, the final proposition of the minority in general, so far as they are at present advised, as to how they wish to leave the substitute which they propose. We ought not to cut off general debate on those two measures, the main scheme of each side, by an agreement of this kind until we know that.

That is one consideration, and the other is this: I should like to know when my honorable friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] is expected to speak. The announcement was that he was to speak at length on Monday.

Mr. LODGE. It was generally supposed that the Senator from Wisconsin would speak to-morrow. The Senator from Wisconsin, I know, will not allow any speech of his to stand in the way of getting an agreement for a vote on this bill, and I am authorized to say that for him.

Mr. HOAR. Nobody on this floor would desire to lose the pleasure of hearing any contribution which the Senator from Wisconsin might make to any debate, I believe. Certainly I would not. But it may be that the very able and interesting Senator may say something in his speech to reply to which will require a little more than fifteen minutes. Indeed, the proposition is that the fifteen minutes' debate is to be devoted to amendments. I should like to know, if I may, what the present plan is as to the time when the Senator from Wisconsin will speak.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Wisconsin stated yesterday, it then being supposed that Senators on the other side would wish to occupy to-day, that he would go on Thursday morning.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. That is all right so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LODGE. If we have to wait and hear what may be the reply to the Senator from Wisconsin and then the reply to that, of course an agreement is out of the question.

Mr. HOAR. I say it is settled by my colleague's announcement that he expects to speak to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. He expects to speak to-morrow.

Mr. HOAR. He does not expect, in other words, to have the general debate terminate the moment his speech does?

Mr. LODGE. On the contrary, we are to meet on Saturday, and there will be ample opportunity for that.

Mr. HOAR. That is all right. My question was put because the announcement was made yesterday that the Senator from Wisconsin would speak on Monday.

Now, in regard to the other matter. I do not speak of detail or of such things as may occur to anybody, but I should like to know, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] said he would like to know, whether the majority of the committee will be prepared pretty soon or are prepared to-day to make known, for the information of the Senate, the amendments to the bill which they have already determined upon, so that they will not come in at the last moment.

Mr. LODGE. We stand on the bill, in a general way, substantially as it is. The amendments go to questions of detail, just as the minority bill represents, in a general way, the views of the minority. The general views of the two sides of the committee are presented in those two measures. The modifications which the committee will propose are modifications of detail, like the reduction made in the amount of land of which the Senator from Colorado spoke.

Mr. HOAR. Not involving the assertion of any general principle of authority or policy?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know at this time of any intention on the part of the majority to make any general change in the general features of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the senior Senator from Massachusetts will not require the committee to say in advance what amendments they propose to offer.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator did not listen to my statement.

Mr. ALLISON. I listened to the statement——

Mr. HOAR. Let me repeat it, and then we will see whether or not the Senator wishes to criticise it. I said I thought so far as the committee had agreed on any amendment to the bill they should now make known the purpose to move the amendment, not referring, however, to amendments of details. I said I did not expect that they would be precluded if any new view came to them hereafter from suggesting it. In other words, I said we ought to have before the Senate now, if we can, before we commit ourselves, an understanding of the general policy proposed by the two sides. That is all I say. Now, if there is anything in that which does not suit the Senator from Iowa, I am sorry.

Mr. ALLISON. It suits me very well. But I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say we were to offer no amendments affecting any principle.

Mr. HOAR. I did not say that. I said "general principles."

Mr. ALLISON. Then I mistook the statement.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator did. I ought to say that I am entirely contented with my colleague's statement on that subject.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I will make no further observations.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Chair to submit the proposition for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will undertake to submit the proposition. It is that the Senate shall meet on Thursday and Saturday of the present week, and Monday and Tuesday of next week, at 11 o'clock; that the general debate on the pending bill shall close on Saturday; that the debate on Monday and Tuesday shall be under the fifteen-minute rule, and that the vote on the bill and amendments pending and to be offered shall be taken at 4 o'clock on Tuesday, without further debate.

Mr. RAWLINS. One other suggestion is made that the entire time on the days mentioned be devoted to the bill.

Mr. BERRY. Not to interfere with conference reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts include that?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts includes the condition that the entire time on the four days named shall be devoted to the bill, not, however, to interfere with conference reports.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose nobody wants to talk?

Mr. TELLER. I wish to include in that an arrangement as to the disposition of the time when the fifteen-minute rule shall be in operation. I do not want to say that it should be divided between the parties, but I wish to have it provided that the Chair shall not make a list of Senators, but that Senators shall take their chance, according to the old custom of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I think the time ought to be equally divided, as we did before.

Mr. TELLER. I am quite willing to leave it to the Chair, if there is no list.

Mr. LODGE. Very well.

Mr. TELLER. I do not want a list of Senators, so that when a Senator rises the Chair looks over at some other Senator in his seat and recognizes him instead of recognizing the Senator who is on the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Colorado is entirely right. I agree with him entirely.

Mr. TELLER. If we can have the old method which prevailed in the Senate, when Senators took the chance of obtaining recognition by the Chair, I am content to have the time evenly divided or equitably divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. I now——

Mr. HOAR. Before the matter of the amendments is taken up, I ask leave to occupy two or three minutes of the time of the Senate.

In addressing the Senate the other day on this bill, Mr. President, I stated, I think in a discussion with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], but of that I will not be sure, for I have not looked at the RECORD to see, the circumstances which attended the making known to the people of the Philippine Islands of the original proclamation of President McKinley, which General Otis altered in what I deem a very material fashion. The effect of that proclamation, in my judgment, was to bring on this war. It was, in my judgment, a declaration of war between the two people as nations.

I stated that while General Otis saw that the various phrases—"sovereignty" and "submission" and so on—used by the President would tend to bring on war, and for that reason took the liberty of suppressing them, General Miller, at Iloilo, received the proclamation and was eager or desirous for a fight, and that he made the proclamation known, and that Aguinaldo received it as a declaration of war and instantly issued his proclamation that if that were insisted upon he and his people would fight.

I made the statement as to General Miller's purpose on the authority of reports which I have not had time to look up, but as to which my recollection is pretty distinct and which I will look up and bring to the attention of the Senate a little later, and upon the authority of letters from General Miller to his commanding officer, urging that he be permitted to attack Iloilo at once, on the ground that the strength of the men whom he called the insurgents was constantly increasing, and that the sooner that capture was made the easier and better.

I have received a letter from General Miller, and I desire that it shall be read. I have not the least question of General Miller's absolute sincerity in this letter, and that his feeling was exactly what he states. I should like to have the letter read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

2110 R STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 27, 1902.*

Hon. Senator HOAR.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the New York Tribune certain remarks reported to have been made by you yesterday in Philippine debate, in which you used my name as follows: "But General Miller, who notoriously did want an attack, produced it and Aguinaldo met it with an instant, speedy defiance." Now, dear Senator, as to my wanting to fight, and to the implied motive that I, for that reason, produced the President's proclamation, you were entirely in error. Both proclamations came to me from General Otis in the same mail, and my adjutant-general had copies of both printed in Spanish and distributed merely as a matter of routine according to orders, General Otis not having informed me that he did not want the proclamation of the President issued.

As to wanting to fight, you must have been misinformed, as it was equally notorious at Iloilo that I made every endeavor with the leaders of the insurgents to accept the sovereignty of the United States peaceably, telling them evidently we had been thrown together this way through no intentions of our own, but by those of Divine providence. We ought not fight each other about it; advised them that they should accept the sovereignty of the United States, and that later the Congress of the United States would grant them all conditions nearly that they could desire, as set forth in the President's proclamation; if one Congress did not grant them to try the next, and the next, that finally their reasonable desires would be granted. I was on most agreeable social relations with all the leaders and all the people whom I met and repeatedly said to them that my Government would greatly regret the necessity of appealing to arms and the shedding of one drop of blood between our peoples. They knew I was in earnest and agreed to all I said, always ending, "We must abide by the orders from the central government."

Later, when I saw ships being loaded with hemp and sugar and they collecting customs I advised taking the city to stop that.

Yours, respectfully,

M. P. MILLER,
Brigadier-General, United States Army.

Mr. HOAR. That is evidently the letter of a sincere and honest gentleman. Nobody can read it or hear it without being satisfied that whatever General Miller says he did or thought is

exactly what he did or thought. I wish to make that very plain. And yet it is clear that, although General Miller's motive for desiring to resort to arms then, if it were necessary, was not to prevent the Filipinos from getting their independence, but, on the contrary, he urged them to trust Congress, and if one Congress did not give them what they wanted to try again and again until they got it. He evidently seemed to think that what he calls the justice of Congress would do just what I think the justice of Congress will do some of these days. And so, unquestionably, he must be absolutely acquitted of any suggestion that he published this original order for the purpose of bringing on hostilities, and I wish, if I have said anything inconsistent with that, absolutely to withdraw and disclaim it.

Yet it is still true that General Miller desired, unless the Filipino people submitted, to have the attack made then. He said he wanted to stop them from introducing cargoes and collecting customs at Iloilo, which was their capital city, as they regarded it. He wanted it at once stopped, and, unless I am mistaken in my memory, he said also in his letter, which is in the report of the War Department, that he thought we had better make the attack then, because the rebels, as he called them, or the insurgents, the resisting power, were becoming stronger and stronger every day. So I can not see that there is any doubt that General Miller wanted the fight to begin unless Aguinaldo and his people submitted, although I am absolutely satisfied that he did not publish this proclamation with any such purpose or design.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to amend the bill in section 10, on page 6, line 23, after the words "eighteen hundred and ninety-eight," by a formal amendment simply covering military property. I move to insert:

Except such land or other property as shall be designated by the President of the United States for military and other reservations of the Government of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In section 12, on page 7, line 19, I move to strike out "one hundred and sixty" and insert "forty;" so as to read:

Not exceeding 40 acres, or its equivalent in hectares.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In section 12, on page 8, line 4, I move the same amendment, striking out the words "one hundred and sixty" and inserting "forty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In line 16, page 8, section 13, I move the same amendment, striking out "one hundred and sixty" and inserting "forty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In section 14, on page 9, line 4, I move the same amendment, striking out the words "one hundred and sixty" and inserting "forty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In section 68, on page 41, line 23, after the word "President," I move to insert the words "and the Congress;" so as to read:

With the consent and approval of the President and the Congress of the United States.

That is to limit the issuance of municipal bonds by municipalities outside of Manila.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In line 2, page 42, section 68, after the words "par value" and before the bracket, I move to insert:

in gold coin of the United States.

That corresponds with the other provision.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In section 72, on page 43, line 19, after the words "par value" and before the bracket, I move the same amendment, inserting the words "in gold coin of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Those are all the amendments I have to offer in behalf of the committee at the present time. There are one or two others that the majority of the committee are considering.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee for just a moment to the fact that those are amendments I had proposed in the amendment I offered the other night, but in addition I had proposed to strike out all of section 13 after the word "person," in the seventeenth line, striking out these words:

nor more than 5,000 acres to any corporation or association of persons.

Mr. LODGE. That is the limitation on corporation holdings?

Mr. TELLER. Yes. What does the Senator say about it?

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator that the question of the amount of land that corporations can hold is being considered by the majority members of the committee. I can not tell him yet what decision they will reach.

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator will agree to strike out that clause. I regard it as an exceedingly dangerous and objectionable feature in the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is it the Senator's proposition to strike out all of section 13?

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no; but to strike out in section 13 the words "nor more than 5,000 acres to any corporation or association of persons." I want to get that clause out, and then if it is necessary to offer an amendment which shall prevent them from granting anything to corporations I should like to offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I did not intend to participate in the general debate upon this bill, but to content myself with the opportunity that would be afforded under the fifteen-minute limit of debate. However, as no Senator on the other side desires to proceed this afternoon, I will husband the time which I intended to take by making some observations now upon the pending measure. What I have to say will be confined to the measure under consideration and nothing else, for nothing else, to my mind, is important.

Mr. President, we have come at last to the parting of the ways. After journeying in this Philippine matter now for more than four years, the time has come when we must determine our future course. If there is to be a change it can not be decided upon too soon. If the present course is to be persisted in, it can not be too clearly pointed out or definitely understood. And after having chosen our course, whatever it may be, it is important that we pursue it with stability and without questioning.

The Committee on the Philippines present to the Senate two propositions, the bill of the majority and the substitute of the minority. These two propositions fairly represent the divergent views of the committee, and I presume of the country, as to the future government of the Philippine Islands, and we are called upon to determine which course shall be taken. It is important, therefore, at the outset to clearly understand the two proposed policies and the direction in which they lead.

The bill of the majority, in general terms, looks to the temporary, if not the permanent, occupation by the United States of the Philippine Archipelago. It proposes to establish therein what is denominated in the bill "A civil government for the Philippine Islands," under and by virtue of American sovereignty. The leading features of the bill are as follows:

There is to be appointed for the "government of the Philippine Islands" a governor, vice-governor, members of the Commission, the heads of executive departments, a chief justice of the supreme court and associate justices, all to be selected by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; a census of the inhabitants of the islands is to be taken at an early day, which shall embrace all needful information as to the conditions, character, and attainments of the people, the result of which shall be reported to the President of the United States; the Commission shall also report, in connection with the returns of such census, whether all or any portion of the Philippine people are "capable, fit, and ready for the establishment of permanent popular representative government;" additional municipal and provincial governments are to be established "with popular representative government" so far and as rapidly as "communities in such civil divisions are capable, fit, and ready for the same."

The Government is authorized to "improve the harbors and navigable waters of the archipelago;" construct and maintain "warehouses, light-houses, signal stations, and like instruments of commerce;" all "property and rights which may have been acquired in the Philippine Islands by the United States under the treaty of peace with Spain are placed under control of the government of the Philippine Islands," to be administered for the benefit of their inhabitants.

The "government of the Philippine Islands" is also authorized to make rules for the leasing, sale, and disposition of public lands, "other than the timber or mineral lands," but such regulations shall not go into effect or have the force of law "until they receive the approval of the President of the United States, by and through the Secretary of War," and they shall also be submitted to Congress for amendment or disapproval; the government is authorized to make rules and regulations prescribing the terms and conditions to enable persons to perfect their title to public lands, not exceeding 160 acres, who, prior to the transfer of sovereignty, from Spain to the United States, had fulfilled all or some of the conditions required by Spanish laws, and the President of the United States is authorized to issue patents therefor; the government is authorized to lease, let, and demise to "actual occupants and settlers and others," for a term of not more than five years, such parts and portions of the public domain, not exceeding 160 acres, other than timber and mineral lands, as may be deemed wise; in the leasing, demising, or letting of any part of the public domain preference shall be given to actual occupants and settlers, and "all moneys obtained from such leasing shall be covered into the insular treasury, to be used only for insular purposes;" no

timber, trees, forests, or forest products on lands leased or demised "shall be cut, destroyed, removed, or appropriated, except by special permission of said government."

No timber lands forming a part of the public domain shall be sold or leased, but said government shall have the right and is empowered to issue licenses to cut timber under forestry regulations of the islands.

It is further provided that in all cases public lands in the islands valuable for minerals shall be reserved from sale except as otherwise expressly directed; but all valuable mineral deposits in public lands "are free and open to exploration and purchase, and the land in which they are found to occupation and purchase by citizens of the United States, natives of the Philippine Islands, and persons who have, under and by virtue of the treaty of Paris, acquired the political rights of natives of the islands," and the laws and regulations touching mineral lands shall conform, so far as applicable, to the general laws of the United States on that subject; and land districts and a mining bureau are to be established in the islands.

The government of the Philippine Islands is also authorized "to acquire, receive, hold, maintain, and convey title to real and personal property, and may acquire real estate for public uses by the exercise of the right of eminent domain;" and under this provision it is expressly empowered to acquire such lands, easements, and appurtenances as on the 13th day of August, 1898, were owned or held by associations, corporations, communities, religious orders, or private individuals in such large tracts or parcels as in the opinion of the Commission injuriously affect the welfare of the people of the Philippine Islands;" and to provide the necessary funds for the purchase of such lands the government of the Philippine Islands is empowered to borrow money and issue bonds therefor upon the usual terms and conditions; and the lands so acquired shall constitute a part of the public property of the "government of the Philippine Islands," and may be disposed of by such government on such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, the proceeds to constitute a sinking fund for the payment of principal and interest.

Mr. CLAY. With the Senator's permission—he seems to be reading the bill from beginning to end, going through the different sections—the section he is on now, if I remember correctly, authorizes the Philippine Commission to permit the municipality of the city of Manila to issue $4,000,000 of bonds and any other city or town to issue bonds, and those bonds are to draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent, payable semiannually. The bill further provides that these bonds are nontaxable by the Government of the United States; and it also provides that the bonds issued by the city of Manila and the other cities in the Philippine Islands are nontaxable by any State in this Union, or by any municipality. Now, as I understand it, if the city of Manila shall issue $4,000,000 of bonds and some syndicate in Georgia or the Senator's State or New York were to buy those bonds, they would be nontaxable by the city of New York or any municipality or State where they were held. I desire to ask the Senator if he can point to a single instance where the Government of the United States has ever authorized a city or town within any of its territory to issue bonds that are nontaxable by another State or another municipality?

Mr. BURROWS. I will say in reply to the Senator from Georgia that the provisions to which he refers are not contained in the section which I was reading.

Mr. CLAY. It is in section 72, I think, or section 76.

Mr. BURROWS. It is in a section to which I shall refer in a few moments. The section I was reading is the one which authorizes the acquirement of lands belonging to religious orders and corporations and the issuing of bonds for the purpose of raising the necessary funds to provide for their purchase.

The Supreme Court of the United States is given jurisdiction in certain important cases with power to review, revise, reverse, modify, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the supreme court of the Philippine Islands.

Section 68 is the one to which the Senator from Georgia called my attention, and is as follows:

> That for the purpose of providing funds to construct sewers, to furnish adequate sewer and drainage facilities, to secure a sufficient supply of water, and to provide all kinds of municipal betterments and improvements in municipalities, the government of the Philippine Islands, under such limitations, terms, and conditions as it may prescribe, with the consent and approval of the President of the United States, may permit any municipality of said islands to incur indebtedness, borrow money, etc.

Mr. CLAY. And if the Senator will read further he will find that they are nontaxable by a State or municipality.

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly; I am aware of that provision, but I am not stopping to discuss the merits of the several provisions of the measure, my only purpose being to show what the bill is, and in what manner and to what extent it asserts the sovereignty of the United States.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator if he thinks that Congress ought to authorize any city in its territory to issue city bonds that can not be taxed by any city or State in the Union where they are held. I grant you that when we issue Government bonds, they are nontaxable by the States or by any city in a State; but when Congress authorizes a city to issue bonds, does the Senator think Congress ought to provide that a syndicate owning those bonds in any State or municipality shall not be taxed?

Mr. BURROWS. Now the Senator is discussing the merits of the proposition. I am not doing that now. My purpose, as I said before, is simply to show the scope of the bill. When we come to the fifteen-minute debate, if the question made by the Senator comes up, it will then be proper to consider that question and I will be pleased to discuss it with the Senator.

Mr. QUARLES. Will the Senator permit me a moment? If it will not disturb him I should like to ask my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] whether as a matter of law these bonds, issued pursuant to Federal authority under that section, do not become in some sense a Federal instrumentality to carry out a Federal policy, as much so as though they had the great seal of the United States upon them? If that is so, Mr. President, then the same principle by which a United States bond would be made nontaxable would apply to this issue of bonds.

Mr. CLAY. Now, when the Government——

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. CLAY. Certainly, with pleasure. I started to answer the question.

Mr. BURROWS. This debate is exceedingly interesting, but I do not wish to be diverted from the one purpose I had in view at this time, a succinct statement of the leading features of the committee's bill. The merits or demerits of these provisions I do not now propose to discuss.

Mr. CLAY. I want it to appear, then, that the Senator declined to yield. I do not want it to appear that the Senator from Wisconsin asked me a question and I refused to answer it. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BURROWS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There are other suggestions to be made in this connection, if the Senator pleases, if we are going into it.

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator must see where it will lead if we are now to enter upon a discussion of the merits of the various propositions contained in the bill, and if persisted in I will be unable to conclude within the time I should feel warranted in occupying.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was about to say to the Senator from Michigan that the only reason why I do not make one or two other suggestions in addition to the one made by my friend, the honorable Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES], was because I did not think the Senator from Michigan desired the logical sequence of his statement to be broken into.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not desire to have a discussion of any of these side issues now. All these matters can and will be considered later under the fifteen-minute debate, and I trust Senators will forego their consideration until they properly arise.

Mr. President, the bill of the majority also provides for establishing a mint at the city of Manila for coinage purposes, and for a general system of currency adapted to the commercial necessities of the people; and finally the Philippine government is authorized to grant franchises, privileges, and concessions for the construction and operation of works of public utility and service, subject always to amendment, alteration, or repeal by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I have now accomplished the only purpose I had in the beginning—to place before the Senate the policy of the Government in dealing with the Philippines, as outlined in the pending measure.

It will be seen that the bill of the majority provides a most elaborate system of civil administration for the government of the Philippine Islands, which in its practical operation it is hoped and believed will develop the material resources of the islands, advance the industrial interests of their inhabitants, and promote the civilization, peace, and prosperity of the whole people. All this, it is frankly admitted, is to be done under American sovereignty, and so far as this measure is concerned without promise or expressed purpose, for the present, at least, of surrendering that sovereignty or abandoning the control of the islands.

The proposition of the minority, as frankly stated, points in another direction, and in the express terms of the substitute, to the "relinquishment of all claims of sovereignty over, or title to the Philippine Islands;" to the calling of a convention of the various peoples and tribes in the islands for the purpose of forming a constitution "for and by the people," which when formulated that fact shall be certified to the President of the United States, whose duty it shall be, in the language of the substitute, "to issue his proclamation declaring the independence of the people of the archipelago; and that they constitute an independant state and

nation; and that within sixty days from the election and inauguration of the officers provided for by such constitution, the President shall cause the armed forces of the United States to be withdrawn from the archipelago."

This proposition of the minority calls a halt in our course, and commands our forces, civil and military, to "mark time," while the proposed convention deliberates, taking no thought for the development of the islands; no thought for the establishment of industries; no thought for the betterment and uplifting of the people under the beneficent sway of American sovereignty; but is intent only upon the abandonment of the islands and consigning them to an uncertain, and I confidently believe, disastrous future.

That I may not do the minority an injustice in thus characterizing their policy, I beg to insert in this connection a copy of the proposed substitute:

Amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by Mr. RAWLINS to the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. That, subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth, the United States of America hereby relinquish all claim of sovereignty over and title to the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands.

SEC. 2. That the United States shall continue to occupy and govern said archipelago until the people thereof have established a government, and until sufficient guaranties have been obtained for the performance of our treaty obligations with Spain and for the safety of those inhabitants who have adhered to the United States, and for the maintenance and protection of all rights which have accrued under the authority thereof, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. That ninety days after the President of the United States shall have proclaimed that all armed resistance to the United States has ceased in said archipelago the United States Philippine Commission shall make and promulgate rules and regulations for the holding of an election in the provinces of said archipelago for members of a convention, which convention when organized shall proceed to the adoption of a constitution for the government of said archipelago. That all male inhabitants of said archipelago 21 years of age and over who speak and write either the English or Spanish languages or any of the native languages of the said archipelago, and who shall have resided therein for one year, shall be qualified to vote for members of the convention, and any person so qualified as an elector shall be qualified to become a member of said convention. The members of the said convention shall number three hundred, and shall be apportioned by the United States Philippine Commission among the several provinces of said archipelago so that the distribution shall be in proportion to their population as near as may be; and when the said apportionment has been determined upon, the said Commission shall by proclamation order an election of the members for said convention, to be held throughout the said archipelago at such time as shall be fixed by the said Commission, which election shall be held not more than one year from the date of the proclamation by the President of the United States hereinbefore provided for, and ample time shall be given before said election to circulate said proclamation throughout said archipelago and arrange for the holding of the said election.

SEC. 4. That the members of the convention thus elected shall meet at the city of Manila on a day to be fixed by the said United States Philippine Commission not more than ninety days subsequent to the day of election, the time for which meeting shall be stated in the proclamation calling attention to the election aforesaid; and after organization the said convention shall proceed to form a constitution and organize such government as they may deem best adapted to promote the welfare and secure the peace and happiness of the inhabitants of said islands: *Provided*, That said convention shall provide by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States:

First. That there shall belong to the United States and continue to be the property thereof such lands and waters as the President of the United States shall designate to the said convention for naval, military, and coaling stations and terminal facilities for submarine cables, the same to continue under the control and sovereignty of the United States.

Second. To carry into effect the treaty obligations of the United States with the Kingdom of Spain, and for the maintenance and protection of all rights and property acquired under the authority of the United States.

Third. That no inhabitant of said archipelago shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her adherence to the United States.

SEC. 5. That when the constitution and government shall be formed for and by the people of said archipelago in compliance with the provisions of this act, the said United States Philippine Commission shall certify the fact to the President of the United States, together with a copy of said constitution and ordinances, whereupon it shall be the duty of the President to issue his proclamation declaring the independence of the people of said archipelago, and that they constitute an independent state and nation.

SEC. 6. That the President of the United States is hereby requested to negotiate an agreement between the United States, the said Philippine Archipelago, and Great Britain, Germany, France, and such other powers as he may deem best, providing for its perpetual neutrality and inviolability from all foreign interference, and also for equal opportunities of trade to foreign countries with said archipelago.

SEC. 7. That immediately after the President shall have proclaimed that all armed resistance to the United States has ceased in said archipelago, he is requested to proclaim full amnesty to all the inhabitants thereof for or on account of political offenses and the bearing of arms against the United States, and all Filipinos or inhabitants of said archipelago who have been deported shall be returned to the place from whence they were so deported: *Provided*, That such amnesty shall not apply to any who have violated the rules of civilized warfare or were guilty of murder or torture. That the latter, if any, shall be afforded a speedy trial for their offenses in the civil courts of said archipelago, and be punished or acquitted, as the facts and law may warrant.

SEC. 8. That within sixty days from the election of officers under the constitution to be formed by the said Philippine Archipelago and the inauguration of said officers the President shall cause the armed forces of the United States to be withdrawn from said archipelago as speedily as may be, except such forces as may be maintained in such parts thereof as have been retained by the United States for naval, military, and coaling stations and terminal facilities for cables; and the President of the United States and the Secretary of War shall make all needful regulations to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote the welfare and establish the independence of the Philippine Islands."

Mr. President, these are, in substance, the two measures before the Senate; and they fairly present, as I have said, the conflicting opinions of the Senate and the American people upon this great question. Which course shall be pursued is the vital and all-absorbing issue, and all other questions are incidental and insignificant as compared with this.

If the water cure has been administered to some persons in arms against the Government, that is no reason why we should abandon the islands or surrender our sovereignty.

Mr. President, I do not propose to consider or trace the various steps which led up to our occupancy of the Philippine Islands, over which the United States is to-day asserting its sovereignty. Nor will I stop now to inquire who fired the first shot or who is responsible for the inauguration of the conflict. These questions belong to the past and to history, and their consideration at this time can not, in my judgment, contribute in the slightest degree to the solution of the problem immediately confronting the American people.

We are in the Philippines, and what shall be our future policy in relation to their government is the sole question before the Senate. Shall we continue our present course, or shall we "about face" and abandon it for that course suggested by the minority?

And, first, let me say that the bill of the majority is in line with the avowed policy of the Government toward the Philippine people from the beginning—from our first occupation of the islands until this hour. It is not a hastily formed plan or an untried experiment. It is only the continuation and consummation of that policy in which there has been no variableness or shadow of turning. That policy is set forth by the Philippine Commission on page 5 of their report, which I will ask to have embodied in my remarks without reading.

The extract referred to is as follows:

1. The supremacy of the United States must and will be enforced throughout every part of the archipelago, and those who resist it can accomplish no end other than their own ruin.

2. The most ample liberty of self-government will be granted to the Philippine people which is reconcilable with the maintenance of a wise, just, stable, effective, and economical administration of public affairs, and compatible with the sovereign and international rights and obligations of the United States.

3. The civil rights of the Philippine people will be guaranteed and protected to the fullest extent, religious freedom assured, and all persons shall have an equal standing before the law.

4. Honor, justice, and friendship forbid the use of the Philippine people or islands as an object or means of exploitation. The purpose of the American Government is the welfare and advancement of the Philippine people.

5. There shall be guaranteed to the Philippine people an honest and effective civil service, in which, to the fullest extent practicable, natives shall be employed.

6. The collection and application of taxes and revenues will be put upon a sound, honest, and economical basis. Public funds, raised justly and collected honestly, will be applied only in defraying the regular and proper expenses incurred by and for the establishment and maintenance of the Philippine government, and for such general improvements as public interests may demand. Local funds, collected for local purposes, shall not be diverted to other ends. With such a prudent and honest fiscal administration, it is believed that the needs of the government will in a short time become compatible with a considerable reduction in taxation.

7. A pure, speedy, and effective administration of justice will be established, whereby the evils of delay, corruption, and exploitation will be effectually eradicated.

8. The construction of roads, railroads, and other means of communication and transportation, as well as other public works of manifest advantage to the Philippine people, will be promoted.

9. Domestic and foreign trade and commerce, agriculture, and other industrial pursuits, and the general development of the country in the interest of its inhabitants, will be constant objects of solicitude and fostering care.

10. Effective provision will be made for the establishment of elementary schools in which the children of the people shall be educated. Appropriate facilities will be provided for higher education.

11. Reforms in all departments of the government, in all branches of the public service, and in all corporations closely touching the common life of the people must be undertaken without delay and effected, conformably to right and justice, in a way that will satisfy the well-founded demands and the highest sentiments and aspirations of the Philippine people.

Mr. BURROWS. I also ask leave to print as a part of my remarks an extract from the report of the Taft Commission, found on page 148 of their report, giving the conclusions of that body, and showing that the bill of the majority is in line with and carries out in the main the suggestions of the Commission and the policy of the United States.

The extract referred to is as follows:

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

The Commission recommends—

1. That Congress make appropriations to construct posts or garrisons for the army outside of the towns, so that they shall not be quartered in the towns.

2. That Congress be requested to confirm the legislation of the Commission already enacted, and vest by Congressional enactment in the civil governor, and Commission, and their successors to be appointed by the President, the authority heretofore exercised by them under the instructions of the President, with the limitations therein contained, until January 1, 1904; and that provision be made in such legislation for a government to begin on January 1, 1904, and to be composed of a governor and the heads of four executive departments, to be appointed by the President; of an executive council, to consist of the governor and the four heads of departments, and four others, to be appointed by the President (the executive council to consist both of Americans and Filipinos), and of a popular assembly of not exceeding 30 representatives, to be elected from districts to be determined after a census of the Filipino

population in the islands; that in such government the members of the popular assembly shall serve for a term of two years, and the popular assembly shall be limited to an annual session of three months, from the 1st of January to the 1st of April, except as this may be extended by call of the governor for a definite period in extra session; that the power of the popular assembly shall be that of a coordinate branch of the legislature, except that in the case of appropriation bills, if the popular assembly shall fail to vote the appropriations required by law during its regular session of three months the right to vote such necessary appropriations shall vest in the executive council; that the governor shall have the power to veto the legislation of the two chambers unless the same shall be again passed by a two-thirds vote of both houses; that Congress shall have full power to abrogate all legislation, and that by a joint vote of the popular assembly and the executive council two delegates, who shall be residents of the islands, shall be elected to represent the interests of these islands and the Filipino people before Congress and the Executive at Washington, their expenses and salaries to be paid from the insular treasury.

3. That the Commission be authorized to issue bonds of the insular government with which to buy up the agricultural holdings and other property of the religious orders, to purchase the same, and to sell lands thus acquired, preferably to the present tenants on easy payments, and be required to use the proceeds of the sales as a sinking fund with which to meet the bonds issued.

4. That an appeal be granted from the supreme court of the islands to the Supreme Court of the United States in the San José College case, and in all cases between the insular government and the Catholic Church, or any of its dependencies, in respect to the ownership or administration of trust or other property in the Philippine Islands.

* * * * * * *

6. That the Commission be given power to itself issue bonds for the city of Manila, or to authorize the municipal board to do so in an amount not exceeding $4,000,000, sufficient to make needed improvements in the water supply and the sewerage and drainage systems.

7. That the Commission be given power to grant street-railway, electric-light, telephone, and other municipal franchises in the towns of the islands, subject to the confirmation of the President.

8. That the Commission be given authority to pass a general public-land law, making provision for the acquisition of homestead rights, the perfecting of titles of those who have in good faith settled upon public lands and improved the same, and public auction sales of the public lands at a fixed minimum price per acre in tracts of comparatively large extent, and upon such other conditions as the Commission may impose; and that this authority shall include the right of the Commission to grant to the pueblos commons from the public lands.

9. That the Commission be authorized to continue the present regulations of the cutting of timber, with such modifications as experience may show to be wise.

10. That the Commission be authorized to pass a mining law having a general resemblance to the United States mining laws, with such modifications as the local conditions require.

11. That the Commission be given power to pass a general incorporation law for the conducting of legitimate businesses by corporations.

12. That the Commission be given special authority to issue charters to commercial railroads, with power to make donations of lands, or guarantee the interest on the investments, or both; such grants to be subject to the approval of the President of the United States.

13. That Congress enact a general coinage law providing for the establishment of a gold standard, with local silver currency, and shall confer power upon the Commission, by a gold reserve and otherwise, to maintain the parity between the gold standard and the local currency, as indicated in the body of the report.

14. That Congress shall enact a general banking law for the islands, providing for the establishment of national banks in the islands, with branches in various parts of the islands and in the United States; for the establishment of branches in these islands of national banks located in the United States; for the carrying on and supervision of other banks not national, and for the establishment of mortgage land banks; all as outlined in the body of this report.

15. That Congress shall enact a law authorizing the Commission to appropriate the Spanish and insurrectionary seized funds now in the treasury of the islands to the making of a school fund or for the use of the provinces in which such funds were captured.

* * * * * * *

17. That Congress shall enact a law appropriating a sum sufficient to reimburse the insular treasury for the amount expended in the purchase and fitting of certain Spanish gunboats turned over to the Navy and now used by that Department.

WM. H. TAFT.
DEAN C. WORCESTER.
LUKE E. WRIGHT.
HENRY C. IDE.
BERNARD MOSES.

NOTE.—The three Filipino commissioners were not installed in office until the 1st of September, 1901, and as the period covered by this report is from the 1st of December, 1900, until the 1st of October, 1901, it was agreed between the commissioners that it would be more just to make this report as the report of the original Commission rather than that of the Commission as at present constituted. The three Filipino commissioners, however, having read this report, agreed in the recommendations as to the form of a permanent central civil government to be established.

Mr. BURROWS. The bill before us is in furtherance of that end, an end to be attained, let me say, not by the harsh instrumentality of war alone, but by the gentler means of civil administration. Much has been said of the harshness of military rule, and I have been surprised that the minority, in view of their criticisms, should so persistently resist the efforts of the majority and of the Government to relieve the people of military control and put in its place civil administration.

The purpose of this Government from the beginning has been, so soon and so far as our sovereignty was established in the islands, to subordinate military rule to civil control, to employ the military only when necessary, and to establish civil authority whenever and wherever possible.

This was President McKinley's policy in the beginning, as announced in his message to Congress in December, 1899. I quote from that document:

As long as the insurrection continues the military arm must necessarily be supreme. But there is no reason why steps should not be taken from time to time to inaugurate governments essentially popular in their form as fast as territory is held and controlled by our troops. To this end I am considering the advisability of the return of the Commission, or such of the members thereof as can be secured, to aid the existing authorities and facilitate this work throughout the islands. I have believed that reconstruction should not begin by the establishment of one central civil government for all the islands, with its seat at Manila, but rather that the work should be commenced by building up from the bottom, first establishing municipal governments and then provincial governments, a central government at last to follow.

In execution of that purpose, it will be remembered that a second commission was appointed, with Judge Taft at its head, who entered upon the work of establishing civil government in the Philippine Islands under instructions from the President of the United States; which instructions set forth so clearly the purposes of the Government in this regard that I beg to quote therefrom. The President said:

It is probable that the transfer of authority from military commanders to civil officers will be gradual and will occupy a considerable period. Its successful accomplishment and the maintenance of peace and order in the meantime will require the most perfect cooperation between the civil and military authorities in the island, and both should be directed during the transition period by the same executive department.

Without hampering them by too specific instructions, they should in general be, after making themselves familiar with the conditions and needs of the country, enjoined to devote their attention in the first instance to the establishment of municipal governments, in which the natives of the islands, both in the cities and in the rural communities, shall be afforded the opportunity to manage their own local affairs to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and subject to the least degree of supervision and control which a careful study of their capacities and observation of the workings of native control show to be consistent with the maintenance of law, order, and loyalty.

The next subject in order of importance should be the organization of government in the larger administrative divisions corresponding to counties, departments, or provinces in which the common interests of many or several municipalities falling within the same tribal lines or the same natural geographical limits may best be subserved by a common administration. Whenever the Commission is of the opinion that the condition of affairs in the islands is such that the central administration may safely be transferred from military to civil control they will report that conclusion to you, with their recommendations as to the form of central government to be established for the purpose of taking over the control.

And further:

Beginning with the 1st day of September, 1900, the authority to exercise, subject to my approval, through the Secretary of War, that part of the power of government in the Philippine Islands which is of a legislative nature is to be transferred from the military governor of the islands to this Commission, to be thereafter exercised by them in the place and stead of the military governor. * * *

That in all cases the municipal officers, who administer the local affairs of the people, are to be selected by the people, and that wherever officers of more extended jurisdiction are to be selected in any way, natives of the islands are to be preferred, and if they can be found competent and willing to perform the duties, they are to receive the offices in preference to any others. * * *

It will be necessary to fill some offices for the present with Americans, which after a time may well be filled by natives of the islands. * * *

It will be the duty of the Commission to promote and extend, and, as they find occasion, to improve the system of education already inaugurated by the military authorities. In doing this they should regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which shall be free to all, and which shall tend to fit the people for the duties of citizenship and for the ordinary avocations of a civilized community. * * *

Let me supplement this with what Governor Taft said before our Committee on the Philippine Islands. I quote from page 57 of the hearings:

I have studied, of course, the instructions issued by President McKinley with a great deal of care, and have watched their operation in the development of the government of those islands, and perhaps it is my intimacy with them and my interest in their operation that make me say that I think they constitute one of the greatest state papers ever issued in operating as they were intended to operate and in bringing about a state of affairs that they intended to bring about; and their operation was this: There was insurrection in the country. How far that insurrection attracted the sympathy of all the people is of course a mere matter of opinion, upon which there will always be a substantial difference. That there were two parties, however—those who favored the exclusion of American sovereignty altogether, and a substantial party who favored the government which we are now establishing—is undoubtedly true; and that there was a large body of ignorant people who were entirely indifferent, provided peace could be established and they could be protected from oppression and violence and assault, and who had very few political ideas at all, is also true.

Senator BEVERIDGE. This third division is the great body of all?

Governor TAFT. Yes; ignorant people.

Now, the problem there was on the one hand to suppress the insurrection, and that had to be done with the Army. On the other hand, it was to teach the people that our purpose was not to continue a military government, but by object lessons to show them what civil government was by legislation and by putting it into force.

Now, here was a dual government. There was the military arm on the one hand and there was the civil arm on the other, and the effect of those instructions—you can see it operate every day—was to bring the Filipino—and I do not except anybody in that statement; I do not even except the insurrectos—to bring the people into more friendly relations with the civil government than with the military government.

The conduct of a dual form of government of that sort was of course difficult. The instructions were framed so that they have worked. But the coming into the minds of the people a consciousness of the existence of power in the civil government and its effect on them, and the gradually placing more and more power in the civil government, which the instructions contemplated, have had a marvelous effect in showing the people what our purpose was.

War is hard; war is rough; war is cruel; and when the death and the suffering that were caused to many Filipinos were known to their brethren, it is not reasonable to expect that they should love the instrument by which that punishment was inflicted. And that speaks the greatness of these instructions, that accompanying the necessary instrument in suppressing that insurrection was another instrument, the civil government, winning, almost

by contrast, you might say, the affection and confidence of the Filipino people. The hand that drew those instructions followed a brain that understood human nature, and the working out of them in the short two years is a vindication of that judgment.

But, on behalf of the Commission, I think I may say that we have had chiefly in mind always the good of the Filipino people; that we have been attempting to gain their confidence, to make them feel that we are anxious to give them the best government possible, and to secure them in the enjoyment of such rights as will enable them to progress and achieve contentment and prosperity.

Gentlemen who think that that is an impossibility—and included amongst such classes are the men whom I have mentioned—disagree with us. Whatever the cause, I assert without hesitation on my part that the Philippine people as a people sympathize with the Commission in its efforts, welcome us to every part of the islands, and have confidence in our attempt to bring good to them.

This letter of President McKinley's to which I have referred, and concerning which Governor Taft has spoken, was the chart by which we have thus far directed our course in this venturesome and, I grant you, perilous voyage. This policy of subordinating military to civil rule was further clearly and tersely set forth by the able Secretary of War in his report for the year 1901, from which I desire to make a single quotation.

The policy contemplated—

Says the Secretary—

The policy contemplated in the instructions of April 7, and followed by the War Department, has been to steadily press forward, as rapidly as it could be done safely and thoroughly, the gradual substitution of government through civil agents for government through military agents, so that the administration of the military officer shall be continually narrowed, and that of the civil officer continually enlarged, until the time comes when the army can, without impairing the peace and order of the country, be relegated to the same relation toward the government which it occupies in the United States. In this way we have avoided the premature abandonment of any power necessary to enforce the authority of the United States, and at the same time have held open to the people of every community the opportunity to escape from the stringency of military rule by uniting with us in effective measures to bring about peaceful conditions in the territory which they inhabit.

This, Mr. President, has been the wise and humane policy of the Government from the beginning. In the forceful words of the Secretary of War—

The administration of the military officer shall be continually narrowed, and that of the civil officer continually enlarged, until the time comes when the army can, without impairing the peace and order of the country, be relegated to the same relation toward the government which it occupies in the United States.

And now, Mr. President, I desire to submit, and in this connection, a chronological statement of the various acts taken by the executive branch of the Government for the establishment of general, provincial, and municipal civil government in the Philippines; to show at a glance how steadily and how rapidly we have advanced to the consummation of our purpose to supplant military rule and establish peace and order under civil control.

CHRONOLOGICAL STATEMENT OF STEPS TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GENERAL, PROVINCIAL, AND MUNICIPAL CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

1899.

January 20.—Jacob Gould Schurman, of New York; Maj. Gen. Elwell S. Otis, of the United States Army; Rear-Admiral George Dewey, of the United States Navy; Charles Denby, of Indiana; Dean C. Worcester, of Michigan, appointed by the President as Commissioners to the Philippines.

January 21.—Secretary of State transmitted copy of instructions of the President, dated January 20, 1899, to the above-named Commissioners.

March 4.—Commissioners Schurman and Worcester arrived at Manila.

April 2.—Commissioner Denby arrived at Manila.

April 4.—Proclamation of the Commission to the people of the Philippine Islands.

1900.

March 16.—Hon. William H. Taft of Ohio, Hon. Dean C. Worcester of Michigan, Hon. Luke E. Wright of Tennessee, Hon. Henry C. Ide of Vermont, and Hon. Bernard Moses of California, appointed Commissioners to the Philippine Islands.

April 7.—Instructions of the President to the "Taft Commission."

June 3.—Taft Commission arrived at Manila.

September 1.—Commission began its legislative and executive duties under the instructions of the President.

September 19.—(No. 5.) An act for the establishment and maintenance of an efficient and honest civil service in the Philippine Islands.

September 26.—(No. 6.) An act prescribing the order of procedure by the Commission in the enactment of laws.

(No. 7.) An act for the establishment of a bureau of statistics for the Philippine Islands.

October 3.—(No. 12.) An act prescribing the method to be adopted by the insular treasurer in keeping and rendering accounts of his receipts and disbursements.

October 10.—(No. 16.) An act for the reorganization of the forestry bureau of the Philippine Islands.

(No. 17.) An act for the reorganization of the mining bureau of the Philippine Islands.

(No. 20.) An act to reorganize the office of the auditor of the Philippine Islands.

October 17.—(No. 24.) An act establishing a court of first instance for the province of Bohol.

October 24.—(No. 28.) An act establishing a court of first instance for the provinces of La Union and Benguet.

(No. 33.) An act abolishing the office of the captain of the port at every port in the Philippine Islands except Manila and transferring the duties of such office to the proper collector or inspector of customs.

October 29.—(No. 36.) An act regulating the system of keeping accounts of public revenues and the returns thereof, and repealing certain orders and circulars relating to those subjects.

October 31.—(No. 49.) An act prescribing the method to be adopted in making requisitions for funds from the insular treasury, and repealing portions of Executive order of May 8, 1899.

November 12.—(No. 44.) An act providing for the service of process in the provinces where civil courts have not been organized.

November 22.—(No. 48.) An act providing for the establishment of local civil governments in the townships of the province of Benguet.

November 23.—(No. 49.) An act providing for the establishment of a civil government for the province of Benguet.

November 23.—(No. 52.) An act providing for examinations of banking institutions in the Philippine Islands and for reports by their officers.

December 12.—(No. 58.) An act authorizing the establishment of local police in cities and towns of the Philippine Islands and appropriating one hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($150,000), money of the United States, for their maintenance.

December 14.—(No. 59.) An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors within the city of Manila and its attached barrios.

December 21.—(No. 62.) An act authorizing the provost-marshal-general to establish police and health regulations in the nature of municipal ordinances for the city of Manila.

1901.

January 9.—(No. 70.) An act providing for the organization of three companies of police for the city of Manila and neighboring towns.

January 16.—(No. 73.) An act providing for the examination and licensing of applicants for the positions of master, mate, and patron of seagoing vessels.

January 21.—(No. 74.) An act establishing a department of public instruction in the Philippine Islands and appropriating $40,000 for the organization and maintenance of a normal and a trade school in Manila, and $15,000 for the organization and maintenance of an agricultural school in the island of Negros for the year 1901.

January 31.—(No. 82.) A general act for the organization of municipal governments in the Philippine Islands.

February 6.—(No. 83.) A general act for the organization of provincial governments in the Philippine Islands.

Acts extending the provisions of the provincial-government act to the provinces of—

February 13.—(No. 85.) Pampanga.
February 16.—(No. 86.) Pangasinan.
February 18.—(No. 87.) Tarlac.
February 27.—(No. 88.) Bulacan.

February 28.—(No. 90.) An act reciting an Executive order of the President of the United States amending the Executive order of May 8, 1899, creating the office of auditor for the islands, of deputy auditor for the islands, and chief clerk of the auditor for the islands of the Philippine Archipelago, and enacting, with the concurrence and approval of the Secretary of War first had, the rules and instructions relative to the accounting system of the military government of the United States in the islands of the Philippine Archipelago.

March 2.—(No. 92.) An act extending the provisions of the provincial-government act to the province of Bataan.

March 9.—(No. 98.) An act to regulate commerce in the Philippine Islands.

Acts extending the provisions of the "provincial-government act" to the provinces of—

March 12.—(No. 103.) Tayabas.
March 16.—(No. 104.) Romblon.
March 18.—(No. 105.) Masbate.
April 11.—(No. 113.) Iloilo.
April 13.—(No. 114.) Antique.
April 15.—(No. 115.) Capiz.
April 18.—(No. 116.) Cebu, and incorporating the pueblo of San Nicolas in the municipality of Cebu.
April 20.—(No. 117.) Bohol.
April 20.—(No. 119.) Negros Occidental; also the Municipal Code to the same province.
April 20.—(No. 120.) Oriental Negros; also the Municipal Code to the same province.
April 22.—(No. 121.) Leyte.
April 26.—(No. 122.) Albay.
April 27.—(No. 123.) Ambos Camarines.
April 30.—(No. 124.) Sorsogon.
May 1.—(No. 125.) Marinduque.
May 2.—(No. 126.) Batangas.
May 15.—(No. 127.) Surigao.
May 15.—(No. 128.) Misamis.

May 22.—(No. 131.) An act providing for the establishment of a weather bureau for the Philippine Islands and appropriating $8,066.50 (in money of the United States) for the purchase of meteorological instruments and apparatus and the installation of the same.

May 22.—(No. 132.) An act to amend the Municipal Code, No. 82.

May 22.—(No. 133.) An act to amend the provincial-government act, No. 83.

June 11.—(No. 136.) An act providing for the organization of courts in the Philippine Islands.

Acts extending the provisions of the provincial-government act to the provinces of—

(No. 137.) Rizal.
(No. 138.) Cavite.
(No. 139.) Nueva Ecija.

June 12.—(No. 140.) An act defining the judicial districts of the Philippine Islands, prescribing the salaries of the judges thereof, and the times when and the places where terms of courts of the first instance shall be held in the several districts.

June 13.—(No. 141.) An act to amend the provincial-government act, No. 83, and the act amendatory thereof, No. 133.

June 18.—(No. 142.) An act to amend act No. 104, entitled "An act extending the provisions of the provincial-government act to the province of Romblon, as therein defined."

June 21.—Hon. William H. Taft appointed civil governor of the Philippine Islands.

June 21.—(No. 145.) An act authorizing the appointment of disbursing clerks in the various civil departments, bureaus, and offices, prescribing the duties of disbursing clerks, and fixing their compensation as such.

June 21.—(No. 146.) An act creating the office of insular purchasing agent for the government of the Philippine Archipelago, defining the duties of such officer, and making an appropriation of $100,000 for the purpose of carrying said act into effect.

June 26.—(No. 151.) An act fixing the compensation of the clerk of the court of first instance for each province.

June 27.—(No. 152.) An act providing for the lawful custody of courthouses and the public property therein, and for the appointment of stenographers, typewriters, interpreters, and translators, when necessary.

July 1.—(No. 156.) An act providing for the establishment of government laboratories for the Philippine Islands.

July 1.—(No. 157.) An act providing for the establishment of a board of health for the Philippine Islands.

July 4.—Inauguration of civil governor.

July 13.—(No. 164.) An act amending act No. 157, entitled "An act providing for the establishment of a board of health for the Philippine Islands."

July 16.—(No. 166.) An act creating a special court for the trial of certain actions, appellate and original, pending in courts of the island of Negros on and before the 16th day of June, 1901.

July 17.—(No. 173.) An act restoring the provinces of Batangas, Cebu, and Bohol to the executive control of the military governor.

July 18.—(No. 175.) An act providing for the organization and government of an insular constabulary and for the inspection of the municipal police.

July 25.—(No. 181.) An act amending that portion of act No. 102 which relates to the organization of the postal service, and for other purposes.

July 31.—(No. 183.) An act to incorporate the city of Manila.

August 7.—Charter of Manila went into effect.

August 7.—(No. 190.) An act providing a code of procedure in civil actions and special proceedings in the Philippine Islands.

August 12.—(No. 195.) An act to amend act No. 90 so as to transfer the duties of military governor respecting the expenditures of Philippine funds to civil governor.

Acts extending the provisions of the provincial-government act and its amendments to the provinces of—

August 15.—(No. 203.) La Union.

August 16.—(No. 205.) Ilocos Sur.

August 19.—(No. 206.) Abra.

August 20.—(No. 207.) Ilocos Norte.

August 22.—(No. 209.) Cagayan.

August 24.—(No. 210.) Isabela.

August 28.—(No. 211.) Zambales.

August 31.—(No. 212.) An act extending the time on which act No. 190, providing a code of procedure in civil actions and special proceedings in the Philippine Islands, shall take effect from the 1st day of September to the 1st day of October, 1901.

August 31.—(No. 214.) An act amending the Manila charter.

August 31.—(No. 215.) An act establishing and regulating accountability for public property in the Philippine Archipelago.

September 1.—Dr. T. H. Pardo de Tavera, Señor Benito Legarda, and Señor José Luzuriaga (native Filipinos) became members of the Philippine Commission.

September 2.—(No. 218.) An act creating a bureau of public lands.

September 6.—(No. 222.) An act providing for the organization of the departments of the interior, of commerce and police, of finance and justice, and of public instruction.

September 6.—(No. 223.) An act amending the provincial-government act, No. 83, as amended by act No. 133.

September 17.—(No. 230.) An act to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Archipelago.

September 24.—(No. 238.) An act fixing the limits of Cavite Harbor, vesting the admiral of the United States Navy in command of the Asiatic Station with police jurisdiction thereof, and providing rules and regulations for governing vessels anchoring therein.

October 2.—(No. 253.) An act creating a bureau of non-Christian tribes for the Philippine Islands.

October 2.—(No. 254.) An act organizing the office of the insular purchasing agent.

October 8.—(No. 261.) An act creating a bureau of agriculture.

October 17.—(No. 266.) An act creating the bureau of coast guard and transportation.

October 17.—(No. 267.) An act amending in several particulars act No. 183, entitled "An act to incorporate the city of Manila."

October 18.—(No. 268.) An act creating a bureau of architecture and construction of public buildings.

October 21.—(No. 273.) An act creating a bureau of archives.

October 29.—(No. 284.) An act establishing in Manila an insular museum of ethnology, natural history, and commerce, and appropriating $8,000, in money of the United States, for maintaining the same and for paying the expenses of collecting, caring for, and preserving the objects illustrating the ethnology of the Philippine Islands.

October 29.—Hon. Luke E. Wright appointed vice-governor.

November 7.—(No. 296.) An act creating a bureau of public printing.

November 12.—Vice-Governor Wright cabled that 765 towns had been organized under the provisions of the Municipal Code.

November 27.—(No. 303.) An act amending act No. 82, entitled "The Municipal Code," and act No. 225, amendatory thereof.

December 2.—(No. 307.) An act providing for the establishment of provincial boards of health and fixing their powers and duties.

(No. 308.) An act providing for the establishment of municipal boards of health and fixing their powers and duties.

December 4.—(No. 310.) An act regulating the practice of medicine and surgery in the Philippine Islands.

December 10.—(No. 315.) An act creating a bureau of cold storage and ice plant, and providing the method of conducting said plant and the personnel and salaries of the employees thereof.

December 20.—(No. 322.) An act repealing so much of act No. 173 as applies to the province of Cebu, and restoring that province to the executive control of the civil governor.

December 31.—(No. 325.) An act providing for the reorganization of the office of the attorney-general and for an increase in the salary of the judge for the third judicial district of the Philippine Islands, and amending acts 136, 140, and 300.

1902.

January 25.—(No. 336.) An act amending act No. 83, entitled "A general act for the organization of provincial governments in the Philippine Islands," and act No. 320, amendatory thereof.

January 28.—(No. 337.) An act providing for the organization of a provincial government in the province of Nueva Vizcaya.

January 29.—(No. 341.) An act amending act No. 183, entitled "An act to incorporate the city of Manila," and acts Nos. 214, 267, 313, and 323, amendatory thereof, by fixing new boundaries for the city of Manila.

February 6.—(No. 355.) An act to constitute the customs service of the Philippine Archipelago and to provide for the administration thereof.

February 20.—(No. 360.) An act for the reorganization of the office of the United States Philippine Commission.

March 3.—(No. 365.) An act repealing so much of act No. 173 as applies to the province of Bohol, and restoring that province to the executive control of the civil governor.

March 3.—(No. 367.) An act to reorganize the personnel of the Philippine customs service.

Mr. BURROWS. In this connection I submit a chronological statement showing the provincial governments already established, the islands or groups of islands in which they are located, their dependent islands, and their approximate areas and populations, exhibiting the extent of territory over which civil government has been established and the population of the islands brought under control of civil government.

Chronological statement showing provincial governments established by acts of the Philippine Commission; also the islands or group of islands in which they are located, their dependent islands, and their approximate areas and population May 15, 1902.

Provinces.	Island or group.	Date of act.	Area.[a]	Number of dependent islands.	Population.[a]
		1900.	*Sq. m.*		
Benguet	Luzon	Nov. 23	990		15,175
		1901.			
Pampanga	do	Feb. 13	2,209		223,922
Pangasinan	do	Feb. 16	1,316		302,178
Tarlac	do	Feb. 18	1,295		89,339
Bulacan	do	Feb. 27	841		239,221
Bataan	do	Mar. 2	436	1	50,761
Tayabas	do	Mar. 12	2,334	8	109,780
Romblon	Visayas	Mar. 16	515	32	55,339
Masbate (Masbate)	do	Mar. 18	1,315	46	23,069
Iloilo (Panay)	do	Apr. 11	2,102	80	462,444
Antique (Panay)	do	Apr. 13	1,340	6	115,434
Capiz (Panay)	do	Apr. 15	1,661	30	224,000
Cebu	do	Apr. 18	1,782	29	518,032
Bohol	do	Apr. 20	1,614	59	260,000
Negros Occidental	do	Apr. 20	3,112	14	231,512
Negros Oriental	do	Apr. 20	1,742	3	140,498
Leyte	do	Apr. 22	4,214	40	270,491
Albay	Luzon	Apr. 26	1,711	21	228,139
Ambos Camarines	do	Apr. 27	3,161	83	194,022
Sorsogon	do	Apr. 30	675	16	98,650
Marinduque	Visayas	May 1	681	13	48,000
Batangas [b]	Luzon	May 2	1,108	28	311,180
Surigao	Mindanao	May 15	13,201	83	85,125
Misamis	do	May 15	5,879	5	126,942
Rizal	Luzon	June 11	1,048	3	246,940
Cavite	do	June 11	610	7	134,569
Nueva Ecija	do	June 11	3,840		156,610
La Union	do	Aug. 15	867		110,164
Ilocos Sur	do	Aug. 16	491	2	215,792
Abra	do	Aug. 19	1,964		57,285
Ilocos Norte	do	Aug. 20	1,265	4	163,349
Cagayan	do	Aug. 22	5,291	46	96,367
Isabela	do	Aug. 24	5,395	2	48,302
Zambales	do	Aug. 28	2,210	76	87,295
		1902.			
Nueva Vizcaya	do	Jan. 28.	1,075		60,628

[a] Approximate.
[b] Restored to executive control of military governor July 17, 1901.

Mr. BURROWS. I will also submit certain memoranda taken from official sources showing the provinces, districts, and islands in the Philippine Archipelago in which conditions have been such as not to require military interference since American occupation; also a table showing the date of the last engagement, skirmish, or affair in the several provinces, districts, and islands where there have been military operations.

AMERICAN SUBDIVISIONS.

Since American occupation in the Philippines the island of Luzon has been divided into 27 provinces, in 22 of which provincial government has been established, and in 5 only is a military government now maintained.

LATEST MILITARY OPERATIONS.

Statement showing the date of the last skirmish in each of the several provinces or islands in the Philippines, in which there has been military operations, as shown by the reports received in the Adjutant-General's Office.

Province or island.	Date.	Province or island.	Date.
Masbate Island	Oct. 12, 1900	Nueva Ecija Province	May 19, 1901
Cagayan Province	Nov. 15, 1900	Paragua Island	June 25, 1901
Pangasinan Province	Nov. 28, 1900	Panay Island	July 1, 1901
Catanduanes Island	Jan. 8, 1901	Albay Province	July 4, 1901
Burias Island	Feb. 4, 1901	Camarines Sur	Aug. 15, 1901
Surigao Province	Feb. 20, 1901	Negros Island	Sept. 5, 1901
Marinduque Island	Feb. 22, 1901	Cebu Island	Oct. 30, 1901
Tarlac Province	Mar. 11, 1901	Sorsogon Province	Do.
Zambales Province	Mar. 17, 1901	Camarines Norte	Nov. 27, 1901
Benguet Province	Mar. 25, 1901	Morong Province	Nov. 29, 1901
Manila Province	Mar. 29, 1901	Ilocos Norte Province	Dec. 21, 1901
Union Province	Apr. 2, 1901	Bohol Province	Dec. 24, 1901
Lepanto Province	Apr. 3, 1901	Mindoro Island	Jan. 15, 1902
Bataan Province	Apr. 5, 1901	Cavite Province	Feb. 1, 1902
Pampanga Province	Do.	Leyte Island	Feb. 10, 1902
Ilocos Sur Province	Apr. 14, 1901	Laguna Province	Feb. 14, 1902
Bulacan Province	Apr. 24, 1901	Tayabas Province	Feb. 15, 1902
Abra Province	Apr. 27, 1901	Samar Island	Feb. 22, 1902
Infanta Province	May 5, 1901	Cotabato Province	Mar. 15, 1902
Isabela Province	Do.	Batangas Province	Apr. 16, 1902
Nueva Vizcaya Province	May 19, 1901	Misamis Province	May 3, 1902

The Adjutant-General, in referring to the above list, states:

"The engagements should be known as skirmishes, not even 'affairs,' possibly scouting parties' attacks would be better; any military phrase gives too much dignity—these of late date have been neither skirmishes, engagements, nor affairs."

PROVINCES NEVER IN INSURRECTION.

The following list comprises the provinces, districts, and islands in which there have been no military operations since American occupancy, as there has never existed any insurrection requiring aid of the military:

Amburayan, Apayaos, Balabac, Baras, Basilan, Batanes, Binatangan, Bongao, Bontoc, Butuan, Cabugoan, Calamianes, Cayapa, Concepcion, Corregidor, Dapitan, Davao, Itaves, Iligan, Lanao, Levac, Malabang, Matti,

Principe, Quiangan, Reina Regente, Romblon, Sarangani Bay and Islands, Siasi, Sulu, Tataan, Tiagan, Tucuran, Zamboanga, Rizal.[1]

Mr. BURROWS. The Senate Committee on Philippine Affairs was instructed by the Senate to investigate existing conditions in respect of both civil and military affairs in the archipelago. In carrying out those instructions the committee called for and received the reports of the governors of the several provinces into which the islands are divided. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] presented a synopsis of these reports to the Senate and they need not, therefore, be reproduced. I call attention, however, to the fact that these governors are generally natives of the islands, and were elected to their offices by the inhabitants of the provinces over which they preside. The showing made by these reports ought to be convincing proof of the success of our efforts to establish civil government, and exceedingly gratifying to every loyal American who desires to promote the general welfare of the people of the Philippines.

The following is a syllabus of these reports:

Abra.—Conditions peaceful, people prosperous, education excellent.

Albay.—Peaceful, prosperous, work plenty, crops and schools good.

Ambos Camarines.—Absolute peace, people content, good schools.

Antique.—No acts of hostility for over a year; people contented.

Bataan.—Peaceful, prosperous, schools popular, well attended.

Benguet.—Everything peaceful; sentiment favorable to Americans.

Bulacan.—Sublimely peaceful; people appreciate conditions.

Batangas.—No report from governor.

Bohol.—Conditions have been varied, becoming pacified fast.

Cagayan.—Peaceful, people busy and contented; good schools.

Capiz.—Ready to fight for peace; fine schools.

Cavite.—Peace and order prevail; civil government successful.

Cebu.—Conditions have been disturbed, becoming peaceful.

Ilocos Sur.—Completely pacified, people busy and contented.

Ilocos Norte.—General satisfaction among the natives.

Iloilo.—Could not be more satisfactory, excellent schools.

Isabela.—Peace reigns, finances strong, and conditions satisfactory.

La Union.—Uniform peace; financially, morally, otherwise strong.

Leyte.—Peace conditions satisfactory; people happy and contented.

Marinduque.—People perfectly satisfied; education flattering.

Masbate.—Peace established; people thankful for conditions.

Misamis.—Disturbed conditions; peace returning gradually.

Negros Occidental.—Era of contentment and love reigns.

Negros Oriental.—Conditions favorable, strong financially.

Nueva Ecija.—Conditions pleasant, good crops, people contented.

Nueva Vizcaya.—No report from governor.

Pampanga.—Peaceful, educated people, unexcelled conditions.

Pangasinan.—Perfect peace, great activity, good schools.

Rizal.—No report from governor.

Romblon.—Perfect tranquillity; education desired; finances good.

Sorsogon.—Peace conditions improving.

Surigao.—Perfect tranquillity, contentment, and prosperity.

Tabayas.—Governor Gardener's report only.

Tarlac.—Conditions peaceful; good crops, finances strong.

Zambales.—People express satisfaction at existing conditions.

Mr. President, such has been the progress and result of our efforts to establish civil government in the Philippine Islands and to relieve the people of military rule. When we consider the difficulties surrounding the situation, the remoteness of the islands, and the character of the inhabitants with whom we had to deal, the results attained are exceedingly gratifying and give assurance of a happy and successful termination.

As a part of this work of the Commission in the establishment of civil government on an intelligent and permanent basis, we must not overlook the fact of the inauguration and maintenance of an educational system through which we hope to lay the enduring foundations of peace, progress, and civilization. This work began in the spring of 1901 by the employment of teachers and the construction of schoolhouses in peaceful communities, and this work is still in progress and being rapidly extended.

As garrisons are withdrawn, public schools are installed in their places. During the year 1901 the advent of peaceful conditions in the Philippine Islands has been followed in close succession by the introduction of American methods of education in the hands of American instructors. In the early spring of 1901 arrangements were made for the appointment of several hundred teachers in the United States for service in the Philippine Islands, and by October 1, 1901, 743 teachers had arrived and had been distributed among the provinces as follows:

Manila	76	Nueva Ecija	15
Panay	54	Tarlac	13
Negros Occidental and Oriental	51	Sorsogon	13
Mindanao	44	Zambales	13
Cavite	40	Batangas	13
Leyte	39	Masbate	12
Bulacan	32	Bataan	12
Camarines	31	La Union	12
Pampanga	30	Benguet	11
Rizal	30	Abra	10
Tayabas	27	Bohol	8
Pangasinan	26	Isabela	8
Romblon	22	Cebu	5
Ilocos Sur	20	Marinduque	5
Ilocos Norte	19	Samar	3
Albay	15	Nueva Vizcaya	2
Cagayan	15		
Laguna	15	Total	743

Governor Taft, in the hearings before the committee, says that "835 teachers were placed in 445 towns; that 245 of those towns were garrisoned and 200 were not garrisoned," and yet the teachers in the 200 towns without garrisons are as safe as in any portion of the United States, and it is gratifying to know that the common school, both American and native, is rapidly taking the place of and supplanting the United States garrisons. No more convincing proof could possibly be adduced of the triumph of civil rule and the establishment of peace. In addition to this force of American instructors, 4,000 native Filipino teachers are engaged in this educational work.

As a further evidence, Mr. President, of the substitution of civil for military rule——

Mr. HOAR. May I inquire of the Senator if the 835 teachers are in addition to the 743, or has the number decreased to 743?

Mr. BURROWS. It appears from the table just submitted that on the 1st of October, 1901, 743 teachers had arrived in the islands and were employed as instructors in the various provinces.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is that the total number?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes; at that date.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator said that 743 had been employed in 1901, and then he mentioned 835 as being employed. My inquiry was whether the 835 is plus the 743.

Mr. BURROWS. The force of 743, October 1, was augmented to 835.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There are more than that now.

Mr. BURROWS. Since that time a number have been added, as I have said, and the force has now increased to 1,000.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is correct—something over a thousand.

Mr. HOAR. Can the Senator state the number of pupils?

Mr. BURROWS. No; I can not.

Other evidence, Mr. President, of the progress of peaceful government and the substitution of civil for military rule is found in the reduction of the number of army posts and the withdrawal of United States troops from the archipelago. There has been so much said about the use of the Army in the Philippines and the necessity for its continued and possibly increased employment, that I desire to place before the Senate and the country the official record.

On the 8th day of this month (May, 1902) the War Department telegraphed to General Chaffee as follows:

ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, May 8, 1902.

CHAFFEE, *Manila:*

Cable number posts and number American officers remaining in each province.

I have in my hand a copy of General Chaffee's reply to that cablegram which I will read, as follows:

EXTRACT OF CABLEGRAM RECEIVED ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

MANILA, *May 10, 1902.*

ADJUTANT-GENERAL, *Washington:*

* * * With reference to your telegram of 8th, number stations occupied 253. Province Albay, 2 stations, 3 troops; Bataan, 1 station, 1 company; Batangas, 18, 9 troops, 5 companies; Bulacan, 3, 2 companies; Cagayan, 4, 6 companies; Camarines, 9, 2 troops, 6 companies; Cavite, 11, 2 troops, 6 companies; Ilocos Norte Province, Luzon, Ilocos Sur Province, Luzon, 7, 12 troops; Laguna, 25, 12 troops, 9 companies; Isabela, 8, 6 companies; Marinduque, 3, 3 companies; Masbate, 1, 2 companies; Mindoro, 6, 6 companies; Nueva Ecija, 5, 4 companies; Pampanga, 3, 3 troops; Pangasinan, 14, 1 troop, 11 companies; Principe, 1, 1 company; Rizal, 18, 6 artillery, 2 engineers, 2 signal, 10 troops, 20 companies; Romblon, 1, 1 company; Sorsogon, 5, 4 companies; Tarlac, 4, 4 companies; Tayabas, 15, 7 troops, 10 companies; Zambales, 3, 4 companies; Bohol, 1, 1 company; Busuanga, 1, 1 company; Capul, 1, detachment; Cebu, 4, 1 engineer, 1 signal, 5 companies; Mindanao, 21, 1 artillery, 1 engineer, 8 troops, 22 companies; Negros, 3, 2 companies; Panay, 6, 4 troops, 4 companies; Paragua, 2, 1 company; Samar, 37, 4 troops, 31 companies; Siassi, 1, 1 company; Tawi-tawi, 1, 1 company. Sixth, Ninth, Nineteenth Infantry not included; assembling Manila for shipment United States of America.

CHAFFEE.

Based upon this reply of General Chaffee, I present a table which shows at a glance the stations occupied and American troops serving in each province in the Philippine Islands May 31, 1901, and May 10, 1902.

[1] Rizal is a new province containing a portion of the territory formerly included in the province of Manila.

Stations occupied and American troops serving in each province in the Philippine Islands, May 31, 1901, and May 10, 1902.

Province.	May 31, 1901.		May 10, 1902.	
	Number of stations.	Number of companies.	Number of stations.	Number of companies.
Abra	12	9		
Albay	9	7	2	3
Batangas	13	15	18	14
Bataan	7	4	1	1
Benguet	1	1		
Bongao (island)	1	1		
Bohol (island)	5	4	1	1
Bulacan	19	10	3	2
Busuanga			1	1
Camarines	23	14	9	8
Capul			1	Det.
Cagayan	16	6	4	6
Catanduanes (island)	2	1		
Cavite	11	12	11	8
Cebu (island)	14	10	4	7
Corregidor (island)	1	1		
Ilocos Norte, Luzon	16	11	7	12
Ilocos Sur, Luzon	16	18		
Isabela	14	6	8	6
Jolo (island)	1	3		
Laguna	20	20	25	21
Lepanto	1	1		
Leyte (island)	2	1		
Marinduque (island)	4	6	3	3
Masbate (island)	1	2	1	2
Mindanao (island)	15	19	21	32
Mindoro			6	6
Morong	4	2		
Negros (island)	33	8	3	2
Nueva Ecija	18	21	5	4
Nueva Vizcaya	5	2		
Pampanga	14	12	3	3
Pangasinan	26	27	14	12
Panay (island)	51	18	6	8
Paragua (island)	1	1	2	1
Principe	1	1	1	1
Rizal	14	71	18	40
Romblon (island)	1	1	1	1
Samar (island)	6	8	37	35
Siassi (island)	1	2	1	1
Sorsogon	5	3	5	4
Tarlac	12	13	4	4
Tawi-tawi			1	1
Tayabas	19	11	15	17
Union	13	12		
Zambales	21	13	3	4
Total	469	408	245	271

NOTE.—The province of Rizal includes the city of Manila.

From this table it appears that on the 31st day of May, 1901, there were 469 military stations in the Philippine Islands, and on the 10th of May, 1902, there were only 245 stations or posts, a reduction, as it will be seen, in a single year of 224 stations.

Let me state further in this connection that of these 245 posts existing to-day, 55 are in the disturbed provinces of Samar and Batangas, leaving but 190 military posts outside these provinces to keep the peace and preserve order in the entire archipelago.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Michigan allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And these are being very rapidly supplanted by native constabulary.

Mr. BURROWS. Yes. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. These remaining posts are greater in number to-day than they would be if there were facilities for housing and caring for troops at central points.

The reduction of our military force in the Philippine Islands during the last four years has been no less remarkable than the diminution of the number of posts. It appears from the official reports of the War Department that the whole number of troops serving in the Philippine Islands since the 30th of June, 1898 (the date of our first landing in Manila), to May 1, 1902, was 4,006 officers and 122,787 men.

The maximum strength, as appears by official reports in the Philippine Islands at any one time, including officers and men, was in the month of December, 1900, when it aggregated 69,420. Since that date there has been a gradual but steady retirement of our force as civil rule has been extended, and I will insert here a table showing the progressive reduction of our forces in the archipelago during last year.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There are only 33,000 there to-day.

Mr. BURROWS. The official table I present discloses the facts.

1901.

January	67,393
February	61,924
March	55,781
April	57,940
May	55,155
June	50,074
July	49,227
August	47,354
September	43,283
October	43,145
November	43,251
December	37,072

1902.

January	36,944
February (latest report)	33,830

The estimated strength of troops there at present is about 32,000, including Hospital Corps, and exclusive of Philippine scouts.

In this connection it should be noted that orders have already been issued by the Secretary of War for the further withdrawal of troops from the Philippines, and it is safe to say that by the time Congress shall next assemble in regular session the military forces in the Philippines will be reduced to 18,000, or possibly 15,000, men.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question in this connection?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator if there is as yet any disciplined and armed force of Filipinos in the service of our Government; if, from the friendly persons whom we understand to be there in such large numbers, any force has been armed and officered by Filipinos?

Mr. BURROWS. I will say in answer that we have provided for a constabulary force.

Mr. HOAR. I am not speaking of constables. I am speaking of soldiers.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not know that we have any considerable force of enlisted natives in the military service.

Mr. HOAR. Is there as yet any body of Filipinos enlisted, armed, and disciplined, with Filipino officers, trusted with sword or gun; and if so, what is the number of such soldiers?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Michigan permit me?

Mr. BURROWS. I will yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. With the exception of the last word, "soldiers," there is. There is a force which we have recruited with great care, consisting exclusively so far as the rank and file are concerned of Filipinos, which is armed, uniformed, and drilled.

Mr. HOAR. And disciplined?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Armed and uniformed and disciplined by American officers. My recollection upon the particular point I am going to mention now is not accurate, but I think the third-class inspectors, so called, are Filipinos.

Mr. HOAR. As to the number?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As to the total number, the total of the armed and disciplined constabulary——

Mr. HOAR. No; I mean Filipinos.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am speaking of Filipinos, just as the Senator from Massachusetts speaks of Filipinos.

Mr. HOAR. I am not asking about constables.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. You used the word "soldiers."

Mr. HOAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The situation is that there is now, and rapidly increasing up to the maximum number of 5,000 men, an armed, uniformed, disciplined, drilled force of Filipinos under the control of American officers called inspectors.

Mr. BURROWS. I think——

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I put the question to the Senator from Michigan and not to anyone else. While I am quite delighted to have an answer from any gentleman who has investigated it, it does not help me to say there is something else there than about which I inquired.

I think it would be a very interesting thing, in regard to our knowledge of the real reconciliation, to know whether or not we can have a regiment of armed, disciplined, Filipino soldiers, officered by Filipinos—whether that time has yet come. It does not help the answer to that question to get up and talk about constabulary and about men governed by American inspectors. They are not a body of men who can combine. After the war, when we had disturbed times in the South, during reconstruction, they would not, in certain places, allow the negroes to form military companies. That is power. Now, if men are on your side——

Mr. BURROWS. Will the Senator pardon me——

Mr. HOAR. And if you trust them with power, we want to know it.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand the Senator has his answer.

Mr. HOAR. It has not been made. There has not been any answer made to my question—not the slightest.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Michigan allow me?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. We have had in the Army, not in the constabulary at all, as high as 8,000 Filipino troops. I think I have the figures correct. Some of the generals before our committee were

questioned in regard to it and testified to the loyalty of those troops. General Hughes said that the percentage——

Mr. HOAR. I do not mean Macabebes, but Filipinos.

Mr. LODGE. Macabebes are Filipinos. They are Christianized Filipinos of the same race exactly.

Mr. HOAR. Oh, well.

Mr. LODGE. They are of precisely the same race as the others. There is no difference between them.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. One moment. Not only Macabebes but others. We had at one time as many as 5,000 Macabebes. We had other enlisted Filipinos in other islands where there are no Macabebes at all. In General Hughes's division we had Filipinos enlisted, Visayans, and the General stated, whom I asked about their fidelity—said that the percentage of desertion among them was less than among the American troops, notwithstanding the fact that desertion among the American troops in those distant islands was exceedingly small. He stated that they were very loyal and very faithful and did very good work.

Mr. HOAR. That is an answer.

Mr. BURROWS. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has given his colleague the information as to the number of enlisted natives. It, however, in no way affected the statement I was making that the United States has steadily withdrawn its military force, and it will be still further reduced so that by the 1st of next December or the 1st of January, 1903, the military forces of the United States in the islands will not exceed 18,000 and probably not more than 15,000.

It will thus be seen that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands have been almost entirely relieved of the severities of military rule and are in the full enjoyment of a large measure of civil liberty and peaceful government—larger than they ever before enjoyed during four hundred years of Spanish rule.

Mr. President, at this point with the work of pacification and the establishment of orderly government so nearly accomplished, it is proposed to abandon this policy and commit the fate of these islands to their native inhabitants. They are to be permitted to undertake the experiment of establishing an independent government. The difficulty, in my judgment, with the proposition of the minority to give independent government to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands lies in the fact, in the first place, that they are not now capable of establishing and maintaining such a government. If I believed them capable of doing so, I would for one unhesitatingly accord it to them. I hate a tyrant, whether an individual or a nation, and I commiserate a slave, whether a man or a people.

I was profoundly impressed, as was the Senate and the country, with the recent utterances of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, whose words will not soon be forgotten; and, indeed, it will be a sad day for the Republic when such patriotic sentiments find no responsive chord in the hearts of the American people. And I believe if the time shall ever come when a majority of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands shall desire and be able to establish an independent and stable government insuring protection to life, liberty, and property, and the performance of international obligations, the American people will gladly accord to them the full measure of national independence.

In support of the proposition that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are not now capable of self-government, I desire to quote some authorities which ought to come home to the Senate and the country with convincing force.

It is idle to talk and speculate about a free, independent, and stable government with a people who are not capable of forming or maintaining it. I desire to read from the report of the Taft Commission, a commission which has been on the ground, and which certainly ought to know as much about the subject as we do. I read from the report, at page 82:

> While the peoples of the Philippine Islands ardently desire a full measure of rights and liberties, they do not, in the opinion of the Commission, generally desire independence. Hundreds of witnesses testified on this subject to the Commission and its individual members, and, though they represented all possible varieties of opinion—many of them being in sympathy with the insurgents—they were uniform in their testimony that, in view of the ignorance and political inexperience of the masses of the people, the multiplicity of languages, the divergencies of culture and mode of life, and the obstacles to intercommunication, an independent sovereign Philippine state was at the present time neither possible nor desirable, even if its poverty and internal weakness and lack of coherence would not invite, and the dissatisfaction of aliens entail, the intervention of foreign powers, with the inevitable result of the division of the archipelago among them and the disappearance forever of the dream and hope of a united and self-governing Philippine commonwealth. The Philippine Islands, even the most patriotic declare, can not at the present time stand alone. They need the tutelage and protection of the United States.

The first Commission concluded their report on this subject (on page 120) by saying, among other things:

> The Filipinos are wholly unprepared for independence, and if independence were given to them they could not maintain it.

The second or Taft Commission in their first report, dated November 30, 1900, say in speaking of the investigation made by the Commission (p. 15):

> Many witnesses were examined as to the form of government best adapted to these islands and satisfactory to the people. All the evidence taken, no matter what the bias of the witness, showed that the masses of the people are ignorant, credulous, and childlike, and that under any government the electoral franchise must be much limited, because the large majority will not, for a long time, be capable of intelligently exercising it.

And on page 17 they add—

> From all the information we can get it seems clear that a great majority of the people long for peace and are entirely willing to accept the establishment of a government under the supremacy of the United States.

In the second report of the Taft Commission, so called, dated October 15, 1901, pages 19 and 20, they state, referring to this subject:

> The theory upon which the Commission is proceeding is that the only possible method of instructing the Filipino people in methods of free institutions and self-government is to make a government partly of Americans and partly of Filipinos, giving the Americans the ultimate control for some time to come. In our last report we pointed out that the great body of the people were ignorant, superstitious, and at present incapable of understanding any government but that of absolutism.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Meantime it is necessary by practical lessons and actual experience to eliminate from the minds of the more intelligent part of the community who form the electorate those ideas of absolutism in government and to impress the conception of a limitation upon power which is now so difficult for them to understand.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> As the government proceeds, this association in actual government will certainly form a nucleus of Filipinos, earnest, intelligent, patriotic, who will become familiar with practical free government and civil liberty. This saving remnant will grow as the years go on, and in it will be the hope of this people.
>
> How long, it is asked, must this education be continued before real results will be accomplished? Of course it is impossible to tell. Certainly a generation—perhaps two generations—will be needed.

These are the deliberately formed and expressed opinions of both commissions sent to the Philippine Islands with instructions to inquire into the conditions of their people.

And now let me supplement the conclusion of the Commission with some testimony taken by the Commission while on the ground and in the islands as to the capacity of these people for self-government.

The first Philippine Commission, under instructions from the President, heard the testimony of numerous witnesses, and among other subjects took evidence on the question of the ability of the Filipinos to conduct self-government. I submit a few extracts from that testimony.

Señor Cayetano S. Arellano is a prominent lawyer in the Philippines, born in Manila, and is at present chief justice of the supreme court of the islands. He ought to know as much about it as we do. To him President Schurman propounded this question:

> Q. Can't we give these people a local self-government?
>
> A. In my poor opinion, no. We do not believe them capable of themselves forming a governmnent of themselves, an autonomous government. That is my opinion.
>
> By Colonel DENBY:
>
> Q. What reforms do you think the people desire, and what do you think would be advisable?
>
> A. They desired, for example, to have a representative in the Cortes in Madrid; they desired, furthermore, a part in the administrative government of the islands and the enjoyment of liberty, of which they were deprived. The question of independence was not then raised among them and not until just now—of late.
>
> By President SCHURMAN:
>
> Q. Please state whether they are capable of governing their pueblos without any intervention on the part of the general government at Manila. There are pueblos, there are provinces, and there is the general government at Manila. I am beginning with pueblos, large and small, and I ask you whether the people are capable of governing them without any intervention on the part of the government at Manila?
>
> A. No.
>
> Q. Do you think the provinces are capable of governing themselves without any intervention from the federal government at Manila?
>
> A. To a certain extent, yes. In certain provinces, as, for example, Pampanga, the people are sufficiently enlightened to govern themselves in a certain manner; but independent general government, no.

Enrique Lopez, a physician, who was born and has always resided in the Philippines, testified as follows:

> Q. Please state briefly the scheme of government which you recommend for the Philippine Islands.
>
> A. I have seen in many of the proclamations the word "autonomy." Autonomy is a word that covers a great deal of ground; it is a word of a very large scope. The American Commission undoubtedly has the greatest desire to give proper liberties to the people, and I wish to present my plan to you. If it is not exactly what the Commission desires, of course there will be various changes in it—modifications, but that is for the Commission and not for me to meddle with. The plan is to have five governors, under the sovereignty of America. The governor-general should be an American, and the sovereignty undoubtedly should be in the United States, without speaking of the army or navy, or anything else.
>
> Q. The political sovereignty?
>
> A. My plan is to have five ministers. A minister of the treasury, of internal affairs—five different ministers of the general government, and they are to be Filipinos partly, Filipinos according to the amplitude of the autonomy. According as the Commission decides, the number of employees, Filipinos and Americans, would be raised.

Señor Pablo Antonio Martinez, a lawyer, who has resided in Manila for twelve years, testified:

> Q. Do you think the Philippine people capable of self-government?
>
> A. I do not believe they are at present.

Q. Do you think they are capable of governing their own pueblos?
A. No, sir.

By Colonel DENBY:

Q. Don't you think that there could be elected to a legislature to hold its sessions in these islands enough intelligent men to pass local laws?
A. How large an assembly? I can answer your question if you will name me the number.
Q. Say 100 for all the islands.
A. I think they might be found by a careful search.

Adolph Von Bosch, a Belgian merchant, who has resided in the Philippines about ten years, testified:

Q. Are they favorable to the Americans, the people?
A. The ordinary people, yes. The workmen, the lower classes and middle classes, those who have interests there, are certainly most decidedly in favor of the Americans. The leading military men and those who call themselves the governors are decidedly not.
Q. The military men are against the Americans?
A. Yes.
Q. Because they have something to lose?
A. Yes; they would lose their positions. It is, according to my view, only a matter of interest which dictates their conduct.
Q. I suppose the great majority of people, then, favor the Americans?
A. Oh, yes; the entire mass——
Q. Eighty or 90 per cent?
A. Put it down at 60.
Q. You think safely 60 per cent?
A. Sixty per cent. I don't think the lower classes have any idea—they have no idea at all about it; no fixed idea.
Q. They have not?
A. But I am sure if they get an American government——
Q. That is to say, they want a good government?
A. Yes; they want a good government. They want to be fairly treated.
Q. Would the Vicols be capable of governing themselves?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Would the Tagalogs?
A. There are some Tagalogs who would be, but it would be a small minority. They would not have sufficient men to form a government.
Q. But the Tagalogs would be fit to occupy subordinate places in the government?
A. Yes; and even of the Vicols there would be—there are some very good men who occupied civil positions under the Spanish Government.
Q. But you think it would be necessary to have Americans at the head?
A. Yes; no government could last for six months under Tagalog rule, according to my opinion.

Angel Fabie, a native Filipino, and formerly captain of a port by appointment from Aguinaldo, and his secretary of marine, says:

Q. Are the people capable of governing themselves?
A. No, sir; they are not educated. They are not educated people, but by and by, when they are more educated after the American fashion, they will be able to govern themselves, and the people will be peaceable and orderly.
Q. And how much American intervention is necessary here to govern them now?
A. I don't know; but, in my opinion, they will be better under American supervision they will be better off with more American officials.

A. Kuensle, a Swiss merchant, importer, who had resided in Manila for fifteen years, referring to the matter of self-government, said:

By General MACARTHUR:

Q. From that you would infer they are not capable of self-government?
A. Certainly not. They would have big fights among themselves.

By President SCHURMAN:

Q. Could they govern themselves in the provinces?
A. No; never. Those who would govern would simply squeeze the people, and after a while dissatisfaction and internal squabbles would come on. They are certainly unfit for self-government.
Q. Are they capable of education in that line?
A. Certainly. I believe there are few natives so intelligent as the Filipinos; but a very small percentage have any education so far. It might be a possibility some thirty or forty years from now for them to know what self-government means.
Q. Have they ever had any example of good government here?
A. No; it has gone from bad to worse.
Q. So that they will need both example and experience?
A. Yes, sir.

Señor Benito Legarda, a resident of Manila, and at one time vice-president of the Filipino congress, so called, referring to the money paid and agreed to be paid to Aguinaldo at the time he left the Philippines for Hongkong, says—I need not read that portion of his testimony, as it relates to another subject:

Q. Did they have at any time during the course of that revolution the idea of fighting for their independence?
A. No; I never heard this word "independence" spoken, nor do I think that they are capable of understanding it even up to this time.

Señor Manuel Xerez, a Filipino, born in Manila, by profession a physician, commenting on the ability of the Filipinos to maintain a government, says:

Q. Do you believe that these people, at this time, are capable of establishing and maintaining a republican form of government, or do you think it better to wait for some years of probation?
A. I think it is too soon at present.
Q. Would you advise that for some time the government should be administered by persons appointed by the United States and that by degrees a republican form of government elected by the people should be established, or would you advise that a republican form of government should be established immediately?
A. I think it should be a mixed government; that the subordinate positions in towns and in provinces could be filled by Filipinos, but always under the supervision of another, who should be an American.
Q. Then do you think, after a given number of years, this government might be turned over to the Filipinos to run themselves?
A. Not in a few years. It would require some time, for it would be necessary to change a great many evil practices here. I think that the Filipinos will need the direction of the Americans for many years. They are educated very much in the Spanish way, and it is necessary to get the Spanish ways eradicated little by little.

This is a part and but a small portion of the testimony of prominent men formerly connected with the Aguinaldo government, who tell us that those people are not capable of self-government.

Therefore, Mr. President, to surrender our sovereignty now over the islands, as proposed by the minority, would, I believe, result most disastrously to the inhabitants and involve the future of the archipelago in revolution and ruin.

AMERICAN PROTECTORATE.

It will hardly do, with these conditions, to talk about Philippine independence under an American protectorate. We would hardly assume to answer for the acts of a people unfitted for government, over whose conduct we would have no control.

President McKinley, speaking upon this question, as you remember, in his annual message to Congress December 5, 1899, said:

The future government of the Philippines rests with the Congress of the United States. Few graver responsibilities have ever been confided to us. If we accept them in a spirit worthy of our race and our traditions, a great opportunity comes with them. The islands lie under the shelter of our flag. They are ours by every title of law and equity. They can not be abandoned. If we desert them, we leave them at once to anarchy and finally to barbarism. We fling them, a golden apple of discord, among the rival powers, no one of which could permit another to seize them unquestioned. Their rich plains and valleys would be the scene of endless strife and bloodshed. The advent of Dewey's fleet in Manila Bay instead of being, as we hope, the dawn of a new day of freedom and progress, will have been the beginning of an era of misery and violence worse than any which has darkened their unhappy past.

The suggestion has been made that we could renounce our authority over the islands and, giving them independence, could retain a protectorate over them. This proposition will not be found, I am sure, worthy of your serious attention. Such an arrangement would involve at the outset a cruel breach of faith. It would place the peaceable and loyal majority, who ask nothing better than to accept our authority, at the mercy of the minority of armed insurgents. It would make us responsible for the acts of the insurgent leaders and give us no power to control them. It would charge us with the task of protecting them against each other and defending them against any foreign power with which they chose to quarrel. In short, it would take from the Congress of the United States the power of declaring war and vest that tremendous prerogative in the Tagal leader of the hour.

What says the Commission upon this subject? Let me read a word from the report of the first or Schurman Commission upon this point—independence with an American protectorate:

The idea of a protectorate entertained by the insurgent leaders, under which they should enjoy all the powers of an independent sovereign government, and the Americans should assume all obligations to foreign nations for their good use of those powers, would create an impossible situation for the United States. Internal dominion and external responsibility must go hand in hand. Under the chimerical scheme of protection cherished by Aguinaldo, if a foreigner lost his life or property through a miscarriage of justice in a Philippine court or in consequence of a governor's failure to suppress a riot, then the United States would be responsible for indemnity to the foreigner's government, though without possessing the power of punishing the offenders, of preventing such maladministration, or of protecting itself against similar occurrences in the future. Nor could the liability to foreign nations be reduced without permitting them directly to seek redress, and such a course would, it is to be feared, speedily lead to the appropriation of the Philippine Islands by the great powers, who would not need to seek far for pretenses for intervention.

But, Mr. President, the latest and I may say the most convincing evidence upon the propriety of turning the islands over to their inhabitants to establish for themselves such a government as they may choose we find in the testimony given before our committee this very year.

EFFECT OF AMERICAN WITHDRAWAL.

Senator MCCOMAS asked this question:

What would happen to them if we withdrew in this fashion?
Governor TAFT. The personal hostility between leading Filipinos at times has been so great as to lead to bloody measures. How far they would be carried here I have no idea. That is conjectural.
I should like to say, if I may, although I had not expected to come to this part of the discussion now, that it is a very logical and reasonable proposition on its face to say, Will not the insurrection come to an end; will not there be general peace and tranquillity if you promise to give these people independence when they shall be fitted for it? That proposition, put in that way, seems to have a great deal of force.

That is the wrong paper. The paper I wanted to read is as follows——

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, as he is making a very interesting argument, I should like to hear Governor Taft's answer to that qestion.

Mr. BURROWS. I shall read it in a moment, on another point, but it is not on the point I am now discussing.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

Mr. BURROWS. Upon the point of their capacity for self-government the governor was asked in relation to that provision of the minority bill which declares "that the United States shall continue to occupy and govern said archipelago until the people thereof have established a stable government." I read from page 327 of the hearings before our committee:

Senator MCCOMAS. I was going to ask how long that would take?
Governor TAFT. I doubt if the people can establish a stable government. I assume that this is without the aid of American guidance and control. If it is with the aid of American guidance and control, then the time taken must be indefinitely in the future.
Senator MCCOMAS. Generations, probably?
Governor TAFT. Yes, sir.
Senator MCCOMAS. That was to be my next question—how many years we must continue to occupy and govern the archipelago until the people had established a stable government. You have said many generations.

Governor TAFT. Yes, sir; I think if it means what it may be inferred to mean, it means that the generals of the insurrecto forces shall call together a number of delegates and shall go through the form of making a government, and then when that government has its offices filled at once the transfer of sovereignty shall take place.

There would result after that—it might last six months, it might last a year—but there would result anarchy and interference with the rights of individuals and interference with the rights of vested interests in which foreign governments are concerned, which would require the United States at once to step back and begin over the work which it had been doing, and it would find itself where it was two years ago.

I make that statement, first, on the experience of the Aguinaldo government. For eight months Aguinaldo had a government in Luzon. It consisted of the congress at Malolos, the members of which were appointed by him, many of them distinguished lawyers and educated men from Manila largely.

Thereupon he appointed governors for various provinces, and the outrages that were committed by those governors in the conduct of government and the collection of taxes, the corruption which existed through the territory over which he had control, leave no doubt as to what the result would be, that a similar government would be established—and I assume that is what this substitute means—within a short period of time, and would be followed by the withdrawal of American sovereignty.

Secondly, the local control which the educated people of each province have over the ignorant people there would enable disappointed politicians in any particular province to set up a little force by itself, and that inevitably, in the course of one or two years, would produce the state of anarchy of which I have spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think, in this connection, we having withdrawn and a state of anarchy having arisen, it would probably lead to the partition of the islands among other powers?

Governor TAFT. It is a question of opinion as to the interest which foreigners take in the islands. They are called among foreigners whom I know in Manila the gems of the Orient. The interest that Japan has taken in the islands the records of the military department will show. The interest that other governments would take in the islands may be judged of by reference to the foreign capital invested there. The Germans have a great deal of capital. The English have a good deal.

Again, on page 341, Governor Taft says:

I wish to impress the fact that were the government turned over to those who profess to be the leaders in the insurrection to-day, among the irreconcilables or intransigentes, though not in arms, the idea of civil liberty would be the last idea which would be practically carried into effect.

Senator ALLISON. That is, liberty regulated by law?

Governor TAFT. Yes, sir. The tendency of all governments under them would be toward absolutism, an oligarchy which would mean that the presidente of the village would control absolutely the village; the governor would control the province, and the head of the government would control the governors. The idea of elevation and protection to that indifferent mass of 90 per cent would be possibly professed, but would fall far short of actual realization; and, therefore, offering to them independence now is offering to them—that is, to the 90 per cent of the people to whom I have referred—a condition of things which would be as far from enjoyment of free institutions as it is possible to imagine.

But, Mr. President, although they are not capable of self-government at present, it is said, Why not fix a time now and declare the date when the United States will surrender its sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and permit their inhabitants to establish their own government in their own way and receive recognition as a separate and independent nationality? Why not now declare that at some time in the future we will leave the islands to the government of their own people?

Mr. President, to my mind the answer to that question is simple and complete.

In the first place it is impossible now to determine that date with any degree of certainty; and in the second place if it were possible, such a declaration would thwart the very purpose the advocates of such a proposition have in view—the establishment of a stable and independent government. It would arrest all development, breed innumerable dissensions, ferment discord within and invite assaults from without, and end in the absorption and division of the archipelago among the naval powers of the world and crush the last hope of independent government for the Filipino people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion there?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I simply wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that Governor Taft testified before the committee when asked that very question that such a declaration would prevent that very thing.

Mr. BURROWS. I was about to allude to that.

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

Mr. BURROWS. I am very glad the Senator from Indiana called my attention to it, but before referring to that I wish to call attention to what the first Commission say upon this very question of the inexpediency of fixing a time when the United States will surrender its sovereignty over these islands:

It is, of course, a quite different proposal to relinquish sovereignty over the Philippine Islands as soon as the Filipinos are capable of governing themselves. So far as such a policy rests upon conceptions of American duty, convenience, or expediency, it does not fall to this Commission to consider it. But, from the point of view of the Philippines, it is proper and, indeed, imperative to observe that, in the opinion of the Commission, the consideration of that proposal must be qualified by two conditions: First, it is impossible, even approximately, to fix a time for the withdrawal of American sovereignty over the archipelago, as no one can foresee when the diverse peoples of the Philippine Islands may be molded together into a nationality capable of exercising all the functions of independent self-government. They are certainly incapable of such a work to-day; whether in one or more generations they can be trained to it only the future can disclose; and, second, if American sovereignty over the archipelago should ever be relinquished, if all American authority over the people should ever cease and determine, then the United States should renounce all obligations to foreign nations for the good conduct of the Filipinos. Undoubtedly the raising of the American flag in the Philippine Islands has entailed great responsibilities upon us; but to guarantee external protection while renouncing internal dominion is no way of escaping from them; on the contrary, while you pull down the flag you only pile up difficulties.

Let me now quote briefly from the testimony of Governor Taft before our committee, which the Senator from Massachusetts desired I should read, bearing upon the advisability of making a promise as to the future independence of the Philippine people.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator, before he proceeds to that point, if he will kindly answer the question, Where does the proposition which he is now attacking, of fixing a time, come from? I have not heard one as far as I know.

Mr. BURROWS. It has come repeatedly in the course of the debate from the opponents of this measure. In the course of the discussion it has been frequently asserted that it would be wise to declare when the people of the islands could expect the relinquishment of American sovereignty, and the fact that we have not done so has been the subject of severe animadversion.

Mr. HOAR. I dislike to put my recollection against that of the Senator. It has so happened, unless I am oblivious quite, that I never heard a statement to that effect.

Mr. BURROWS. My recollection is that I have heard it frequently.

Mr. HOAR. The proposition, as I understand it, and as far as I know from the beginning—I do not mean that I know personally about it, but I know generally—is that you were bound to say what the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has said very frankly in his speech, with which I was much pleased, that if they were fit for a government of their own they were entitled to it on American principles. My contention has been that such a declaration would have removed the war and this whole business. Now, has anybody said that a time should be fixed?

Mr. BURROWS. I have heard it repeatedly.

Mr. HOAR. I never heard it in my life.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a few moments longer. Governor Taft in testifying upon this point confirmed what I say, that such a declaration at this time would be most unfortunate. I quote Governor Taft, as follows:

The condition of the people of the Philippine Islands to-day is such that the extension of the constitutional restrictions which apply in a State would very much interfere with the establishment of a stable and successful government.

A government ought to be established under American guidance which shall form a stable government, by which and under which the Filipinos shall gradually improve their knowledge of what is individual liberty and what is a constitutional government, and subsequently the time will come when the United States and the Filipino people together can agree upon what their relations shall be.

Whether a colony—I mean a quasi-independent colony, as Australia and Canada are to England—an independent state, or a State of the Union, is a question so far in the future, dependent upon the success of the operation of the stable government, that I have not myself reached a conclusion on the subject.

QUESTION OF STATEHOOD.

Senator CARMACK. You think, then, it is an open question whether the people of the Philippine Islands—islands populated with eight or ten million Asiatics—should be admitted to the full rights of American citizenship or whether or not an archipelago so populated should be admitted to statehood in the Union? You think it is an open question?

Governor TAFT. I think it is a question that I would not answer two or three generations before it will arise. I think the great evil to-day is the discussion of something that is utterly impossible of settlement to-day. The thing the Filipino people need to-day is a stable government under the guidance of American control, teaching them what individual liberty is and training them to a knowledge of self-government, and when they have that, the question of what relations shall then exist between the islands and this country may be settled between them and the citizens of the United States.

But to attempt to decide in advance something that it is utterly impossible wisely to decide now, it seems to me, with deference to those who differ with me, very unreasonable.

Senator CARMACK. I was speaking of it from the standpoint of the people of the United States, as to whether you thought it was a question of possibility——

Governor TAFT. What the people of the United States may think, or what they ought to think, fifty or a hundred years from now I do not venture to say.

Senator PATTERSON. It is a century problem?

Governor TAFT. It is quite possible, as we say in our report, that it may take a generation, or two generations; but no matter how long it is, it is, in my judgment, the duty of the United States to continue a government there which shall teach those people individual liberty, which shall lift them to a point of civilization of which I believe they are capable, and which shall make them rise to call the name of the United States blessed.

I have thought over this subject a great deal; we have become intensely interested in the problem, and of course motives, the charge of which we can not avoid, are given to us in reaching such a conclusion; but if I ever was convinced of anything in my life it is that the problem which the United States there has is a great problem worthy of its solution, and which, when solved by establishing a stable government there under the guidance of American control, will redound to the honor and the benefit of this country, and I am proud to have to do with that work.

Senator CARMACK. You say the great trouble in all this matter has been that we are thinking about what may happen a generation or two generations from now. If the possession of the Philippine Islands by the United States involves the possibility of an archipelago 7,000 miles away, inhabited by people of an Asiatic race, becoming a State of the Union fifty or a hundred years from now, do you not think it is a question which deserves consideration now? Do you not think we ought to consider what may happen fifty years from now?

Governor TAFT. No, sir; and I will say why. Nothing that can to-day be said to the Filipino people in the nature of a promise as to the form of government which may take place after an established stable government shall be formed could be otherwise than misleading to them and confusing in establishing that government.

It would at once begin the agitation among those who desire that separation to have that separation, because, in their opinion, they are fitted for it at once. It would drive away from the support of the stable government that conservative element who are strongly in favor of American guidance and control, because they would anticipate an early change.

They would think they would early be left without the support which the presence of the American Government necessarily gives, and the promise of something in the future, instead of helping to establish, would render unstable any government which was attempted to be established.

* * * * * * *

My proposition is that it is the duty of the United States to establish there a government suited to the present possibilities of the people, which shall gradually change, conferring more and more right upon the people to govern themselves, thus educating them in self-government, until their knowledge of government, their knowledge of individual liberty shall be such that further action may taken either by giving them statehood or by making them a quasi-independent government like Canada and Australia, or if they desire it, by independence.

My point, and the point I insist upon, if I may be pardoned for using that expression, is that the discussion to-day of independence, of statehood, of a colonial form of government, in the sense of a permanent relation of colony to mother country, is altogether aside from the questions which are now presented.

Those are, and those concern, the establishment of a firm and stable government in which the Filipino people shall learn self-government by exercising it partially.

* * * * * * *

Senator MCCOMAS. What would happen to them if we withdrew in this fashion?

Governor TAFT. The personal hostility between leading Filipinos at times has been so great as to lead to bloody measures. How far they would be carried here I have no idea. That is conjectural.

I should like to say, if I may, although I had not expected to come to this part of the discussion now, that it is a very logical and reasonable proposition on its face to say, Will not the insurrection come to an end; will not there be general peace and tranquillity if you promise to give these people independence when they shall be fitted for it? That proposition, put in that way, seems to have a great deal of force.

Practically the effect of such a promise would be exactly the opposite from that which the argument presupposes. The promise to give them independence when they are fit for it would be accepted by them as a promise to give them independence certainly during the lifetime of the present generation. It would at once bring into a discussion of every issue the question whether now were not the people ready for independence. It would drive out capital; prevent capital from coming there; and upon the investment of capital, the building of railroads, the enlargement of vision of the Filipino people, much of our hope of progress must depend.

In addition to that, by reason of the constant agitation as to the granting of this independence in a year or two years or three years or a decade, it would at once discourage the sincere efforts of the educated Filipinos who are with us to-day in building up a stable government. For these reasons I think such a promise as that would be a great mistake.

Senator MCCOMAS. Could you, in deciding the question of leaving the sovereignty of the islands, determine now, from your several years' experience there, to which inhabitants you would leave it, with their rivalries and confusion of tongues?

Governor TAFT. Of course, if you left the islands to anybody you would leave them, I assume, to some sort of a committee or parliament, appointed or selected, who would be dominated probably by those whose violent methods have continued the guerrilla warfare; and that such a body could be created by proclamation within a reasonable time I have no doubt. But that it would not constitute a stable government; that it would give rise to anarchy and division between the tribes and between individuals of power and force, I have no doubt.

And so, Mr. President, we have the testimony of Governor Taft, that great jurist and administrator, fresh from the field of his labors in these islands, confirming the unwisdom of surrendering our sovereignty and abandoning these islands.

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, so I repeat now, "we have come to the parting of the ways." The responsibility is upon us, and it can not be avoided or postponed. Upon the choice of this hour depends, I believe, the honor of the Republic and the future well-being of the Filipino people.

In my judgment the course proposed by the majority as outlined by their bill is the only safe and honorable way for this nation to take, committing the future to the enlightened judgment of those who are to come after us.

And let us trust that by pursuing this course with steadfastness and courage there will ultimately be realized the hope of the dead President, that "all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands will come to look back with gratitude to the day when God gave victory to American arms at Manila, and set their land under the sovereignty and the protection of the people of the United States."

APPENDIX.

SYNOPSIS OF REPORTS OF GOVERNORS OF PROVINCES IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS SUBMITTED TO THE CIVIL GOVERNOR OF THE PHILIPPINES, AS PRINTED IN THE HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE PHILIPPINES BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 1902, AND THE PRESENT DATE, MAY 8, 1902.

ABRA PROVINCE.

On pages 429 to 433 and pages 212 and 461 to 470 of the hearings are found reports of W. H. C. Bowen, United States Army, governor of Abra Province, wherein he says:

There is a feeling of confidence and good-fellowship throughout the province. The people are hard-working, and peace and quiet reigns throughout all sections. They need and request industrial schools, especially men to teach the proper method of curing tobacco, which will be the wealth of the province. The people are contented, comparatively prosperous, and happy. The general conditions are good, and will remain so until some hot-head springs up, who, for personal reasons and private ends, may attempt to stir up strife. No people are perfect, but these people of Abra approach it as far as lies in their power.

It makes mention of one English teacher attempting to impart knowledge to 200 native children. After eight months of teaching two young men, owing to their efficiency in the English language, were appointed teachers of English, and at the end of the school year the superintendent expects to recommend at least four more for such positions.

ALBAY PROVINCE.

On pages 197 and 198 of the hearings is the report of Arlington U. Betts, provincial governor of Albay Province, wherein he says:

At present perfect peace prevails throughout the province. The constabulary have been and are doing excellent work, and their services have been highly commented upon by the military officers of this province. Both the military and civil officers are in perfect accord, there being no friction whatever.

I am informed by leading citizens that there never was a time in the history of the province when it was in so prosperous a condition as it is at present, and every man in the province who desires to work has plenty to do. The wages at present being paid are greater than they have ever been. The sale of hemp is bringing an enormous amount of money into the province, and the government has no difficulty in collecting its taxes, which give ample revenue to conduct the government on a very liberal basis. Public buildings, highways, and bridges are being put in repair and new ones erected.

Some idea of the enormous business being done can be had in the fact that in the town of Legaspi alone over $1,000,000 changes hands every thirty days. Schools have been established in all the pueblos, most of them having American instructors, and the progress they are making is exceptionally gratifying.

Governor Betts at the time of his appointment as governor was a captain in the Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, which regiment has subsequently been mustered out of service, and he has continued to occupy the position. At the recent election he was elected to succeed himself as governor for the ensuing term, and his election has been confirmed by the Commission.

AMBOS CAMARINES PROVINCE.

On pages 474 to 484 of the hearings is found the report of Thomas Ross, governor of Ambos Camarines Province, in which he says:

Absolute peace prevails in all sections. It is certain that there is not an armed insurgent within the borders of this province, and the people are loyally supporting the government. It has for some time been evident to me, and the opinion has been strengthened by my recent tours of this province, that the people are for permanent peace and have full confidence in the civil government now in force in the archipelago. Very little is said in this locality as to the desire of the people as to the future form of government, the unanimous sentiment appearing to be to await the progress of events with full confidence in the honor and justice of the American Government and people, believing that the future will be properly provided for, and that their rights and interests will be properly guarded.

He adds:

A good start has been made in educational work; 32 American teachers have arrived, and all towns without teachers are persistently calling for them, and 20 more can be employed in this province advantageously.

Thomas Ross was appointed governor by the Philippine Commission, and was thereafter elected by the people to succeed himself for the ensuing term, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

ANTIQUE PROVINCE.

On pages 486 to 492 of the hearings is found a report of Capt. W. A. Holbrook, provincial governor of the province of Antique, wherein he says:

There are 114,000 to 125,000 people in the province. Since March 22, 1901, when General Fullon, with 34 officers and 255 enlisted men, surrendered, there has not been a single act of hostility against the Americans. These people were allowed to take the oath of allegiance and return to their respective homes. The inhabitants of this province greeted the Commission with triumphal arches when they came to organize civil government.

Courts of first instance and justice have been organized.

Some minerals are found in the province, and generally the people are successful and contented.

Leandro Fullon, the former General Fullon above referred to, has been elected to and accepted the position of provincial governor under United States authority, and his election has been confirmed by the Commission.

BATAAN PROVINCE.

On pages 497 and 498 of the hearings is found a report of J. H. Goldman, provincial governor of Bataan Province, who states that—

Local governments have been established in all the municipalities, and they are conducted in an active, judicious, and praiseworthy manner. There has not been a single abuse or breach of trust committed by any official since the establishment of civil government in the province.

The municipal funds are in a good condition. All the towns are accumulating money, much of which is being used in constructing schoolhouses and other improvements. English is being taught in all the towns of the province. Public schools are aided and encouraged by the people, and, with a single exception, the attendance is larger than the teachers can instruct with good results.

Governor Goldman closes by adding:

In my opinion, the province is free from any taint of insurrection and will always remain so.

BENGUET PROVINCE.

On page 361 of the hearings is a telegraphic report from Governor William F. Pack, of Benguet Province, dated Baguio, December 26, 1901, wherein he states:

Everything peaceful in this province. Just returned from tour over end province. Myself and Spanish secretary only white men in the party. No danger. This promising. Sentiment favorable to Americans.

BULACAN PROVINCE.

On page 191 of the hearings appears the report of José Serapio, governor of Bulacan Province, who says:

The province of Bulacan, under my charge, presents, politically considered, a sublime idea of its sincere gratitude and loyalty to the Government of the United States of America in the Philippine Archipelago. I am justified in this statement by that very revolutionary spirit shown by the province in past times, and the readiness with which the inhabitants recognized the laudable intentions of the Government of the great North American nation in regard to this country and the urgent need for becoming thoroughly penetrated with the transcendent importance of peace, being convinced that only under peace can the welfare and uplifting of the Philippines under American rule be effected.

He also says:

The province is enjoying unbroken peace, and its inhabitants, contented beyond measure with the establishment of civil rule in the Philippines, are doing all they can to strengthen that peace, thus showing their appreciation of the Government which now so wisely rules the destinies of this country.

Jose Serapio is a native Filipino, appointed provincial governor by the Philippine Commission.

MISCELLANEOUS.

As to the provinces of Rizal and Nueva Viscayas, no report from any officer appears in this record.

From the province of Tabayas the report of Governor Gardener has been considered elsewhere and a report from him called for as to statements made therein.

As to the provinces of Bohol, Cebu, Misamis, and Sorsogon, full reports are made, showing the disturbances which have occurred therein, with but little general information otherwise.

From the province of Batangas there is no report from the governor, the secretary submitting a general report only.

CAGAYAN PROVINCE.

On pages 361 and 362 of the hearings is a report of M. Gonzaga, governor of Cagayan Province, wherein he says:

Such is the general state of peace and tranquillity in the province, the inhabitants are busy with their usual occupations, which are mostly agricultural. A sincere proof of the affection and good will of the people toward the constituted government is their desire to learn English. In the municipalities which have American teachers the schools are assiduously visited by the children and grown-up people, not only of the pueblo, but of the neighboring pueblos which have no American teachers, and the latter are begging the superintendent of instruction to provide such teachers.

M. Gonzaga is a native Filipino, appointed governor by the Philippine Commission, subsequently reelected by the people for the ensuing term, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

CAPIZ PROVINCE.

On pages 210 and 211 and pages 1499 and 1512 of the hearings is found a report from S. Jugo Vidal, governor, and other officials of the province of Capiz, wherein he says:

So pronounced is the public spirit for the preservation of order and the maintenance of civil institutions that at the beginning of October last, shortly after the unhappy event at Balangiga, island of Samar, some bad patriots with perverse intentions spread a rumor that an outbreak was about to occur in this province, the result was that all the pueblos universally were vigilant in their desire to maintain peace and disposed to sacrifice themselves in the interest of order, as was reported by the presidentes of the pueblos in replying to recommendations made by this government.

Public instruction is giving very favorable results from the appointment of American teachers, and already the number of children who begin to speak English is quite large, and all of them are anxious to become acquainted with the modern American methods of instruction.

S. Jugo Vidal is a native Filipino and was appointed provincial governor by the Philippine Commission, and was subsequently elected to that position for the ensuing term by the vote of the people, and his election has been confirmed by the Commission.

CAVITE PROVINCE.

On page 199 of the hearings is found a report from Mariano Trias, provincial governor of the province of Cavite, who says:

I can assure you of the peace and order of my province, and that the civil authorities with the constabulary forces will be sufficient to maintain and preserve them.

From information gathered from a trip through the provinces organizing the municipalities, he adds:

I feel that I ought to entertain no doubt of the desire for peace by all the inhabitants.

Mariano Trias is a native Filipino; was appointed provincial governor of this province by the Philippine Commission; subsequently reelected to that position for the ensuing term by the people, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

Mariano Trias was a prominent Filipino, and at one time secretary of the treasury under the insurgent government. He was subsequently a general in active service in southern Luzon.

ILOCOS SUR PROVINCE.

On pages 193 and 194 of the hearings is found a report from M. Crisologe, provincial governor of Ilocos Sur Province, wherein he says:

Since the surrender of General Tinio with all his forces and of Father Aglipay with his men in May last this province has been completely pacified and all the pueblos enjoyed the tranquillity and personal security of normal times before the outbreak of the insurrection against Spain. As a consequence Americans and natives can visit all parts of the province with entire freedom and safety. The people are peacefully following their customary vocations to the extent that no one any longer remembers the war save through newspaper reports of engagements and skirmishes.

M. Crisologo is a native Filipino, appointed governor of this province by the Philippine Commission, subsequently elected to that position by the people, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

ILOCOS NORTE PROVINCE.

On pages 459 and 460 of the hearings is a report of Aguedo Agbayani, governor of Ilocos Norte Province, wherein he says:

The establishment of a provincial government in Ilocos Norte has caused a feeling of general satisfaction among the inhabitants, who have seen in it a favorable change in their political situation. Their conviction was furthermore confirmed by the organization of the municipalities of the province, to all of which the benefit of the new régime was extended.

Aguedo Agbayani is a native Filipino, and appointed governor of this province by the Philippine Commission.

PROVINCE OF ILOILO.

On pages 943 to 948 of the hearings is shown the report by Martin F. Delgato, governor, and other officers of Iloilo Province. The governor says:

The relations of this provincial government with the pueblos could not be more satisfactory than they are. Each of them in its own sphere is trying to do its duty.

It is true they have been compelled to suspend two presidentes (mayor), and he adds:

These are isolated cases and will serve as a caution to others, for this government is determined to enforce obedience to the law and either by admonitions or by punishments to wipe out forever from these pueblos every vestige of the past evil administration. There are schools in 51 pueblos, with an attendance of about 8,000 children. The kind welcome accorded the American teachers is demonstrated by the keen desire of the inhabitants to acquire and speak the English language, and it is desirable that there be stationed at least one teacher of English in each pueblo, so as to facilitate the diffusion of that language throughout the province.

Martin F. Delgato is a native Filipino, and was appointed governor by the Philippine Commission. He was subsequently reelected governor by the people to succeed himself for the ensuing term, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

ISABELA PROVINCE.

On pages 1512 to 1526 of the hearings is found a report of Capt. William H. Johnston, provincial governor of the province of Isabela, who says:

No bands of armed insurgents or ladrones have been reported within the province since the provincial government was organized. I have gone without escort from one end of the province to the other, and the provincial treasurer has made several journeys collecting taxes equally without escort. I consider that portion of the province settled by Christian tribes as perfectly tranquilized as any State of the Union. Financially the province is in a very satisfactory condition. Over $14,000 gold was collected as taxes, and they have met their obligations with a surplus.

In concluding his report, he says:

The people of this province seem to yield sincerely to American sovereignty and to have no regret over the fall of the dictatorship of the Tagalo tyrants. They boast that they took no part in the insurrection until the advent of some Tagalo officers from the Malolos government, who compelled the enrollment of home guards. They are proud to claim that no Filipino of this province ever fought in any other province, and that they surrendered bodily as soon as the presence of sufficient troops of the United States insured stable government.

LA UNION PROVINCE.

On pages 929 to 943, inclusive, are found reports of Joaquin Ortega, governor, and other officers of La Union Province, wherein the governor says:

There are 123,152 inhabitants. To demonstrate conclusively the existence in this province of uniform peace and tranquillity, he mentions two facts which alone furnish, as he says, incontestible and incontrovertible evidence of the truth. First, that since the month of February, 1900, not a single shot has been fired in combat within the jurisdiction of this province, nor has there been a report which would indicate in the vaguest way the existence of insurgents or enemies to the public order. On the 16th of August, 1901, when civil government first went into operation, 108 prisoners, then confined in the jails, were set free, and since that time, with a population as above stated, the average number of prisoners confined within the province has been but 22, and says: "Could more eloquent and irrefutable proofs be furnished than the two facts just cited, in particular the circumstances, that there are only 22 prisoners confined in the province, to demonstrate that peace and tranquillity shine forth in all their splendor in this Ilocano country."

All the municipalities have been organized and are in a prosperous condition. The provincial treasury shows a balance of $10,000 in gold at the end of the year, with all outstanding warrants paid. The value of the private property is estimated for taxation purposes at $7,770,481, and the value of municipal property in the province at $616,081. There are at present 118 municipal schools, with an attendance of 8,785 children of both sexes.

There are 14 American teachers, and the enthusiasm of the children in learning the English language is proved beyond question by the perseverance and steadiness they display while in attendance at school.

Joaquin Ortega is a native Filipino, and was appointed governor by the Philippine Commission. He was subsequently reelected governor by the people of the province to succeed himself for the ensuing term, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

PROVINCE OF LEYTE.

On pages 203 to 210 of the hearings is to be found the reports of Governor J. H. Grant and other officers of the province of Leyte, wherein the following is stated by those officers:

The peace conditions of this province are fairly satisfactory. There are some few marauders, but they will soon be disposed of. The people generally are anxious for civil government, and the officials elected in the various towns are developing, as a general rule, a very high degree of intelligence in the performance of their respective duties. That the great majority of the people are happy and contented with their present condition is evidenced by the renewed activity displayed in all branches of industry. Agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing industries are taking on new life throughout the province, while the people are rebuilding their towns and homes and are erecting in many instances substantial and comfortable buildings instead of nipa shacks. One of the most gratifying and encouraging indications as demonstrating their appreciation of our institutions is the intense interest manifested among the masses to acquire a knowledge of the English language. During the current year the municipalities of this province have expended about 10,000 pesos in the construction and equipment of schoolhouses. There are at present 36 American teachers on duty in the province, all of whom are doing excellent work. The treasury shows tax collections from January 1 to December 1, 1901, to have been $66,126.07 in gold.

MARINDUQUE PROVINCE.

On pages 1485 to 1495 of the hearings is found the report of Ricardo Paras, provincial governor of Marinduque Province, who says:

Every day our people better understand the importance of the mission which the liberal government of America has intrusted to them. They are afforded opportunities for observing clearly the purified justice and liberty which, linked together, palpitate in the text of every law, and have become convinced of the truth that under the present system of government only persons whose capacity and integrity render them the most worthy should fill official positions. Flattering results may be predicted for the future.

Speaking of educational matters, he says:

So many pupils presented themselves for enrollment that they were compelled to request additional teachers, and the results of the teaching in said schools under American methods are very flattering and promise at no distant date to help on materially the regeneration of the province.

It is impossible to praise sufficiently the zeal and interest displayed by the general superintendent of public instruction in developing his plans for the diffusion of the best possible kind of education in the Philippines.

Commerce is flourishing as never before.

Ricardo Paras is a native Filipino, and was appointed governor of this province by the Philippine Commission, was subsequently reelected by vote of the people, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

MASBATE PROVINCE.

On pages 257–258, 360, and 213 are found the reports of Bonifacio Serrano, provincial governor of Masbate Province, wherein he says:

Peace is so completely established in the province that there is not so much as a gang of robbers in the whole territory. The provincial government and the municipalities are doing their work with regularity, and the people are deeply thankful for the benefits derived from the civil régime. Agriculture and commerce are prosperous. The people have a strong desire to learn the English language and are calling for more teachers.

Bonifacio Serrano is a native Filipino, appointed governor of Masbate Province by the Philippine Commission, has been reelected for another term by the people, and his election has been confirmed by the Commission.

NUEVA ECIJA PROVINCE.

On pages 500 to 514 of the hearings can be found the report of J. F. Kreps, provincial governor, and other officials of Nueva Ecija Province, wherein the governor says:

The relations between the civil and military authorities have always been the most pleasant, and the province and its government owe great thanks to the latter for the encouragement and material aid received. Two of the pueblos were terrorized by robber bands, but they have been captured and the province is now quiet. It is worthy of note that the most prominent of the ladrone leaders were captured and brought in by the natives themselves. They have good crops. The interest of the people in local government is growing.

The provincial treasury is in a fair condition, showing a cash balance of $7,816 in gold at the end of the fiscal year.

Captain Kreps was at the time of his appointment an officer of the Twenty-second United States Infantry. His secretary was a Filipino named Epifanio de los Santos. The latter has recently been elected to succeed Captain Kreps as provincial governor, and his election has been ratified by the Commission.

OCCIDENTAL NEGROS PROVINCE.

On pages 435 to 441 is found a report of Leandro Locsin, civil governor of the province of Occidental Negros, who says:

Civil government was established nine months ago, and although this is a short period in which to appreciate the character of the political epoch, one sees already among the people the first signs of an era of contentment and love for a régime which has been so long desired which can not fail to lay for the future the stable foundations of a radical and deeply autonomous constitution.

There are 257,000 inhabitants in this province. Public instruction is receiving attention and enthusiasm by the people. The classes in English are well attended, and this province has sent more of its sons to the colleges and universities of the United States than any other province in the Visayas, thanks to the decided protection of the first military governor here, the always well-remembered General Smith.

Public order is now well assured.

Leandro Locsin is a native Filipino, and was appointed governor of this province by the Philippine Commission. He was elected by the people for the ensuing term, and his election has been confirmed by the Commission.

ORIENTAL NEGROS PROVINCE.

On pages 351 to 358 of the hearings is found a report from Demetrio Larena, provincial governor of the province of Oriental Negros, who says:

The disposition of the pueblos toward the new régime under American sovereignty is on the whole favorable.

He shows the province to have a cash balance in its treasury of $17,732 gold after paying all expenses of the year; that the 24 municipalities are all organized. There has been some difficulty in obtaining men of sufficient intelligence to properly administer the affairs of the municipalities, but that condition is improving.

Demetrio Larena is a native Filipino and was appointed governor of this province by the Philippine Commission.

PAMPANGA PROVINCE.

On page 191 of the hearings appears the report of C. Joven, governor of Pampanga Province, wherein he says:

This province is in the most peaceful condition. Many of the natives are highly educated, and since the introduction of United States public schools a great improvement is noticed among the lower classes. I believe that this province is in better condition than ever before, and under the present system of government will continue to improve, as affording an opportunity and inspiration to develop its resources.

C. Joven is a native Filipino, and was appointed governor by the Philippine Commission.

PANGASINAN PROVINCE.

On pages 484–486 of the hearings is found a report of P. Sison, governor of Pangasinan Province, wherein he says:

During the year 1901 the inhabitants of the province have enjoyed and are enjoying perfect peace.

Pueblos have all been organized and much improvement has been carried on with the greatest activity. The schools are well attended, assessments are collected with great regularity, their rice crop is plentiful, and municipalities are repairing and constructing new public buildings. He adds:

Under the present civil régime, the general conditions of the province are daily improving, as well as the private interests of the inhabitants.

P. Sison is a native Filipino, appointed governor by the Philippine Commission.

ROMBLON PROVINCE.

On page 360 of the printed proceedings of the hearings on the Philippine Islands appears a telegraphic report from Francisco Sanz, governor of Romblon Province, wherein he says:

The province enjoys perfect tranquillity and is going ahead on the road to progress and knowledge.

On pages 1496, 1497, and 1498 he further adds—

That there are 20 American teachers and 25 native teachers; that every pueblo has its own schoolhouse for both sexes; they are all in fine condition, and are sustained by their respective municipalities; in addition to full day schools, they hold evening schools three times a week for adults; that the capital of the province has introduced waterworks for general and municipal use, and suggests schools of a higher grade may be established there, and asks that they have cable communication with the outside world.

Francisco Sanz is a native Filipino, and was first appointed governor of this province by the Philippine Commission, and thereafter elected by a vote of the people and his election confirmed by order of the Philippine Commission.

SURIGAO PROVINCE.

On pages 1495 and 1496 and pages 493 to 498 of the hearings is found a report of Prudencio Garcia, provincial governor of Surigao Province, wherein he says:

Perfect tranquillity exists in the province. The inhabitants are very obedient toward the constituted authorities. All the pueblos have been organizing into municipalities, and have their courts. Gold mines are under exploitation. A large amount of hemp is being produced. There are 93,000 inhabitants who are contented and prosperous.

Prudencio Garcia is a native Filipino, and was appointed governor by the Philippine Commission.

TARLAC PROVINCE.

On page 195 of the hearings appears the report of Wallis O. Clark, governor of Tarlac Province, wherein he says:

There has been no interruption of the province since its organization under provincial-government act. On my recent visit through the province I heard expressions of the desire for peace, which were earnest and sincere. Crops are good, taxes are collected without difficulty, and the province's income exceeds its expenditures. Instruction in English is somewhat impeded by vacations required for planting and harvesting.

Governor Clark is a captain of the Twelfth Infantry, United States Army.

ZAMBALES PROVINCE.

On pages 470 to 474 of the hearings is found the report of Potenciano Lisaca, governor of Zambales, wherein he says:

The people highly appreciate the advantages of the new civil government established by the Philippine Commission—

And especially refers to the fact that—

they know that the pueblos govern themselves through the representatives whom they elect from among their own people. They see with the greatest satisfaction that the funds which they contribute, in the measure of their forces, toward the payment of the public expenses are never diverted from their legitimate object. They remark that, luckily for the province, the provincial officers are no longer what they used to be in former times—those who tyrannized the unfortunate inhabitants, disposing of their persons and of their property in an arbitrary and cruel manner, whereas the new officials work for the happiness and the welfare of the province, and faithfully perform the duties of their respective offices; that individual rights are now respected in the courts, and that justice is not bartered like merchandise and sold to the highest bidder.

Potenciano Lisaca is a native Filipino, appointed governor by the Philippine Commission, subsequently reelected by the people, and his election has been confirmed by the Philippine Commission.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, if no other Senator is going to address the Senate on this bill this afternoon, I should like to take the floor on it and proceed in the morning.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There are three or four little bills which have been waiting here on the Calendar which I should like to have considered, if the Senator has no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no objection. I will take the floor on this bill, and then give way to Senators for other business.

Mr. WARREN. I ask the Senator to yield to me a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. Does he yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

SHIP FOSCOLIA.

Mr. WARREN. I offer the concurrent resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 173) "A bill for the relief of the owners of the British ship Foscolia and cargo," the same matter having been included in the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8587) approved by the President May 27, 1902.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McMILLAN. I submit the report of the committee of conference on the river and harbor appropriation bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and lie over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the report read?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the report of the committee of conference will be printed in the RECORD and will lie over until to-morrow.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12346) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 31, 36, 37, 38, 59, 60, 62, 70, 79, 80, 82, 92, 98, 101, 105, 116, 119, 120, 121, 128, 131, 147, 149, 150, 151, 154, 155, 157, 158, 160, 164, 166, 169, 176, 177, 178, 183, 184, 186, 188, 189, 190, 194, 195, 196, 198, 201, 202, 205, 206, and 207.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 63, 64, 67, 68, 71, 72, 74, 76, 78, 81, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 91, 94, 95, 99, 100, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 122, 123, 124, 132, 133, 134, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 152, 153, 156, 159, 161, 165, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 179, 180, 182, 185, 191, 192, 193, 197, 203, and 204, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the first line of said amendment, after the word "Harbor," insert the words "of refuge;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

First, strike out the word "sixty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifty."

Second, strike out the words "completing the present entrance to Point Judith Pond, Rhode Island, $15,000, and the amount hitherto appropriated and unexpended is hereby made available for this purpose" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A board of engineers shall be appointed by the Secretary of War, who shall make an examination of the said harbors of refuge at Point Judith, Block Island, and Great Salt Pond, with a view to reporting upon the relative merits of each of said harbors, what further construction or improvement, if any, is advisable in each, and the cost of such improvement or construction as may be deemed advisable. Said board shall also make an examination of Vineyard and Nantucket sounds and the east shore of Cape Cod, with a view to reporting upon the relative merits of each of said proposed localities for harbors of refuge, and the said board shall also make an examination of Point Judith Pond, with a view to determining whether it is advisable to enlarge the entrance to said pond from the ocean, and if said enlargement is, upon examination, found to be desirable, an estimate of the cost thereof shall be made. The expense of said board shall be paid from the unexpended balance remaining to the credit of the entrance to Point Judith Pond."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "New York" after the words stricken out and insert in lieu of the language stricken out "Canarsie Bay and Sag Harbor, New York, the last in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 77, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "nineteen" and insert the word "thirty-nine;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "continuing improvement, two hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in accordance with House Document No. 122, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, with a view to obtaining a channel not less than 30 feet deep, ninety thousand;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "heretofore" and insert in lieu thereof the word "herein;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following:

"Improving Biscayne Bay, Florida, with a view to obtaining a channel 18 feet deep from the wharves at Miami to the sea by way of the northerly line of the two lines north of Norris Cut, as described in the report submitted in House Document No. 662, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, and a basin of same depth 1,600 feet long and 500 feet wide, adjacent to the wharves at Miami, $50,000: *Provided*, That a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary for prosecuting the project, not to exceed in the aggregate $250,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated: *Provided further*, That of the work herein contemplated the Florida East Coast Railway Company shall construct at its own expense the basin adjacent to the wharves at Miami, as herein described, and the portion of the channel from such basin to the east side of the basin proposed in the report herein mentioned, said channel to be not less than 85 nor more than 100 feet in width, as shall be determined by the Secretary of War, and said basin and channel when so constructed by the railway company shall be open to the free and unobstructed use of the public: *Provided further*, That the amounts herein appropriated and authorized shall be expended in constructing and protecting the portion of the channel extending to the sea from the terminus of the channel to be constructed by the railway company, of such approximately uniform depth and of such width as will best serve the interests of navigation and as can be constructed with the funds herein appropriated and authorized: *Provided further*, That before any part of the appropriation shall be expended the said railway company shall enter into a contract with the United States satisfactory to the Secretary of War for the performing of its part of the work, and for securing in its portion of the channel and in the said basin practicable depths at least as great as are secured in the portion of the channel to be built by the United States, and for maintaining for a period of three years after the said 18-foot channel to be constructed by the Government shall have been obtained an equal depth in the basin and the channel across the bay; and said contract shall also provide that all craft resorting to Biscayne Bay for commercial purposes may use the wharves and warehouses thereon now owned or controlled or hereafter built on Biscayne Bay by the Florida East Coast Railway Company, its successors or assigns, for reasonable rates of compensation, and that proper facilities shall be given to all persons or corporations for the shipment of freight to or from said wharves on the railway tracks of the said company in Miami for like reasonable rates and upon just and reasonable conditions, and in case of disagreement such compensation and conditions shall be determined by the Secretary of War."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the word "and," proposed to be inserted, insert the word "including;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "sixty thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words inserted and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Improving Galveston channel in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 264, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, $100,000: *Provided*, That a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to prosecute said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate $200,000 exclusive of the amount herein appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amount herein appropriated or authorized shall be expended in obtaining a channel from the outer end of the inner bar to Fifty-first street, 30 feet in depth and of such width in the respective portions thereof as shall best subserve the interests of commerce;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words inserted and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further also*, That the said breakwater shall be commenced at the westerly end thereof and shall be extended eastwardly so far as the same can be completed with the money available, in one section or separate sections, as shall be most favorable for the prosecution of the work; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$135,000," insert "$100,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Insert after each of the harbors designated, viz, Ahnapee, Port Washington, and Oconto, the word "Wisconsin;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words inserted and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Improving Oakland Harbor, Cal., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 262, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, $100,000: *Provided*, That a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to prosecute said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate $150,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "two hundred and twenty-two

thousand dollars, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated," and insert in lieu thereof the words "one hundred thousand dollars, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the words stricken out by the amendment insert the following: "and the right is obtained, free of charge, to deposit material dredged from said channel upon adjacent tide lands;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Reinsert the words in the House provision stricken out by the Senate and add thereto in place of the words inserted by the Senate the following: "Said board shall make its reports as above provided for to the next session of Congress;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out from the words inserted by the Senate the following: "Nothing herein shall be construed as permitting the taking or destruction of any structures or improvements in or near said river owned or used by private persons and corporations, public or private, without just compensation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Strike out the words "is hereby authorized and directed to" and insert in lieu thereof the words "may in his discretion." Add at the end of the language inserted by the Senate the following: "And the Secretary of War shall appoint a board of engineers to examine and determine whether existing Government work in connection with the Upper Hudson improvement causes gorges and freshets between Albany and Coxsackie; to report what changes should be made, if any, provided such is the case, together with an estimate of the cost thereof;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "forty thousand dollars," and insert in lieu thereof the words "thirty-five thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words inserted, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Improving Anacostia River, District of Columbia, with a view to the interests of commerce and navigation, in accordance with such portions of the report submitted in House Document No. 87, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, as relates to section 1 of said river, being the portion below the Navy-Yard Bridge, $150,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add to the words inserted the following: "*Provided*, That no part of said amount shall be expended for turning basins or areas mentioned in said report: *And provided further*, That not more than one-half of said appropriation shall be expended for the improvements above the city line of the city of Richmond;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to be expended in obtaining a suitable navigable channel from Wilmington to Fayetteville" and insert in lieu thereof the following: $50,000 to be expended in obtaining suitable sites for the locks and dams designated in said report;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the language proposed to be inserted omit the words "to be expended on Jekyl Creek and the Dividings;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following: "the whole or any part of which sum may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended in dredging a channel to the depth of 8½ feet into the mouth of the Escambia River;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

First. Strike out the words "twenty-five thousand dollars" and insert in lieu thereof the words "fifteen thousand dollars."

Second. Strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eight."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the words "fifty thousand dollars" insert "twenty-five thousand dollars;" and in lieu of the words "two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, exclusive of the amounts herein appropriated," insert the words "one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the words proposed insert the following: "In developing the proposed channel in divisions 1 and 2 to a uniform depth: *Provided further*, That not more than one-half of said amounts shall be expended upon division 2;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words inserted and insert in lieu thereof the following:: "Improving Trinity River, Texas, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 409, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, $125,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for materials and work to prosecute the project recommended in said report, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate $275,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated: *Provided further*, That $350,000 of the amounts herein appropriated and authorized shall be expended to construct locks and dams upon the river between the mouth and section 1, in those places where the most serious obstructions exist, and to procure and operate snag boats and clear the river with the purpose of permitting through navigation over the portion above described; and the sum of $50,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended for the purpose of securing open-channel navigation in section 1 of said river, and a board of engineers shall be designated by the Secretary of War to examine section 1 of said river as described in said House document, and report upon the feasibility and advisability of expending the further sum of $350,000, with a view to securing not less than eight months' navigation annually upon the said section 1 to Dallas;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the language proposed to be inserted substitute a comma in place of the period and add the following: "of which so much as may be necessary shall be used for the completion of Lock and Dam No. 1;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the word "That," being the first word in the paragraph, insert the word "And;" also omit the break indicating a new paragraph immediately preceding said word; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the words inserted insert the following: "Improving the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa forks of the same, West Virginia and Kentucky, the former in accordance with the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, the latter in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 235, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, $175,000: *Provided*, That a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be required to prosecute work upon the said projects, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate $175,000, exclusive of the amounts herein or heretofore appropriated. Of the said amounts appropriated and authorized so much thereof as may be necessary shall be expended for completing the two locks and dams upon the Big Sandy River; of the balance so much thereof as may be necessary shall be used in purchasing a site for a lock and dam and the construction of a lock on each of the said forks next above their junction, and any remaining sum may be expended in raising the crest of the lock and dam at or near Louisa in the Big Sandy River;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the language proposed substitute a comma for the period and add: "so far as the same is in the interest of navigation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "For local" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Improving Ohio River, Pennsylvania: For;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the words "On pages 2608 and 2609 of the Report of the Chief of Engineers for the year ending June 30, 1901" insert "In House Document No. 336, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "Flint," inserted by the amendment, strike out the words "Shiawassee and Bad rivers" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and Shiawassee Rivers and Bad River;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the words "the same," in the last line but one of the language proposed, insert "for so much of the same as is in the interest of navigation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

First. Insert in the fourth line of the paragraph preceding said amendment, after the words "two millions," the words "two hundred thousand."

Second. Substitute for the words stricken out by amendment numbered 126 the following: "*And provided further*, That of the amounts hereby appropriated and authorized to be expended the Mississippi River Commission may expend, in its discretion, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, during a period of two years, in continuing improvements at New Orleans, La., Natchez and Vidalia, Mississippi and Louisiana; Memphis, Tenn., including Wolf River, and the rectification of the Red and Atchafalaya rivers, Louisiana, an amount aggregating $200,000; and in like manner, from said amounts hereby appropriated and authorized, during a period of four years, aggregate amounts for continuing improvements as follows: At Greenville, Miss., $50,000; at Helena, Ark., $20,000; at Caruthersville, Mo., $20,000; at New Madrid, Mo., $20,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Substitute for the word "That" at the beginning of said amendment the word "And;" omit the break before it indicating a new paragraph, and substitute for the word "heretofore" in said amendment the word "herein;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Substitute for the words "one hundred and fifty thousand dollars" the words "one hundred thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert the words "one hundred and seventy-five" and after the proposed amendment insert: "And the Secretary of War shall cause an examination to be made of said portion of said river with a view to ascertaining whether navigation can be obtained at a reasonable cost by dredging and the removal of obstacles; also at and near Hermann, West Glasgow, Wilhites Bend, Lexington, and St. Joseph, with a view to ascertaining what improvements in these localities, if any, are necessary for navigation; *Provided*, That this examination shall not be construed to prevent any improvements which might otherwise be made at the localities named in this provision;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 135: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "above Lewiston," being the last two words in the paragraph, and insert in lieu thereof "between Lewiston and Pittsburg Landing;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

First. Strike out the word "project" where first employed in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "report."

Second. Substitute for the words "four hundred thousand" the words "one hundred thousand."

Third. Substitute for the word "excluding" the words "exclusive of."

Fourth. Add at the end of said amendment the following:

"*Provided*, That before entering upon the work herein contemplated an examination shall be made by a board of engineers with a view to modifying such project in such a way as to diminish the cost thereof, and if said proposed improvement can be so modified, then said work shall be prosecuted under such modified project; otherwise the same shall be prosecuted under the existing project as set forth in the report above referred to."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed insert the following:

"Improving Columbia River between the mouth of the Willamette River and the city of Vancouver, Wash.: Continuing improvement, $2,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 162: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "necessary" insert "in the interest of navigation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add at the end of the language proposed the following: "in the interest of navigation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "survey" and insert in lieu thereof the word "reexamination," and strike out the words "and shall submit an estimate therefor;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words inserted and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina, with a view to the construction of a channel not less than 16 feet in depth, upon the most advantageous route between the points named: *Provided*, That the examination and survey shall be made by a board of engineer officers detailed by the Secretary of War, and any report made shall include the probable cost of any private waterway that it may be to the interest of the United States to acquire in connection with the proposed improvement: *Provided further*, That the total expense of the examination and of any survey which may be made shall not exceed the sum of $5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "Hiawassee" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Hiwassee:" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add to the language proposed the words "from its mouth to Logansport;" and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES McMILLAN,
S. B. ELKINS,
JAMES H. BERRY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. E. BURTON,
WALTER REEVES,
RUFUS E. LESTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. McKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed with amendments the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 493) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia;" and

A bill (S. 4792) relative to the control of dogs in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2510) extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near Oacoma, S. Dak.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12199) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 4995) to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

A bill (S. 712) granting an increase of pension to John Housiaux;

A bill (S. 1038) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus C. Pratt;

A bill (S. 1464) to establish storm-warning stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan;

A bill (S. 1797) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Russell;

A bill (S. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Baldwin;

A bill (S. 2457) granting an increase of pension to Warren Y. Merchant;

A bill (S. 2511) granting an increase of pension to William Phillips;

A bill (S. 2535) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Joseph;

A bill (S. 2551) granting a pension to Amelia Engel;

A bill (S. 2697) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Baldwin;

A bill (S. 3063) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Edge, alias Jason Edge;

A bill (S. 3551) granting an increase of pension to John P. Collier;

A bill (S. 3888) granting an increase of pension to Jesse H. Hubbard;

A bill (S. 3998) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Kimble;

A bill (S. 4240) granting an increase of pension to Calvin N. Perkins;

A bill (S. 4415) granting an increase of pension to Vesta A. Brown;

A bill (S. 4638) granting a pension to Helena Sudsburg;

A bill (S. 4642) granting an increase of pension to Anne Dowery;

A bill (S. 4655) granting an increase of pension to Oliver K. Wyman;

A bill (S. 4706) granting an increase of pension to William Harrington;

A bill (S. 4712) granting an increase of pension to Eliphlet Noyes;

A bill (S. 4729) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Hall, alias William Knapp;

A bill (S. 4730) granting an increase of pension to George W. Youngs;

A bill (S. 4732) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Hazzard;

A bill (S. 4758) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Doane;

A bill (S. 4759) granting an increase of pension to Martha Clark;

A bill (S. 4766) granting an increase of pension to James P. McClure;

A bill (S. 4790) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Seavey;

A bill (S. 4829) granting an increase of pension to Nimrod Headington;

A bill (S. 4853) granting an increase of pension to Amos Moulton;

A bill (S. 4862) granting an increase of pension to James Welch;

A bill (S. 4871) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Worthen;

A bill (S. 4983) granting a pension to John W. Smoot;

A bill (S. 5106) granting an increase of pension to Horace L. Richardson;

A bill (S. 5152) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. M. Martin, alias Marion M. Martin;

A bill (S. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Eri W. Pinkham;

A bill (S. 5202) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Wagner;

A bill (S. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Van Eaton;

A bill (S. 5371) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan O. Thompson;

A bill (S. 5669) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Howe;

A bill (S. 5670) granting a pension to Samuel H. Chamberlin;

A bill (S. 5759) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Crooker;

A bill (H. R. 989) to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of $1,704.46;

A bill (H. R. 1346) granting a pension to Adelbert L. Orr;

A bill (H. R. 2857) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Haughton;

A bill (H. R. 6330) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tanner;

A bill (H. R. 6625) granting increase of pension to Mary S. Downing;

A bill (H. R. 7397) granting a pension to Louisa White;

A bill (H. R. 9606) granting a pension to Charles Blitz;

A bill (H. R. 10144) to donate to the State of Alabama the spars of the captured battle ships *Don Juan d'Austria* and *Almirante Oquendo;*

A bill (H. R. 10782) granting a pension to Ole Steensland;

A bill (H. R. 10995) to regulate the introduction of eggs of game birds for propagation;

A bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Matilda C. Clarke;

A bill (H. R. 13395) granting a pension to Arthur J. Bushnell;

A bill (H. R. 13895) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903;

A bill (H. R. 14589) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902;

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) authorizing the use and improvement of Governors Island, Boston Harbor; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Morgan Memorial Association, of Winchester,

Va., certain Revolutionary trophies at Allegheny Arsenal, Pittsburg, Pa.

PROTECTION OF GAME IN ALASKA.

Mr. KITTREDGE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11535) for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment, which is as follows:

"*Provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing sections of this act shall be construed or held to prohibit or limit the right of the Smithsonian Institution to collect in or ship from the district of Alaska animals or birds for the use of the Zoological Park in Washington, D. C."

And agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment add the following:

"*Provided further*, That such heads and hides as may have been taken before the passage of this act may be shipped out of Alaska at any time prior to the 1st day of July, A. D. 1902."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. R. BURTON,
A. B. KITTREDGE,
PARIS GIBSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
FRANCIS W. CUSHMAN,
A. L. BRICK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 12199) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

LIFE-SAVING STATION ON MONOMOY ISLAND, MASSACHUSETTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, to which he calls the attention of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be directed to return to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 4995) to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT CODE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 493) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia;" which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONTROL OF DOGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4792) relative to the control of dogs in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY (ARIZ.) BONDS.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8752) authorizing the board of supervisors of Santa Cruz County, Ariz., to issue bonds for the erection of a court-house and jail for said county.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the board of supervisors of the county of Santa Cruz, Territory of Arizona, is hereby authorized to issue bonds on said county in the sum of $35,000 for the construction of a court-house and jail for said county and vaults for the preservation of its records.

SEC. 2. That said bonds may be in such denominations as the said board may prescribe and shall bear not more than 5 per cent interest per annum, and shall not be sold for less than their par value. Said bonds shall be made payable in thirty years, with an option on the part of the county to pay any or all of them after ten years from the date of their issue.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of paying the interest on said bonds as it becomes due and provide for a sinking fund to pay said bonds the said board of supervisors shall levy and cause to be collected, as other county taxes are levied and collected, a sufficient tax on the assessable property in said county as will meet the interest as it falls due and provide a reasonable sinking fund to pay said bonds when due.

SEC. 4. That said bonds shall be printed with interest coupons attached thereto; each coupon shall represent one year's interest on the bond, and when the interest represented in a coupon is paid the coupon shall be detached from the bond and placed by the treasurer with his other vouchers before the board of supervisors.

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

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

SCHOOL LANDS IN JUNEAU, ALASKA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4616) to grant title to the town of Juneau, Alaska, of land occupied for school purposes, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes that certain real property now situated in the town of Juneau and district of Alaska, upon which the public-school building of the town of Juneau is now situated, and belonging to the United States of America, known as Government reservation No. 2, being all of block 23 except lots Nos. 5 and 6 in the town of Juneau, as the same appears of record on the official plat of the town-site trustee, be granted to the incorporated town of Juneau for school purposes.

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

STATE SCHOOL INDEMNITY SELECTIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5505) adjusting certain conflicts respecting State school indemnity selections in lieu of school sections in abandoned military reservations.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes that all State school indemnity selections in lieu of what are known as school sections in abandoned military reservations made pursuant to the decision of the Secretary of the Interior dated January 28, 1898, and before notice of the withdrawal of that decision was received at the local land office at which the selections were made, and which are otherwise regular and free from any prior lawful claim, shall be confirmed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the lands in such school sections in lieu of which such confirmed selections were made shall be disposed of under the laws applicable to other lands in such abandoned military reservations, a preference right being accorded to those who have made and maintained a bona fide settlement or entry pursuant to said decision of the Secretary of the Interior.

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

SCHOOL-DISTRICT BONDS IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9334) to amend an act to prohibit the passage of special or local laws in the Territories, to limit the Territorial indebtedness, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved July 30, 1886, entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States, to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes," is hereby amended so as to authorize the issuance of bonds by school districts in Oklahoma Territory having a bona fide population of not less than 5,000 persons for erecting necessary school buildings and purchasing the ground for the same. The limitations of said act of July 30, 1886, shall not apply to such school districts: *Provided*, That before any bonds shall be issued the mayor and common council of the municipal corporation composing in whole or in part such school district shall cause an election to be held in such district, and said mayor and common council shall cause to be published in a newspaper of general circulation, published in said district, a notice of the time and place or places of holding such election. Such notice shall be given at least thirty days before such election.

On the question of the issuance of said bonds no person shall be qualified to vote except he be in all respects a qualified elector and owner of real or personal property subject to taxation within the school district. In case two-thirds of the qualified voters, as above described, shall vote affirmatively for the issuance of said bonds, then the mayor and common council shall certify the result to the board of education, and said board shall issue the same, and not otherwise. Said bonds shall contain all necessary provisions as to form, and such school district shall provide a proper sinking fund for the redemption of said bonds. Said bonds shall not bear a rate of interest exceeding 4 per cent, and the interest shall be paid semiannually, and none of said bonds shall be sold at less than their par value: *Provided further*, That no school district under this act shall issue bonds in excess of 6 per cent of the valuation according to the last preceding assessment of the school district issuing the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOAR. I should like to reserve the right to object for a little while, if the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] will pardon me. I only wish to object until I know something about the bill.

It seems to me that it is a very unwise policy as to a whole Territory to provide that a school district having a bona fide population of not less than 5,000 shall issue bonds, making that an absolute condition precedent to the validity of the bond itself, without having some authentic and final and conclusive way of determining whether it has a population of 5,000. Everybody knows the wild estimates about the population of towns, especially in a newly settled territory. People are very apt to believe that the United States census underrates the population of their particular town, and so the census is frequently very disappointing to a great many.

It seems to me instead of making the possession of a certain population a condition of the validity of a bond, which may circulate and which may become a part of the resources or property of widows or orphans or trust funds, that there should be some other provision; for instance, that the governor of the Territory should certify that this school district had this bona fide population, and make that binding.

I wish the Senator would let the bill lie over, so that we may have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am very willing to let the bill lie over.

Mr. HOAR. I do not want to meddle with the Senator's bill, of course.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The bill has had very careful consideration by the Committee on Territories. A subcommittee was appointed on the bill, consisting of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM] and others. Judge BURNHAM has made a very exhaustive report upon the bill. He is a lawyer of very great care and of great learning, and the technical portions of the bill I doubt not are perfect.

The policy involved is a very wise one. The bill relates to only three cities in Oklahoma; and the necessities of those cities with respect to the need of schoolhouses for the children are pressing. The facts are fully set forth in the report, which the Senator will probably find on his desk.

Mr. HOAR. This relates to conditions now existing?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. HOAR. It has been held in the Departments and I think in the courts that the only authentic evidence of population is the census. The census, would, of course, relate to 1900, nearly two years ago; and I do not know whether since then there has been an increase or a decrease in population in these towns in Oklahoma.

I have no doubt that great care has been exercised by the committee; but I know I find in my committee once in a while that in some cases mistakes in phraseology occur, which immediately become obvious after suggestions have been made regarding the matter, but which escaped the attention of the committee and the subcommittee composed of able lawyers.

I think it is a very risky thing to make a bond without having some authority to settle the question of population, when the bond depends for its validity as to all customers and to all holders under all circumstances upon the fact of the amount of population.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator desires the bill to lie over, of course I have no objection.

Mr. HOAR. I think that will be better.

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

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not think so, but I will let it go over. I wish to say that the proposition contained in the bill is not a novel one. It has been quite the usual thing in the past, and precisely the same provision has been adopted in three other instances in recent history.

Mr. HOAR. But if the policy is vicious, we ought to stop it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will consent that the bill go over; but I have another short bill from the same committee, which I should like to have considered.

Mr. KEAN. I think it is getting pretty late to enter upon the consideration of further legislation to-night.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; I shall not ask for the consideration of the other bill at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 29, 1902, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 28, 1902.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Melvin Grigsby, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of Alaska, to be assigned to division No. 2, in the place of Joseph K. Wood, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

Thomas T. Dargie, to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Alameda and State of California, in place of William H. Friend. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1902.

Frank E. Cushing, to be postmaster at Red Bluff, in the county of Tehama and State of California, in place of Frank E. Cushing. Incumbent's commission expires May 28, 1902.

Giles P. Lecrenier, to be postmaster at Moodus, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, in place of Giles P. Lecrenier. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1902.

James A. Simpson, to be postmaster at Kissimmee, in the county of Osceola and State of Florida, in place of James A. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expires June 13, 1902.

Christopher E. Head, to be postmaster at Tallapoosa, in the county of Haralson and State of Georgia, in place of Christopher E. Head. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1902.

William Stickler, to be postmaster at Lexington, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois, in place of William Stickler. Incumbent's commission expires June 14, 1902.

David A. Courter, to be postmaster at Hinsdale, in the county of Du Page and State of Illinois, in place of David A. Courter. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Andrew E. Sheldon, to be postmaster at Paxton, in the county of Ford and State of Illinois, in place of Andrew E. Sheldon. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

William Goodin, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Van Buren and State of Iowa, in place of William F. Thero. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

Thomas A. Hills, to be postmaster at Leominster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in place of Thomas A. Hills. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1902.

Joseph A. West, to be postmaster at Provincetown, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts, in place of Joseph A. West. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1902.

Clinton L. Kester, to be postmaster at Marcellus, in the county of Cass and State of Michigan, in place of Clinton L. Kester. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1902.

Edward L. Bates, to be postmaster at Pentwater, in the county of Oceana and State of Michigan, in place of Edward L. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1902.

Andrew Richmond, to be postmaster at Orleans, in the county of Harlan and State of Nebraska, in place of Andrew Richmond. Incumbent's commission expires June 2, 1902.

Robert S. Fulton, to be postmaster at Germantown, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio, in place of Robert S. Fulton. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1902.

Augustus J. Eminger, to be postmaster at Miamisburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio, in place of Augustus J. Eminger. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1902.

Lewis O. Cooper, to be postmaster at Middleport, in the county of Meigs and State of Ohio, in place of Lewis O. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expires June 15, 1902.

Lynn G. Thomas, to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Bradford and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Charles E. Riggs. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

George D. Shore, to be postmaster at Sumter, in the county of Sumter and State of South Carolina, in place of Emily E. Whittemore. Incumbent's commission expires June 3, 1902.

Harry L. Bras, to be postmaster at Mitchell, in the county of Davison and State of South Dakota, in place of Harry C. Clark. Incumbent's commission expires June 2, 1902.

Gale Armstrong, to be postmaster at Rogersville, in the county of Hawkins and State of Tennessee, in place of Gale Armstrong. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1902.

Gomer S. Williams, to be postmaster at Cisco, in the county of Eastland and State of Texas, in place of Gomer S. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires June 13, 1902.

George G. Clifford, to be postmaster at San Antonio, in the county of Bexar and State of Texas, in place of George G. Clifford. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1902.

John Beaty, to be postmaster at Waxahachie, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas, in place of John Beaty. Incumbent's commission expires June 13, 1902.

Alexander McCormick, to be postmaster at Berryville, in the county of Clarke and State of Virginia, in place of Alexander McCormick. Incumbent's commission expires June 14, 1902.

Allen I. Harless, to be postmaster at Christiansburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia, in place of Allen I. Harless. Incumbent's commission expires June 13, 1902.

James H. Spencer, to be postmaster at Necedah, in the county of Juneau and State of Wisconsin, in place of James H. Spencer. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1902.

William H. Hilton, to be postmaster at Durant, in the Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory, in place of Amelia C. Butler, removed.

Olive L. Stauffer, to be postmaster at Gladbrook, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa, in place of Isaac Stauffer, deceased.

Pryce T. Jones, to be postmaster at Henderson, in the county of Vance and State of North Carolina, in place of Dollie W. Garrett, removed.

John E. Reynolds, to be postmaster at Redding, in the county of Shasta and State of California, in place of John E. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1902.

John M. Frew, to be postmaster at Soldiers Home, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in place of Francis I. Gardiner. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

George Y. Downing, to be postmaster at Camp Point, in the county of Adams and State of Illinois, in place of Richard Seaton. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

John A. Childs, to be postmaster at Evanston, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, in place of John A. Childs. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1901.

Alonzo H. Williams, to be postmaster at Holton, in the county of Jackson and State of Kansas, in place of Moses M. Beck. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1902.

Frank E. Shoemaker, to be postmaster at Neodesha, in the county of Wilson and State of Kansas, in place of James K. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires June 2, 1902.

Reuben K. Sawyer, to be postmaster at Wellesley, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in place of Reuben K. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

John M. Hamilton, to be postmaster at Batavia, in the county of Genesee and State of New York, in place of John M. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

W. L. Harris, to be postmaster at Charleston, in the county of Charleston and State of South Carolina, in place of George I. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expires June 14, 1902.

Fred W. Miller, to be postmaster at Oakesdale, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, in place of Ferdinand A. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1902.

Benjamin Webster, to be postmaster at Platteville, in the county of Grant and State of Wisconsin, in place of Benjamin Webster. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

John Kellogg, to be postmaster at Reedsburg, in the county of Sauk and State of Wisconsin, in place of John Kellogg. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Thomas F. Addington, to be postmaster at Yukon, in the county of Canadian and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Monroe C. Litteer, deceased.

Samuel G. Hanson, to be postmaster at Berea, in the county of Madison and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn May 28, 1902.

William E. Stouffer, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the State of Colorado.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28, 1902.

MARSHAL.

William M. Hanson, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas, commencing July 1, 1902.

POSTMASTERS.

Edward W. Martin, to be postmaster at Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey.

Abram W. Boss, to be postmaster at Flemington, in the county of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey.

E. D. Turner, to be postmaster at Delamar, in the county of Lincoln and State of Nevada.

James Brizzolara, to be postmaster at Fort Smith, in the county of Sebastian and State of Arkansas.

Elias H. Bird, to be postmaster at Plainfield, in the county of Union and State of New Jersey.

Charles Eichhorn, to be postmaster at West Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey.

William O. Armbruster, to be postmaster at Weehawken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *May 28, 1902.*

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock m. by the Hon. ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, Clerk of the House, who read the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1902.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, as Speaker pro tempore for this day.

D. B. HENDERSON, *Speaker.*

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

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

HERMAN GAUSS.

Mr. JOY. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution (No. 261) from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred House resolution No. 261, authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment to Herman Gauss of $750 for services rendered to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, have had the same under consideration, and recommend the accompanying resolution in lieu thereof.

Mr. Gauss is the detailed clerk from the Pension Bureau, under the law, and has rendered extra and expert services to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. This payment is usually made in the general deficiency bill, and we therefore report the following resolution favorably:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment of Herman Gauss $750 for services as acting assistant clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The resolution was agreed to.

D. S. PORTER.

Mr. JOY, from the Committee on Accounts, also presented the following resolution, No. 262.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred House resolution No. 262, have had the same under consideration, and recommend the adoption of the accompanying resolution in lieu thereof.

Mr. Porter is the detailed clerk from the Pension Bureau, under the law, and has rendered extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions. This payment is usually made in the general deficiency bill, and we therefore report the following resolution favorably:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment of D. S. Porter, $500, for services as acting assistant clerk to the Committee on Pensions.

The resolution was agreed to.

CLERK TO CONFERENCE MINORITY.

Mr. JOY, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted the following resolution, No. 260.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred House resolution No. 260, authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to provide for a clerk to the conference minority at $2,000 per annum instead of a messenger at $1,200 per annum, have had the same under consideration, and recommend its adoption by the House.

A messenger was originally provided for service in the room of the minority members of the House, by resolution reported from this committee in the last Congress, and adopted by the House. Provision was afterwards, and is now made by law for the salary of this messenger, and the resolution herewith reported at the request of the minority members of the House provides for a change in law so that the minority will be provided with a clerk at $2,000 per annum instead of a messenger at $1,200 per annum.

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to provide for a clerk to the conference minority at $2,000 per annum instead of a messenger at $1,200 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

LANDS IN SEQUOIA AND OTHER NATIONAL PARKS.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 14511) to authorize the relinquishment to the United States of patent, land, and claim.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in cases in which a tract of land covered by an unperfected bona fide claim or by a patent is included within the limits of the Sequoia National Park, set aside by act of Congress approved September 25, 1890, and the Yosemite and General Grant National parks, set aside by act of Congress approved October 1, 1890, the settler or owner thereof may, if he desires to do so, relinquish the tract to the Government and secure other land, outside of said parks, in accordance with the provisions of the law relating to the subject of such relinquishment of lands in the forest reservations created under section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want some explanation of this bill.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill is unanimously reported from the Committee on Public Lands. It was prepared by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with his last annual report, pages 154 and 155. It provides that the owners of patented lands in the national parks in California may relinquish their lands to the Government and go upon the public domain and take in lieu thereof other land open to settlement. It creates no expense to the Government and has been recommended repeatedly by different Secretaries of the Interior and by superintendents of these parks, and was prepared by the Interior Department and unanimously reported from our committee.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is it necessary in order that the national parks shall be properly carried on that private owners should be out of them?

Mr. NEEDHAM. That is the object of the bill, for the better administration of the parks.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. How much is involved in it?

Mr. NEEDHAM. Something like 55,000 acres are held in private ownership in these parks.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But the whole of those 55,000 acres will not be exchanged; only a portion.

Mr. NEEDHAM. This is simply a privilege extended to these owners; there is nothing compulsory in it; it is simply a privilege of which they may avail themselves if they desire to do so.

Mr. LACEY. The limitation is precisely the same as in the case of forest reserves.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Exactly; this simply extends the law, so far as relinquishments are concerned, to the national parks.

Mr. MADDOX. Have the owners already cut the timber off the land?

Mr. NEEDHAM. No, sir; not to any great extent.

Mr. LACEY. Very little of the timber has been cut in these national parks.

Mr. MADDOX. Have not the parties who own this land cut the timber off?

Mr. LACEY. I think that very few of them have done so, for the reason that the lands are so inaccessible. They are away up in the heart of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me state that the same provision exists now under the general law as to forest reserves; and we have a great number of forest reserves, including many millions of acres.

The national parks ought to be, and in fact are, on a better basis than the reserves; yet by reason of the fact that the law with relation to forest reserves has not been extended to the national parks we have private ownership now in the national parks, which should not exist there.

Mr. MADDOX. Let me state my reason for asking the question. I saw a report here the other day from the Secretary of the Interior in regard to one of these parks. It stated that some parties had gone into some of these parks and cut all of the timber off; and now they want to exchange that land with the Government and go out and locate on other timber lands in order to get the timber from those also. I simply wanted to know whether that was the fact in this instance.

Mr. NEEDHAM. I do not think that condition of things is as prevalent in the parks as in the forest reserves.

Mr. SHAFROTH. A number of applications have been made for land in forest reserves for purposes of that character. But I am opposed to any such policy. It is wrong for the Government to exchange in this way good land for bad.

Mr. FINLEY. Is it not a fact that the holdings by private parties in this national park are comparatively small and are isolated, and that the parties wish to get out of the park and to take lands on the public domain elsewhere, the result of which will be beneficial not only to the Government from having its national park as a unit, but also beneficial to these private parties? The arrangement will be mutually beneficial.

Mr. NEEDHAM. That is approximately the situation. This legislation is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. FINLEY. The results of such a policy, I understand, will be beneficial both to the Government and to the private parties.

Mr. CANNON. How much land is held in these parks by private individuals?

Mr. NEEDHAM. About 55,000 acres.

Mr. CANNON. I believe there are two small parks, which are close together.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Yes, sir. This applies to the three national parks in the State of California.

Mr. CANNON. Does it provide for the purchase, or for the issue of lieu scrip?

Mr. NEEDHAM. Neither. It simply provides that these parties shall relinquish their claims to the Government and go upon the public domain and take other lands which are open to settlement. This is the same legislation which was before the gentleman's committee in connection with a proposed appropriation, and the committee advised this course.

Mr. LACEY. This bill embraces the same limitation which was put in the appropriation bill. It applies to nonmineral, surveyed land, open to settlement.

Mr. CANNON. Then lieu scrip can not be issued.

Mr. LACEY. No scrip is to be issued. An exchange is to be made. The owners of land in the forest reserves or in this park will convey their land with an abstract of title to the Government and then locate on surveyed, nonmineral public lands, open to settlement elsewhere.

Mr. McRAE. Just as in the case of a forest reserve.

Mr. LACEY. Precisely the same as a forest reserve.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Who superintends that exchange?

Mr. LACEY. The exchange is effected through the Land Office.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why do they want to make the exchange?

Mr. LACEY. I will state that these parties inside who have located lands find themselves now, by virtue of the fact that the land has been placed in perpetual reservation, in such a position so that there can be no new neighbors, schoolhouses, churches, or other conveniences. In other words, settlement has been stopped, and they want to get out alongside of people where the land is open to settlement.

Mr. McRAE. I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] that the purpose of the Government is to get control of the park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the title will be amended.

There was no objection.

SALMON CULTURE IN ALASKA.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9976) to encourage salmon culture in Alaska and for the protection of persons engaged in the production thereof, which I will send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person or persons who heretofore or hereafter may establish and maintain a hatchery for the artificial production of salmon in the district of Alaska shall be entitled to the exclusive right of all fish that such hatchery may produce in excess of the normal product of such stream for a distance of 1 mile in all directions in tide water from the mouth of the stream upon which such hatchery may be located.

SEC. 2. That when the average normal product of any stream on which a hatchery may be maintained shall have been taken within 1 mile of the mouth of said stream in any one year by any party or parties, then the remaining fish produced by said hatchery shall be the property of the owner or owners of said hatchery for a distance of 1 mile in all directions in tide water from the mouth of said hatchery stream, and for a further distance of 4 miles in all directions in tide water it shall be unlawful for any party or parties to take fish of the kind propagated by the hatchery for whose protection this law is enacted.

SEC. 3. That in case other streams producing salmon of the same kind as those produced by the hatchery so protected shall intervene within a distance of 5 miles, then the normal product of such intervening stream shall be included in and added to the normal product of such hatchery stream, subject to the same conditions as are provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC 4. That the provisions and immunities of this act shall apply to barren streams and lakes that shall have been stocked with fish from artificial hatcheries.

SEC. 5. That in case two or more persons shall maintain hatcheries on the same stream or stock barren lakes or streams, such persons shall be entitled to their proportionate number of adult fish so produced, and each party shall file a sworn statement of his or their output of young fry with the nearest United States commissioner each year.

SEC. 6. That native Indians may at all times take sufficient fish for food or for drying for winter use as food for themselves or families, and fishing with the rod shall be open and free for all persons.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to grant leases in accordance with the foregoing sections of this act, for a period not to exceed twenty years from the time the product of their hatcheries shall return, to all persons producing satisfactory proof of having maintained hatcheries on any of the streams of Alaska not producing, in a normal state, more than 10,000 salmon of the kind propagated by said hatchery; such lease subject to renewal at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That before any such lease shall be granted the party or parties making application therefor shall accompany such application with proof sufficient to establish the normal product of such stream; and no person shall be entitled to more than one hatchery lease or the privilege of stocking more than three barren lakes or streams and being protected in the product thereof. Corporations owning and operating canneries shall be entitled to one hatchery franchise for each cannery so operated, and no more. All hatcheries that may have been started and maintained on streams producing more than 10,000 salmon of the kind propagated prior to the passage of this act shall be entitled to all immunities of hatcheries established on streams producing not more than 10,000, as provided in this section.

SEC. 8. That all rights and privileges granted by this bill are subject to the supervision and regulation and repeal by Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is too important a bill to be considered otherwise than in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SULZER. I trust the gentleman will not object.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will hear the gentleman.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman withdraw his objection for just a few moments?

Mr. CANNON. No; I will not. I will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. SULZER. Very well. I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that this bill has been very carefully prepared. It was carefully considered by the Committee on Territories and was unanimously reported from that committee. The report is elaborate, instructive, and conclusive to every member that will read it. The committee had before it representatives from Alaska, the representative of the Treasury Department, the representative of the United States Fish Commission, and they all unanimously recommended the passage of this bill. It is a good bill of great merit and should pass immediately in order to prevent the extermination of the salmon of Alaska. Unless something is done to prevent the extermination of the salmon there, these valuable fish and that great industry will be utterly destroyed within the next twenty-five or thirty years. It is very important that this bill should speedily become a law.

Every man who has looked into this matter favors this bill. It leaves the whole matter in the control of the Secretary of the Treasury and in the control of Congress. It grants no special rights, no special privileges; it simply gives to persons who, at their expense, established hatcheries in Alaska for the artificial propagation of salmon the right to catch a portion of those fish when they come back to spawn after the expiration of nine, ten, or eleven years. That is only right and fair and just. It is not alone in the interests of the men who establish these hatcheries and propagate the salmon, but it is in the interests of the people of this country, of the people of all the world who use canned salmon as a staple diet. If the gentleman now objects to this bill, it can not pass this session, and the consequence will be that the people in Alaska who are now ready to establish these hatcheries at their own expense will abandon the enterprise.

The purpose of this bill is to maintain and increase the normal product of salmon in Alaska. The destruction of the salmon fishery on the Atlantic coast demonstrates beyond any question

that some steps are necessary to be taken to protect and preserve this great and valuable source of food supply on the Pacific coast or it will ultimately meet the same fate.

The provisions of the bill will give the necessary protection and encouragement to private citizens to invest their capital and labor in the work of propagating young salmon, which are absolutely needed to replenish and increase the natural supply which is now being steadily exhausted, and which unless some such action is taken by the Government will be finally exterminated. This law will not only keep up the present supply, but will enormously increase the normal supply.

The proposed law simply gives to parties a legal right to property they create from the wastes of nature at their own cost and without taking anything of value from the public domain. If they produced ten where nature produced but one, they surely should have the right to the increase. They also enrich the waters outside the protected zone by thousands of fish that will be public property.

No title in fee simple is asked, merely a lease that need not be renewed unless its continuation should seem just and proper.

The bill also provides that these leases shall be subject to repeal by Congress at any time in case the public interests may demand.

No person or corporation will have a monopoly of any stream. All have equal rights, as provided in section 5. And no individual can have more than one franchise, or corporation more than one for each cannery actually operated. The rights of Indians are more than protected, as they have free access for food purposes to the artificial product, and in common with others to the normal product. Fishing with hook and line is free to all.

Limiting hatchery franchises to small producing streams will prevent clashing of interests, as streams producing 10,000 or less of the valuable redfish are considered of small value and are seldom fished by more than one party, while the large producers, running as high as two and a half millions, are fished by several persons and corporations. Those who have already maintained hatcheries on streams producing large numbers should be protected, in all fairness.

There are thousands of streams and lakes that are barren because of falls near tide water which no fish can pass on the upward passage. By stocking these streams with young fry you reclaim a desert; yet this can be accomplished, and the commercial results of which would be enormous; to accomplish this, however, entails a considerable expense.

No policy will advance the settlement of Alaska more or as much as that provided for in this bill. Every industrious fisherman can, and many will, embark in salmon culture, and in connection with his hatchery will develop what there may be of agricultural resources that will never be utilized except in connection with some auxiliary industry. Nearly all the lands suitable for agricultural purposes are situated at the mouths of streams.

The 1 mile reserved to the propagator in many cases would not be sufficient protection, but a further reserve of 4 miles, as set forth in section 2 of the bill, from which all parties are excluded from taking fish of the kind propagated, will leave those which might be in transit free to pass on to their native streams unhindered, and if they are the product of the protected hatcheries they will go there also unhindered.

Fishing for all kinds of salmon, of a different species from those propagated, as well as other species of fish, is free and open to all.

Col. H. M. Kutchin, special agent of the Treasury Department for the Alaska salmon fisheries, says regarding this measure:

This bill, which we are here to discuss, is fair and equitable. I think that any man who is disposed to put in his time and money and effort, as Mr. Callbreath and others have, should be protected, and I think this bill does it fairly and well, and that it does not encroach upon the rights of anybody. It does not give anybody the exclusive rights of streams. There will probably be contentions, where there are two men on a stream, as to how many fish each produced and how many of the returning fish are his, but that can not well be cared for in this particular bill. I think it is a good bill. So far as the preservation of fisheries is concerned, I think there should be a vital revision of law. There should probably be limitations as to the duration of the fishing seasons and the size of the pack.

Now, gentlemen, I trust there will be no objection to this bill now passing by unanimous consent.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that I concur with my friend from New York [Mr. SULZER] in urging the importance of early action upon this bill, so that the legislation could go to Alaska with the opening of the shipping season, to enable the men who are planting fish there to reap the benefit of that which they plant. Some men have established hatcheries, and this gives them the opportunity to reap the fruits of the hatcheries and it will encourage the establishment of more.

Mr. SULZER. That is all it does, and it is right.

Mr. LACEY. I think it is a very urgent bill, and I hope my friend from Illinois will not object.

Mr. SULZER. It leaves the whole matter, I will state again, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. It does not take one dollar from the public Treasury, and it leaves the whole matter of granting these leases for a period not exceeding twenty years to the Secretary of the Treasury; and it also leaves the matter in the power of Congress, so that Congress can amend or repeal this legislation and regulate these hatcheries in any way it sees fit. Now, just one word more. We know to-day that in almost every State in the Union the State government has at its own expense established fish hatcheries for the purpose of keeping alive the supply of game fish by artificial propagation. This is something more far reaching than that, because these men in Alaska, who have studied this question for years, who are acquainted with the habits of the salmon, and who know all about these fish, know that the young salmon go out to the ocean from the place where they are born, and after nine, or ten, or eleven years come back to spawn to the very place where they were born. And then they die. These men know that, and they are willing to invest their own money, their own time, and their own labor in this enterprise, and all that they ask is to get a lease from the Government and have the Government in some way protect them in their rights. There should be no objection to this bill, and I hope there will not be.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN].

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Committee on Territories, the committee which considered and reported this bill to the House, and also living on the coast of the State of Washington, so near to Alaska, the region affected by this proposed legislation, I feel it to be my duty to say a few words in support of this bill called up by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

The sole object of the bill now before us for consideration is the encouragement of the artificial culture or propagation of salmon in Alaska. The remarks of some gentlemen on this floor give the impression that they fear that the provisions of this bill would in some way give to some persons or concerns a partial or total monopoly of the salmon industry in Alaska. First, let me say, if such a condition were to be created under this bill, no one would oppose it more earnestly than I.

To thoroughly understand the provisions of this bill and their practical operation, if enacted into law, it is necessary to know something of the nature and habits of the Alaska salmon. The mature salmon (a fish nine or ten years old) seeks some stream flowing into salt water, and at some suitable place in this stream spawns and dies. The Alaska salmon spawns but once and then dies. The spawn are deposited in the small stream. Here the young salmon live for eight or ten months. They then disappear from the stream; they go out to sea and remain from seven to ten years, or until they have attained their full growth. They then return—and this is the peculiar and rather marvelous chapter of fish history—they then return to the same identical stream in which they were spawned, and there in turn they deposit their spawn and die.

This rather peculiar trait of fish life has been doubted by many and denied by some. But any expert in the culture and production of young salmon will explain to you that this fact has many times been proven. They prove it in this way: At a salmon hatchery located on one stream the superintendent, before turning loose an immense school of young salmon, will mark several hundreds of the young fish by some peculiar mark. Another hatchery, located perhaps within a few miles of the first one, will also mark several hundred fish of its production by some different mark.

This practice is repeated each year as the young fish are liberated. From seven to ten years afterwards these fish, having attained their growth, return, and the fish marked with the mark of one hatchery return invariably to the stream on which they were produced, while the salmon bearing the mark of the other hatchery return to the other stream. The two streams may be very near to each other, but in the hundreds of fish so marked it is an almost unheard of incident that a fish which was marked in one stream will ever be found in the other stream. They travel in great schools, and by some instinct return in their age to the stream where they were born.

Now, the bill before this House provides that any person or persons who have established or may establish and maintain a fish hatchery in Alaska for the artificial production of salmon shall have certain rights not possessed by other people in relation to the salmon thus produced. It is very clear to me that a man who invests his time, skill, and money in the production of any useful article is entitled to greater rights in the article thus produced than the man who contributed nothing to the transaction.

Now, what are the extra rights conferred by this bill upon the man who puts his money into a fish hatchery on any stream in

Alaska? Is he given all the fish in that one stream? No. He is, however, entitled to all the fish that that one stream may produce in excess of the normal product of that stream. In other words, this law gives him a title to what his own industry and enterprise has created.

Now, how does this law give the owner of the fish hatchery an opportunity to secure ten years from now the fish which are hatched this year at his hatchery? And this is the point in the story at which it becomes important to know the habits of the salmon in order to understand the provisions of this bill.

This bill gives the man who maintains the hatchery the exclusive right within a 1-mile circuit of the mouth of the stream on which his hatchery is located, and within this 1-mile circuit he is entitled to all the fish in excess of the normal product of the stream.

After the fish have become grown and are returning to their native spawning grounds this exclusive right around the mouth of the stream enables the owner of the hatchery to secure the mature fish which his own hatchery sent forth years before. The elements of "monopoly" do not enter into that transaction in any unfair sense any more than the exclusive monopoly of spending a dollar properly appertains to the man who earns the dollar.

Now, this bill is safeguarded in a number of particulars, chief among which is that the discretion for the giving of these grants or leases is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury. This discretionary power vested in him, together with the various limitations contained in the bill, are, in my humble judgment, sufficient safeguards against the possibility of the creation of any fish monopoly.

Now, a word or two in conclusion regarding the necessity of encouraging the artificial propagation of salmon in this region. If something is not done to encourage the artificial production of salmon on the Pacific coast, and particularly in Alaska, that fish will soon be exterminated. They are caught in that region by means of immense nets stretched across some well-known channel where the fish run. These are called "traps;" and in these traps they are caught, not by hundreds or by thousands, but by hundreds of thousands.

I have seen 80,000 salmon—not 80,000 pounds, but 80,000 fish—taken out of single trap in a single day. The fish weigh anywhere from 4 to 10 pounds and even higher. Now, when you consider that that is only the catch of a single trap in a single day, and that there are hundreds of traps operating throughout the long fishing season, you can begin to form some estimate of the immensity of this industry and also of the terrific slaughter of the fish.

And, as I said before, unless something is done to keep up the supply this fish, the most valuable of all the food fishes, will become a historic memory.

There are some people who insist that the proper way to regulate this matter is to stop the wholesale taking of these fish and prevent their destruction faster than they will naturally replenish. That seems to me a foolish and indefensible idea, to stop a profitable branch of human industry which is producing a food staple for the human family, when by a little artificial aid the industry may be allowed to go on and the supply may be kept up.

I wish to insert in the RECORD, as a portion of my remarks on this subject, a table of statistics which I clipped from the Mining Journal of Keticikan, Alaska, of the date of May 3, 1902. This table shows the amount and the value of the salmon canned by the Alaska canneries in the year 1901, and also shows the number of institutions engaged in this branch of industry.

ALASKA'S SALMON FISHERIES.

The Mining Journal is in receipt of the report of Howard M. Kutchin, special agent, on the salmon fisheries of Alaska for 1901, which is more than usually replete with interesting and valuable information. It shows that the industry last year was in the hands of 30 companies and individual packers, operating 5[illegible] canneries and 12 salteries, not including several small concerns from which no reports were secured. The aggregate capitalization of the whole number is put down at $22,313,200, and the valuation of the plants is placed at $4,915,250.

The Alaska Packers' Association operated 20 of its 22 plants, and made a pack of 958,641 cases of canned and 2,883 barrels of salted salmon, of the aggregate market value of $3,272,940. The Pacific Packing and Navigation Company turned out a product of 656,861 cases and 208 barrels, with gross earnings of $2,174,628. The product of the independent concerns ranged from 46,700 cases, worth $163,450, down to a few barrels of salted salmon worth a few hundred dollars only. The entire market value of the season's output is stated at $6,926,167, the valuation in most instances being that given by the packers themselves, and where not so given calculated on a basis of $3.50 per case and $10 per barrel.

The license taxes payable to the Government on the entire product thus reported was $87,622.95, of which sum the Alaska Packers' Association was chargeable with $38,624.31, and the Pacific Packing and Navagation Company with $31,206.60.

The shipping employed in carrying on the business consisted of 110 steamers, 55 sailing vessels, and 1,777 lighters and small boats. The aggregate amount paid in wages was $2,320,645, and the total number of hands employed is put down at 11,636, of whom 4,584 were whites, 4,664 Chinamen, and 2,388 natives.

The following table, taken from Mr. Kutchin's report, shows the output in detail of the several canneries and salting establishments last year:

Report of salmon canneries in Alaska for the year 1901.

Name of cannery.	Owned by—	Location.	Cases.	Value.
Bristol Bay Canning Co.	Alaska Packers' Association.	Nushagak River.		
Alaska Packing Co	do	do	180,080	$630,916
Arctic Packing Co	do	do		
Do	do	Naknek River	75,430	264,320
Guardian Cannery	do	do		
Ugashuk Fishing Station.	do	Ugashuk River	40,864	110,029
Bering Sea Cannery	do	do	107,845	377,728
Point Roberts Packing Co.	do	Koggiung		
Horseshoe Fishing and Mining Co.	do	do	31,740	110,090
Egagek Fishing Sta'n	do	Egagek	40,681	142,382
Chignik Bay Packing Co.	do	Chignik Bay	41,614	145,649
Alitak Packing Co	do	Alitak		
Karluk Packing Co	do	Karluk	196,667	690,311
Alaska Improvement Co.	do	do		
Arctic Fishing Co	do	Kussilof	31,082	108,787
Pacific Packing Co	do	Odiak	40,665	142,327
Pyramid Harbor Packing Co.	do	Pyramid Harbor.	30,709	107,481
Glacier Packing Co	do	Wrangell	59,027	177,081
Alaska Salmon and Fur Co.	do	Loring	89,423	265,839
Whalers' Chignik Cannery.	Pacific Packet and Navigation Co.	Chignik Bay	35,516	117,203
Hume Chignik Can	do	do	29,927	104,838
Orca Cannery	do	Orca	36,590	120,549
Kenai Cannery	do	Kenai	17,725	59,152
Whalers' Uyak Can	do	Uyak Bay	20,983	166,967
Hume Uyak Cannery	do	do	33,479	117,221
Hunters Bay Cannery	do	Hunters Bay	62,000	185,000
Nushagak River Cannery.	do	Nushagak River.	76,774	257,192
Quadra Bay Cannery	do	Quadra Bay	35,141	105,000
Petersburg Cannery	do	Petersburg	58,500	226,200
Sitkoh Bay Cannery	do	Sitkoh Bay	60,000	171,920
Santa Rita Cannery	do	Dundas Bay	21,750	70,000
Taku Fish Co. Cannery.	do	Port Snettisham.	14,574	47,712
Taku Pack. Co. Can	do	Taku Inlet	24,000	78,000
Chilkoot Cannery	do	Chilkoot River	19,397	79,858
Thlinket Gerard Pt. Cannery.	do	Wrangell	26,536	92,876
Thlinket Santa Anna Cannery.	do	Santa Anna Inlet.	24,983	87,440
Yes Bay Cannery	do	Yes Bay	29,736	87,500
Kvichak R. Can. No. 1	N. Alaska Sal. Co	Kvichak River	23,300	81,550
Kvichak R. Can. No. 2	do	do	23,400	81,900
Naknek Cannery	Naknek Pack'g Co.	Naknek	41,000	136,400
Bristol Bay Cannery	Bristol Pack'g Co	Ugashuk River	11,400	38,970
Koggiung Saltery	Northwestern Packing Co.	Koggiung	5,500	15,400
Klawak Cannery	N. P. Trading and Packing Co.	Klawak	36,412	113,000
Nushagak Cannery	Alaska Fishermen's Pack'g Co.	Nushagak River.	38,724	135,450
Chuitna River Cannery.	Alaska Salmon Association.	Chuitna River	11,480	40,342
Ketchikan Cannery	Fidalgo Island Packing Co.	Ketchikan	49,326	155,000
Taku Harbor Cannery.	San Juan Fish and Packing Co.	Taku Harbor	25,500	76,500
Ugashuk River	Red Salmon Packing Co.	Ugashuk River	8,500	28,000
Nushagak Cannery	Columbia River Packing Assn.	Nuskagak River.	24,284	86,612
Nushagak Saltery	Alaska Fishing and Packing Co.	do	5,287	17,000
Tonka Cannery	P. C. and N. P. Co	Wrangell Narrows.	19,432	60,682
Kell Bay Cannery	Union Packing Co.	Kell Bay	20,989	63,000
Lake Bay Cannery	Cross Sound Packing Co.	Lake Bay	13,849	36,212
Metlakahtla Cannery	Metlakahtla Industrial Co.	Metlakahtla	23,000	69,000
Nushagak River Cannery.	Alaska - Portland Packing Assn.	Nushagak River.	20,667	74,400
Do	Alaska Salmon Assn.	do	17,700	63,720
Nushagak River Saltery.	C. E. Whitney & Co.	do	20,520	65,000
Ideal Cove Saltery	Muir Glacier Packing Co.	Ideal Cove	1,765	5,300
Saakaar Saltery	C. F. Brockman	Saakaar	525	2,320
Thorne Bay Saltery	R. C. Bell	Thorne Bay	1,480	4,835
Point Barrie Saltery	F. C. Sepp	Point Barrie	467	1,122
Etoline Island Saltery	J. C. Frey	Etoline Island	135	648
McHenry Inlet Saltery.	J. C. Callbreath	McHenry Inlet	480	1,800
South Arm Saltery	Jacob Louth	Moira Sound	216	1,736
Eagle Harbor Saltery	Oliver Smith	Eagle Harbor	1,375	3,750
Copper Harbor Saltery.	Craig Millar	Copper Harbor	1,760	5,500
Pritchard's Cove Fishery.	Great Northern Fish Co.	Union Bay		
Beechers Pass Cannery.	Royer-Warnock Packing Co.	Beechers Pass		
Port Althorpe Saltery	Perry Hinkle	Port Althorpe		
Bartlett Bay Cannery	Icy Straits Packing Co.	Bartlett Bay		
Taku Point Fishery	do	Taku Inlet		
Sundry (estimated)	Salteries not reported.		5,000	17,500
Total			2,076,661	6,926,167

A glance at this table shows that there are 71 canneries reported (and possibly a number from which returns were not secured). These 71 canneries produced last year over 2,000,000 cases of salmon, of the value of nearly $7,000,000. I call attention to these facts to show what a gigantic industry this is, and the vast amount of fish being produced; and unless something is done in the line of encouragement for keeping up the supply there can be but one result in the near future, and that is the fish will be exterminated.

Mr. COWHERD. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Is there anything in existing law or in this bill that compels the man who puts up a cannery to maintain a hatchery also?

Mr. CUSHMAN. No.

Mr. COWHERD. Is not that the law of some States—either Oregon or Washington?

Mr. CUSHMAN. This is not the law in the State of Washington. I do not think it is in Oregon. Perhaps one of the Oregon members can inform the gentleman.

Mr. COWHERD. Ought it not to be included in the present bill—a provision that any man who puts up a cannery and destroys fish shall be compelled to maintain a hatchery at the same place?

Mr. CUSHMAN. That might be a good provision, but it certainly is not a necessary provision.

Mr. COWHERD. I have understood that was the law of Oregon or Washington. I have been told by persons who were interested and who were familiar with the situation in Alaska that that was the provision most needed there.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I do not consider it so. That might be a good provision—doubtless it would be, but it is not a necessary provision.

Mr. McCLEARY. Is it not required of owners of canneries that they put back four times the number of spawn that they take out fish in Alaska?

Mr. CUSHMAN. I never heard that such a regulation existed or such a law had been enacted. But be that as it may, we are now discussing the provisions of this bill before us. The provisions of this measure, in my judgment, will operate to replenish the rapidly disappearing salmon of Alaska. And it only gives the man who builds and maintains the hatchery a portion of what his own thrift produces. There is nothing more unfair in allowing the man who plants fish to reap a portion of the crop that he has planted than there is in allowing a man who plants a crop of wheat to reap all of that which he has sown.

I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. PAYNE. I was going to make a suggestion. This seems to be an important bill and a bill that certainly has some merit, and which ought to be examined by the members. I was going to suggest to my colleague to let the bill go over until to-morrow morning, or some other day.

Mr. SULZER. Well, I consent to that under the circumstances, and ask to have it go over until Monday morning next.

Mr. PAYNE. Monday morning then.

Mr. SULZER. I will consent to let the bill go over until next Monday morning.

Mr. PAYNE. To remain in the same status as it now is, subject to objection.

Mr. SULZER. Let me respectfully suggest to every member here that between now and next Monday morning he get a copy of the report of the committee on this bill, and if he will read that report I know he will be in favor of this bill. It is one of the most instructive and interesting reports that has ever been made on this subject of salmon in Alaska. Its perusal will amply repay anyone for the time occupied.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to my friend just there that we have had such disastrous experiences in the waters of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands from the agents of the Treasury Department and our legislation all along that line that I have come to regard with something of caution any proposition to confer any rights up there, on anybody's report, without the fullest possible examination. Now, I am willing that the bill shall go over until Monday, so far as I am concerned, keeping the status that it now occupies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will say that the bill has no status now. It is not before the House. A request has been made for unanimous consent, and objection has been made.

Mr. SULZER. Oh, no; I ask unanimous consent that the bill be made a special order for next Monday morning immediately after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday next.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection to his asking unanimous consent then.

Mr. SULZER. Subject to the objection of my distinguished friend.

Mr. CANNON. Or anybody else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. CANNON. I will look into the bill between now and Monday morning.

Mr. SULZER. I trust the gentleman will, and I know if he does he will favor the bill as heartily as I do.

BRIDGE NEAR OACOMA, S. DAK.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2510.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2510) extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near Oacoma, S. Dak.

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the commencement of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near the village of Oacoma, in the State of South Dakota, authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge at or near Oacoma, S. Dak.," approved January 28, 1899, be, and the same is hereby, extended to July 1, 1903, and the time for the completion of said bridge be, and the same is hereby, extended to July 1, 1906.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from New York demanded the regular order, as I understood.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I withdrew that tacitly for this bill. It seems to be only a bridge bill; but I will call up that resolution immediately after the consideration of this bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I did not understand the gentleman had withdrawn the demand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the rule on which the previous question was ordered yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is the vote on the rule reported by the Committee on Rules at the last session, and the Clerk will report the resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule may be considered as adopted, that the time may be extended to four hours, to be equally divided between the two sides, to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] on that side and myself on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the rule may be amended by extending the time for general debate to four hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Connecticut and two hours by the gentleman from Missouri, and that the rule as so amended be considered as adopted. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House numbered 178, have had the same under consideration, and report the following in lieu thereof:

"*Resolved*, That immediately after the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12704) to increase the subsidiary silver coinage, and after two hours of general debate the bill shall be read by paragraphs for amendment, and upon the conclusion of said reading the Committee of the Whole shall rise and report the bill with amendments, if any, to the House: *Provided*, That the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the said bill shall continue privileged each day until said bill is disposed of, not, however, to interfere with revenue or appropriation bills or conference reports."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the rule.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 99, nays 77, answered "present" 25, not voting 150; as follows:

YEAS—99.

Alexander,	Butler, Pa.	Draper,	Haugen,
Allen, Me.	Cannon,	Emerson,	Hedge,
Ball, Del.	Cassel,	Esch,	Hemenway,
Barney,	Connell,	Fletcher,	Henry, Conn.
Bates,	Conner,	Foerderer,	Hepburn,
Bishop,	Coombs,	Fowler,	Hill,
Blackburn,	Corliss,	Gaines, W. Va.	Howell,
Boutell,	Cromer,	Gardner, Mich.	Hull,
Bowersock,	Currier,	Graff,	Jack,
Brick,	Cushman,	Graham,	Jackson, Md.
Bromwell,	Dahle,	Greene, Mass.	Jenkins,
Brown,	Dalzell,	Grow,	Jones, Wash.
Burke, S. Dak.	Douglas,	Hamilton,	Knapp,
Burleigh,	Dovener,	Hanbury,	Lacey,

Lawrence,	Moody, N. C.	Payne,	Stevens, Minn.
Lessler,	Moody, Oreg.	Powers, Mass.	Sulloway,
Littlefield,	Morgan,	Prince,	Tawney,
Loud,	Morris,	Ray, N. Y.	Thomas, Iowa
McCall,	Mudd,	Reeves,	Tirrell,
McCleary,	Needham,	Roberts,	Vreeland,
McLachlan,	Olmsted,	Rumple,	Wachter,
Mann,	Overstreet,	Schirm,	Wadsworth,
Martin,	Palmer,	Shattuc,	Warner,
Minor,	Parker,	Smith, Ill.	Weeks.
Mondell,	Patterson, Pa.	Sperry,	

NAYS—77.

Allen, Ky.	Gilbert,	McCulloch,	Shafroth,
Ball, Tex.	Griggs,	McLain,	Smith, Ky.
Bell,	Hall,	McRae,	Snook,
Bowie,	Hay,	Maddox,	Sparkman,
Brantley,	Henry, Miss.	Mahoney,	Spight,
Breazeale,	Jackson, Kans.	Mickey,	Sulzer,
Broussard,	Jett,	Neville,	Sutherland,
Brundidge,	Kehoe,	Newlands,	Swanson,
Burgess,	Kern,	Pugsley,	Thayer,
Burleson,	Kitchin, Claude	Randell, Tex.	Thompson,
Burnett,	Kleberg,	Ransdell, La.	Vandiver,
Caldwell,	Kluttz,	Reid,	Williams, Ill.
Candler,	Lanham,	Rhea, Va.	Williams, Miss.
Clayton,	Lester,	Richardson, Tenn.	Wilson,
Cochran,	Lever,	Robinson, Nebr.	Woods,
Cowherd,	Lewis, Ga.	Rucker,	Wooten,
Creamer,	Little,	Ryan,	Zenor.
De Armond,	Livingston,	Scarborough,	
Finley,	Lloyd,	Selby,	
Fitzgerald,	McAndrews,	Shackleford,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—25.

Bartlett,	Johnson,	Rixey,	Steele,
Cassingham,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Robertson, La.	Stephens, Tex.
Conry,	Metcalf,	Ruppert,	Tate,
Evans,	Meyer, La.	Shallenberger,	Taylor, Ala.
Gaines, Tenn.	Miers, Ind.	Slayden,	
Gibson,	Pierce,	Smith, Iowa	
Irwin,	Pou,	Stark,	

NOT VOTING—150.

Acheson,	Dick,	Kahn,	Russell,
Adams,	Dinsmore,	Ketcham,	Scott,
Adamson,	Dougherty,	Knox,	Shelden,
Aplin,	Driscoll,	Kyle,	Sheppard,
Babcock,	Eddy,	Lamb,	Sherman,
Bankhead,	Edwards,	Landis,	Showalter,
Bartholdt,	Elliott,	Lassiter,	Sibley,
Beidler,	Feely,	Latimer,	Sims,
Bellamy,	Fleming,	Lewis, Pa.	Skiles,
Belmont,	Flood,	Lindsay,	Small,
Benton,	Fordney,	Littauer,	Smith, H. C.
Bingham,	Foss,	Long,	Smith, S. W.
Blakeney,	Foster, Ill.	Loudenslager,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Boreing,	Foster, Vt.	Lovering,	Snodgrass,
Bristow,	Fox,	McClellan,	Southard,
Brownlow,	Gardner, N. J.	McDermott,	Southwick,
Bull,	Gill,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. J.
Burk, Pa.	Gillet, N. Y.	Marshall,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burkett,	Gillett, Mass.	Maynard,	Storm,
Burton,	Glenn,	Mercer,	Talbert,
Butler, Mo.	Goldfogle,	Miller,	Tayler, Ohio
Calderhead,	Gooch,	Moon,	Thomas, N. C.
Capron,	Gordon,	Morrell,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Clark,	Green, Pa.	Moss,	Tompkins, Ohio
Cooney,	Griffith,	Mutchler,	Tongue,
Cooper, Tex.	Grosvenor,	Naphen,	Trimble,
Cooper, Wis.	Haskins,	Nevin,	Underwood,
Cousins,	Heatwole,	Norton,	Van Voorhis,
Crowley,	Henry, Tex.	Otjen,	Wanger,
Crumpacker,	Hildebrant,	Padgett,	Warnock,
Curtis,	Hitt,	Patterson, Tenn.	Watson,
Darragh,	Holliday,	Pearre,	Wheeler,
Davey, La.	Hooker,	Perkins,	White,
Davidson,	Hopkins,	Powers, Me.	Wiley,
Davis, Fla.	Howard,	Reeder,	Wright,
Dayton,	Hughes,	Richardson, Ala.	Young.
De Graffenreid,	Jones, Va.	Robb,	
Deemer,	Joy,	Robinson, Ind.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. SLAYDEN.
Mr. GILL with Mr. ROBB.
Mr. BURKETT with Mr. SHALLENBERGER.
Mr. VAN VOORHIS with Mr. CASSINGHAM.
Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. NAPHEN.
Mr. LOVERING with Mr. CONRY.
Mr. HASKINS with Mr. JOHNSON.
Mr. CURTIS with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.
Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. CREAMER.
Mr. POWERS of Maine with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.
Mr. DAYTON with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.
Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. SNODGRASS.
Mr. MERCER with Mr. STARK.
Mr. FOSS with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.
Mr. REEDER with Mr. WHITE.
Mr. STEELE with Mr. COOPER of Texas.
Mr. SOUTHARD with Mr. NORTON.
Mr. SKILES with Mr. TALBERT.
Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.
Mr. IRWIN with Mr. GOOCH.
Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.
Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.
Mr. LANDIS with Mr. CLARK.
Mr. GORDON with Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. PIERCE.
Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. MOON.
Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. FOX.

For this session:

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER.
Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. MCCLELLAN.
Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.
Mr. BULL with Mr. CROWLEY.
Mr. HILDEBRANDT with Mr. MAYNARD.
Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.
Mr. BOREING with Mr. TRIMBLE.
Mr. MORRELL with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.
Mr. YOUNG with Mr. BENTON.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. BELMONT.
Mr. DEEMER with Mr. MUTCHLER.
Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.

For one week:

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.
Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.
Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. HOOKER.
Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. DOUGHERTY.
Mr. GIBSON with Mr. SIMS.
Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. GRIFFITH.
Mr. BATES with Mr. BELLAMY.

For ten days:

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana.
Mr. MILLER with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.
Mr. EVANS with Mr. JONES of Virginia, until the 29th.

For this day:

Mr. OTJEN with Mr. DINSMORE.
Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. RIXEY.
Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. LAMB.
Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.
Mr. JOY with Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. BRISTOW with Mr. COONEY.
Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. BARTLETT.
Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. DAVIS.
Mr. BURTON with Mr. MCDERMOTT.
Mr. CAPRON with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.
Mr. COUSINS with Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. ELLIOTT.
Mr. DICK with Mr. FEELY.
Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. FLEMING.
Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.
Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. GLENN.
Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. LONG with Mr. HENRY of Texas.
Mr. MAHON with Mr. HOWARD.
Mr. MARSHALL with Mr. LASSITER.
Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. LATIMER.
Mr. SHELDEN with Mr. LINDSAY.
Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.
Mr. WATSON with Mr. SMALL.
Mr. WARNOCK with Mr. WILEY.
Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. SHEPPARD.

On this vote:

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.
Mr. HITT with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS], and I desire to withdraw my vote in the negative and answer "present."

The Clerk called the name of Mr. GAINES of Tennessee, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram from Mr. BROWNLOW stating that he is ill, and desires me to pair with him. I desire to withdraw my vote of "no" and be recorded as paired.

Mr. PIERCE's name was called, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I notice that my name was read as paired with General GROSVENOR, of Ohio. I have voted "no" on this proposition, and I desire to withdraw that vote and be marked as "present."

The name of Mr. BARTLETT was called, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman in his seat and listening to his name when it should have been called?

Mr. HAUGEN. I was not in my seat, but I was listening for my name and did not hear it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. HAUGEN, and he voted "aye," as above recorded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but I find I am paired with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH, and I desire to be recorded as present.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but I see that I am paired with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HOLLIDAY. I desire to withdraw that vote and be marked present.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. MIERS of Indiana, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this question the yeas are 99 and the nays 75, present 23; the ayes have it, and accordingly the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of House bill 12704, to increase the subsidiary silver coinage, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. TAWNEY, will take the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12704) to increase the subsidiary silver coinage, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into such denominations of subsidiary silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements, and thereafter, as public necessities may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin; and so much of any act as fixes a limit to the aggregate of subsidiary silver coin outstanding, and so much of any act as directs the coinage of any portion of the bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, is hereby repealed.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members who address the committee on this bill may be allowed to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. That request will have to be made in the House.

Mr. HILL. I do not think there will be any objection to that when we get into the House.

The CHAIRMAN. It can be done in individual cases by the committee, but general leave to print can not be granted by the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I was very much surprised last night when the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] objected to the consideration of this bill, and especially because of his reasons for objecting to it, for I find in the RECORD this morning that he declares it is a breach of good faith to bring this bill up for consideration on the ground that in the act of March 14, 1900, there was a distinct promise and agreement, forced by certain silver Senators in the Senate, that the bullion in the Treasury should be coined into silver dollars; that that promise or agreement was reached in order to strike out from the House bill of March 14, 1900, a provision stopping the coinage of silver dollars.

I will say to the gentleman that he has studied the RECORD to poor advantage; that there was no such provision embodied in the House bill. There was no such language, and is not now any such language in the act of March 14, 1900. The proposition to which he refers was in the war-revenue act, and the only promise—and I have taken pains to verify my statement this morning—the only promise that was made then in that bill was to attach the famous bimetallic amendment to the end of the act of March 14, 1900, and it stands there still, so that his charge that there is a breach of faith on the part of anybody is wholly unfounded, and there is no justification for it whatever.

Mr. SHAFROTH. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Did not the gold-standard act, as it passed the House of Representatives, contain a provision for the stopping of the coinage of silver dollars?

Mr. HILL. It did not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the gentleman mean to say that under that act as it passed the coinage of silver dollars is to be continued?

Mr. HILL. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have not examined it.

Mr. HILL. I thought the gentleman had not when he made the statement last night.

Mr. SHAFROTH. My impression is that that is the fact.

Mr. HILL. It is not the fact; neither of the statements contained in the gentleman's charge last night are correct. The House of Representatives was held up in 1898, and a provision compelling one million and a half silver dollars a month to be coined, or else no provision would be made for the expenses of the Spanish war. That bill was passed here along toward midnight, and I had the honor to be one of five who voted against that provision, distinctly understanding that the Congress of the United States was being held up by a few men to compel the coinage of silver dollars rather than provide for the expenses of the Spanish war. It is no breach of faith, Mr. Chairman, in no sense whatever.

Now, I notice, Mr. Chairman, that when the bill was called up the number of the bill was wrongly stated, and I desire, before proceeding to discuss the merits, to remove any possible misunderstanding in regard to what bill is now before the House of Representatives. On the 13th of January the Committee on Coinage reported a bill to accomplish two things.

First, to provide for the maintenance of the gold standard, and, second, to increase the subsidiary coinage. The part relating to the increase of the subsidiary coinage is the bill now before the House. The other bill provoked discussion and involved possibly certain political considerations, and in order to avoid anything of that kind and to meet the requirements of the Treasury Department with reference to a necessary part of our currency, the disputed part of the bill was cut out, and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures reported later so much of the measure as related to subsidiary coinage only. That is the bill we have now before us.

There is involved here no question of the exchangeability of the silver dollar, no question of the redemption of the silver dollar, no question of any provision relating to the maintenance of the gold standard directly, but simply a question of providing the country with a necessary portion of the currency called subsidiary coinage.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just at this point I would be glad if the gentleman would explain to the Committee of the Whole what is omitted from this bill which is contained in what is known as "the Fowler bill."

Mr. HILL. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is no relation whatever between the two bills, except that 14 lines of this bill are found among a large number of sections in what is known as "the Fowler bill." The two bills relate to entirely different subjects.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman state, then, what is omitted here from the original bill?

Mr. HILL. All the provisions relating to the exchangeability or the redemption of silver in gold. The bill before the House relates only to the question of subsidiary coinage.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Those omitted provisions are in "the Fowler bill."

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir; the bill still on the Calendar—House bill 7645.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill are so absolutely innocent—and I will detain the House for only a short time in stating them—that when the minority of the Coinage Committee came to make up their minority report they did not even refer to the propositions contained in the bill now before the House. They expended their entire energy in controverting the proposition of the necessity of the exchangeability of the silver dollar in gold. It was therefore reasonable to suppose that when this bill should come up for action it would come up with the full consent and concurrence of the members of the minority. Its provisions are so plain and distinct that it is even questionable whether every man, no matter how strong a silver man he may be, may not happily and usefully vote for this bill. I remember that a day or two after the bill had passed through the committee——

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

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the bill provide for the repeal of the provision of law directing the coinage of bullion in the Treasury into standard silver dollars?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does it not also provide that the silver bullion in the Treasury may be converted, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, into subsidiary coin?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir; so far as the public necessity may require.

Mr. COCHRAN. And does it not provide that silver dollars already in existence may be recoined into subsidiary coin?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir; so far as the public necessities may require.

Mr. COCHRAN. And the gentleman is astonished that the minority is not perfectly satisfied with that kind of a bill!

Mr. HILL. I stated that when the minority made their report—and they had abundance of time to make it—they never referred in that report to a single provision or a single line of the bill which is now before the House. It was therefore reasonable to suppose that they had no objection to it; and a consistent silver man can not have any objection to it. Indeed, a day or two after the bill came out of the committee, I saw a paper published in Denver—the Denver News—containing large black scare headlines, in which it was charged that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] was opposing the coinage of silver. [Laughter.] I have here before me now a paper published in Alabama accusing me of having changed over from the gold standard to the

silver standard, and declaring in an editorial a column and a half long that the Republicans had stolen the Democratic thunder.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman allow me a word? I wish to say that that position of the papers in the State of Colorado arose from the fact that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] in introducing his bill entitled it "A bill to increase the subsidiary silver coinage," leading the people there naturally to suppose that they were going to get more and more silver out there. Therefore they concluded that the gentleman from Connecticut had become a great champion of silver. Out there they did not get any account of the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, this is purely an administrative measure, absolutely necessary for carrying on properly the business of the country, and it can be consistently voted for by every man. I do not care whether he is in favor of a single gold standard, of a gold and silver standard—either one. It being an administrative measure, I desire to read to the House the views of the Director of the Mint and the Secretary of the Treasury upon the question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman refer back to the first statement that he made, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HILL. The Director of the Mint writes me under date of March 20 as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, March 20, 1902.

Hon. E. J. HILL,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Referring to our conversation upon the subject of legislation to authorize an increase in the coinage of subsidiary silver, I submit the following statement showing the stock of subsidiary coin in circulation outside of the Treasury on the 1st day of March for the last five years:

March 1, 1897	$60,246,493
March 1, 1898	64,618,802
March 1, 1899	69,496,609
March 1, 1900	74,341,322
March 1, 1901	80,853,107
March 1, 1902	83,441,791

This shows a net absorption by the country of nearly $5,000,000 per year. The act of March 14, 1900, authorized the use of bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, for this coinage, but limited the total stock in the country to $100,000,000. The stock in the country on the 1st day of the present month was $92,859,794, of which $9,418,003 was in the Treasury. These figures make it apparent that there must be further legislation at an early day. The stock in the Treasury at this time is always larger than in the more active season of trade, accumulating after January 1 and reaching its lowest point in the fall months. For several years the Treasury has been hard pressed by the fall demand and frequently obliged to fill orders in part only. Now that the new mint at Philadelphia is completed this difficulty will end if Congress will grant requisite authority to execute the coinage.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] last night said that we had $12,000,000 in the Treasury, and therefore needed no legislation on this subject. I want to call his attention to the fact that to-day of that $12,000,000 there are three millions that is worn and abraded and not fit for circulation, and that that amount is small compared to the average amount of worn and abraded coin in the Treasury. There is ordinarily from six to seven million of useless coin in the Treasury carried in this item of subsidiary coin on the daily statement which the gentleman holds in his hand.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The facts are, Mr. Chairman, that in 1893 there were but $2,500,000 in the Treasury of these silver subsidiary coins.

Mr. HILL. I admit it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now, there was a demand at that time for silver, but now, when you have got $12,870,000, as shown by this morning's report, it shows there is no necessity for it.

Mr. HILL. The Director of the Mint goes on to say:

The present amount in the Treasury is not more than a fair stock to carry at all times. It is divided between the Treasury and nine subtreasuries, and comprises half dollars, quarter dollars, and dimes. A considerable portion of it is always worn and uncurrent, and the stock on hand can not be reduced far below what it now is without being broken in some of the offices.

I beg to submit that there is no occasion for limiting the stock of this subsidiary coin to a specific amount, making legislation repeatedly necessary. The demand is continuous, increasing with the population and business of the country, and there can be no difference of opinion about the necessity for meeting it or about the amount required from time to time, for it can only be put into circulation in response to a public demand and in exchange for legal-tender money. If the Secretary of the Treasury is given authority to meet the current demand, there is no way in which the discretion can be injuriously used.

The Treasury held on March 1, 40,132,145 fine ounces of silver, which is being reduced monthly at the rate of about 1,100,000 ounces in the coinage of silver dollars and to meet the current demand for subsidiary coin. At this rate the stock on hand will last less than two years, after which the Government will be obliged to enter the market as a buyer of silver.

I will state that the Acting Director of the Mint told me the day before yesterday that if this or some similar bill was not passed the mints of the United States would have to stop on the 1st day of November next making subsidiary coin. Continuing, he says:

If all of the bullion on hand were diverted to subsidiary coinage, it would, at the average rate of the past five years, last about ten years. But the increased population and business to be expected will enlarge the demand, and if our money should enter into general circulation in the Philippines and other Territories which are likely to use it this bullion would hardly last over six or seven years.

Under these conditions it would appear to be good business policy to hold the bullion remaining in the Treasury to meet the demand. No satisfactory reason can be given for continuing the coinage of silver dollars.

I want to say that this bill does not stop the coinage of silver dollars by law. It simply gives the Secretary of the Treasury discretion to do as he sees fit—to use the bullion for the dollar or to use it for the subsidiary coin, as in his judgment he thinks best. I want to add that in my judgment, if the discretion is given him, as a wise and prudent man he never will coin another dollar, but it does not require him to take that position.

Reading further:

The purchasing act of 1890 was an experiment, its advocates hoping that the demand created would advance the price of silver to its old parity with gold and free coinage be the result. The policy was a compromise between opposing opinions, was unsuccessful, and has been definitely abandoned. If this bullion was not in the Treasury, few would advocate its purchase for dollar coinage. It is in the Treasury, but may be diverted to fractional coin, and to do this will work a saving to the Treasury of approximately $20,000,000.

Respectfully,

GEO. E. ROBERTS,
Director of the Mint.

Approved.

L. M. SHAW, *Secretary.*

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GROW. The subsidiary coin now are not the proportionate parts of the silver dollar.

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. GROW. Why should not the subsidiary coin, while we are now dealing with that subject, be made equal proportions, two halves equaling the present silver dollar and four quarters equaling it, instead of being proportionate parts of 384?

Mr. HILL. For this reason the subsidiary coin is not full legal tender and you can not compel a person to accept it in satisfaction of a contract beyond certain limited amounts of $10 to $20. A dollar is legal tender, and, as I will show you by and by, Germany has adopted precisely the position which the gentleman from Pennsylvania indicates we should take, of recoining our legal-tendar dollar into token dollars on the same basis as the subsidiary coin; but we have carried the legal-tender dollar as a dollar of intrinsic value, which my friends on the other side thought by forcing the purchase of silver would ultimately bring it up in intrinsic value, or to the value at which we carried it nominally, and for that reason, the one being a token dollar and the other a full legal-tender dollar, the proportion in each is made to vary.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why should you ever have that?

Mr. HILL. The reason that it should be changed is that the experiment that was made has been a total failure, as I will proceed to show you.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman does not understand my question.

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

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HILL. I will, after a while. I will yield first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROW. One other question. As we have the Philippine possessions now, we make a half dollar correspond with the dollar that is being used in the East Indies and in China; and would we not dispose of more silver out of the country that never would come back if our proportionate parts of the dollar were made in such shape as to meet that coinage?

Mr. HILL. I will take that up by and by. I think we would have the same experience as we had with the trade dollar. It would come back to us the same as that did. We would have to redeem it in gold as we redeemed the trade dollar in gold.

Mr. GROW. It did not correspond to any coined dollar.

Mr. HILL. I know it was larger, and more silver in it than any dollar we had.

Mr. GROW. It did not correspond with any coin in the country.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was interrogating you about the coining of the half dollars and the component parts of it now. Is it not a fact that up to 1853 we coined a half dollar, a quarter dollar, a dime, and a half dime, and made them full legal tender, as much so as gold and silver?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And did not all of those coins coined up to that date remain full legal tender down to June, 1874?

Mr. HILL. They did not "remain" full legal tender. They went out of the country full legal tender.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They were reported as having been here all the time. Now, why do you make this subsidiary coinage of less value?

Mr. HILL. For the simple reason that the experience of all mankind from that day to this has utterly repudiated silver money as a full legal tender, and almost every civilized nation on earth, as I will show you, has eliminated it from its system of currency; and the very thing which the gentleman from Tennessee cites of the minor coinage or subsidiary coinage being full legal tender up to 1853 is the best illustration of it, from the fact that it all fled the country.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will not agree to that as a statement historically true.

Mr. GROW. Is not that what we would like to have happen with our surplus silver?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Not at all.

Mr. COCHRAN. I call the attention of my friend to the statement just made to say that the gentlemen on this side believe that by constant purchases of silver the price of it would be appreciated to parity with gold. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that every law authorizing the purchase of silver was a Republican law, and that the last one placed upon the statute book bears the name of the Sherman law, and was a Republican measure.

Mr. HILL. I have not the slightest dispute with the gentleman on that question, and if I had I should not inject it into this debate on the subsidiary coinage.

Mr. COCHRAN. But you said just now that such and such legislation would give us such and such results. I call your attention to the fact that this legislation has been resorted to here by Republicans, and not by Democrats.

Mr. HILL. We will see about that as we go along.

The last quotation I made from the Director of the Mint showed that this had been an experiment, its advocates hoping that the demand created would advance the price of silver to its old parity with gold and free coinage be the result. It seems to me that it is not inappropriate to refer briefly to the experience of the United States on that question. On February 28, 1878, the value of the silver in the dollar was 92½ cents, and under the provisions of the Bland-Allison Act we went on to purchase silver, hoping to maintain the price or to bring it up to a parity with gold.

Under the provisions of that act we bought $308,279,261 worth, and continued to buy until July 14, 1890, when, the hoped for results not having been secured, we passed another law, called the Sherman law. Silver had then dropped to 83½ cents in the dollar. Under that act we bought $155,931,002 worth of bullion, so that under the two laws we purchased $464,210,263 worth of bullion. We continued to coin up to the 1st of May, 1902, and are coining now, but the figures which I shall give you are all of them dated May 1 of this year. Under our purchases and coinage the value of the silver in our legal-tender dollar has gone from 92½ cents down to 39.7 cents, and that is about what it is worth to-day. We have lost on this silver speculation, not between the face of the dollar and the bullion price, but we have actually lost on that silver which we have bought $282,950,000, having paid that much more for it than we would have paid for it if we had bought it on the first day of this month.

What is the situation now? On the 1st of May we had remaining bullion to the amount of $32,935,124, and the proposition of this bill is to coin that bullion, or to give the Secretary of the Treasury the power to coin that bullion into subsidiary coin rather than to continue to coin it into standard silver dollars.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to interrupt the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The gentleman in the opening of his speech referred to the fact that there was nothing contained in the House bill relative to the using of the silver bullion in the Treasury for subsidiary coinage.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; I did not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, you stated this, that there was no agreement whatever between the Senate and the House except upon the bimetallic basis.

Mr. HILL. I say it now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to read you——

Mr. HILL. I do not want you to do so.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Here is a statement.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman can read it in his own time. I stated distinctly that there was no proposition positively to stop the coinage of the silver dollar.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But there was a provision.

Mr. HILL. I object to you occupying my time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Here is the compromise upon this very matter.

Mr. HILL. That is a question that can be very easily determined by the members of the conference committee who are upon the floor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Here is the bill, and we have the Senate provision contained in it.

Mr. HILL. I have it.

Mr. Chairman, if we coin the remaining bullion now in the Treasury—$32,000,000 worth—making it into dollars, it will amount to $47,053,493 above what we now have, and will give a total, when the bullion is all exhausted, of $586,855,298, and the difference between the nominal and actual value will be $359,742,297, or so much pure fiat.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will permit me? I have not had the opportunity of hearing all of his remarks. I know he has gone into this question very carefully. What is his opinion as to the length of time that the bullion now in the Treasury, if coined into subsidiary coin, would meet the demands?

Mr. HILL. I will go into that very carefully soon, so that the House may fully understand what they are voting on.

Mr. VANDIVER. Will the gentleman repeat the figures that he gave just a moment ago as to the excess?

Mr. HILL. Three hundred and fifty-nine million seven hundred and forty-two thousand two hundred and seventy-nine dollars and sixty-seven cents.

Mr. VANDIVER. Now, will the gentleman allow me another question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. VANDIVER. Do these dollars circulate in this country?

Mr. HILL. I will refer to that a little later on.

Mr. VANDIVER. Why not do it now?

Mr. HILL. I would rather not be diverted from the statement I am now making.

Mr. VANDIVER. A direct answer to the question would not take as much time as it takes to evade it.

Mr. HILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the result of this kind of experiment, and what has been the effect on the circulation? I would like gentlemen on both sides to notice very briefly how much we have accomplished in this experiment or speculation which we have made and in which we have lost $359,000,000—an amount sufficient to irrigate the States of Colorado and Nevada, as those gentlemen want to have done now. If we could have saved this amount, we would have saved an amount that would have paid the expenses of the Spanish war, built the Nicaragua Canal, and the best navy in the world, if we had not adopted the foolish enactments which we have within the last twenty years.

The largest amount of silver dollars which have ever been in circulation under this experiment was in December, 1900, when we had $76,182,326 in use. The amount in May, 1892, was $69,403,330, about 12 per cent of the amount we have had coined. What has it cost us to get out the 10 per cent which we have in circulation?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In computing the loss in the purchase of silver bullion and the coinage into silver dollars, will the gentleman tell us how much of actual silver was represented in the money which is to-day used by us as a part of our circulation?

Mr. HILL. There was on the 1st day of May $69,403,330 in circulation.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But do not we also have silver certificates circulating as money?

Mr. HILL. We do, and these certificates would circulate just as readily if they were silver notes promising to pay a silver dollar with only an ordinary reserve of silver maintained against them, precisely as the greenback is a gold note with a gold reserve maintained against it. If the silver certificate was changed to a note, the great mass of silver could be sold and converted into gold and gold redemption of the notes maintained. Some have advocated this course. I do not, for I believe we can carry the silver with proper precaution and avoid this great loss.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Well, the gentleman admits that there are six or seven hundred million of silver represented; and that amount added to the coin is the circulating medium?

Mr. HILL. Not at all.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. What would the circulating medium amount to——

Mr. HILL. I am coming to that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If you did not have silver.

Mr. HILL. I would like to follow this through successively. Now, then, what has it cost to give circulation to 69,403,330 silver dollars which have been scattered broadcast all over this country? There have been transported over this country $600,608,000 free of cost, and all the result we have got in permanent circulation is $69,403,330. We have paid out at the expense of the United States Government $2.41 a thousand for hundreds of millions of dollars, which we have been carrying backward and forward over the United States, making a total——

Mr. COCHRAN rose.

Mr. HILL. I beg to be allowed to finish one topic at a time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I just want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the same thing which takes place in relation to the

Government coinage and the interior of the country continually takes place between the Eastern bankers and their Western correspondents?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely not true. If the gentleman wants to prove that statement he can do it on his own time. The Government does not pay the transportation on——

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Connecticut misapprehends my question. I asked him if it is not true that the same thing takes place between the Eastern bankers and their Western correspondents?

Mr. HILL. I will take that up directly. I prefer not to answer that just now until I finish this topic that I am now on. The total cost to the United States for transportation of this silver to get 12 per cent of it into circulation was $1,450,813, and the cost of keeping in circulation $69,000,000 we have now outstanding has been $20.90 a thousand.

That is not all; that is the smallest part of it. Since the circulation of the silver dollar reached its maximum in 1900, it fell off, and in 1901 it increased a little. It increased $1,051,977, and what do you suppose it cost this Government to secure that increase in 1901 of one million and fifty-one thousand silver dollars? It cost $83.32 for every thousand dollars. So that every dollar—every silver dollar—that was added to the increased cirlation in 1901 cost the United States Government nearly 8½ cents apiece.

A MEMBER. How do you explain that?

Mr. HILL. By reason of the free transportation which the Government gives, it goes out and then right back again without the bags ever being opened. It is called for to pay debts. The Government is continually imposed upon day after day. We secured an increase in the circulation of silver dollars in 1901 at an expense of 8.3 cents on every dollar that was put into circulation. Is it not time this experiment was stopped? Is not the Director of the Mint correct in saying that there is no good reason to-day why another silver dollar should be coined?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I have already yielded too much, and my time is rapidly passing.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wanted to ask the gentleman if we do not have the same expense as to the subsidiary coinage as it is on the silver dollar?

Mr. HILL. Not at all; the subsidiary silver goes out and practically remains out. There is a slight change, but the gentleman himself would not for a moment ask such a question if he had examined the reports of the Treasurer of the United States. There is not any sort of comparison; we never have shipped $600,000,000 of subsidiary coin. The idea of its costing 8½ cents on the dollar to keep out subsidiary coin! Why, the gentleman, if he had examined the reports of the Treasury Department, would see that there could be no foundation whatever for such a question.

Now I come to another point in this matter. Is it any wonder, in view of the figures I have given of the absolute total failure of this experiment and the cost to the Government of 8½ cents on every dollar by which our circulation is now being increased, that the legal-tender dollar should go out? What has been the experience of other nations? I ask the gentlemen on this floor, if they have any interest in this question, to take the annual statistics of the monetary stocks of the different countries of the world, and they will find that Great Britain, Austria, Japan, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Spain, Switzerland, Servia, Roumania, Portugal, Cape Colony, Finland, Egypt, Denmark, Cuba, the South African Republics, Canada, and Australia, all of them, have absolutely eliminated the legal-tender silver coin from their currency and have none of it whatever to-day. The United States, with six hundred millions of it, have only got 12 per cent of the amount into circulation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not true that nearly every country the gentleman has enumerated, except Germany and Switzerland and Belgium——

Mr. HILL. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I have just been informed by the Chair that I have but fifteen minutes remaining.

Mr. COCHRAN again rose.

Mr. HILL. I decline to yield. I have already declined as courteously as I knew how.

Now, what shall we do with the 88 per cent of silver which is not in circulation? I will state what the bill proposes to do. On the 1st of May we had $32,935,124 worth of bullion. If coined into subsidiary coinage, it would make $50,320,608. We are compelled now by law to coin it into dollars at the rate of $1,500,000 a month. We might coin it into subsidiary coinage, which the people need and will circulate, instead of coining it into dollars, which they do not want and will not circulate; and the difference to the Treasury Department would be $3,500 every day in the year. That is simply the difference between coining that bullion into subsidiary coinage and coining it into standard silver dollars—$3,500 every day in the year.

A gentleman asked me a little while ago why we should not continue in circulation the silver certificates—whether they are not a part of our circulation. Yes; they are a part of our circulation; but it is not necessary to have in the Treasury the full amount of silver for those silver certificates any more than it is necessary to have in the Treasury the full amount of gold representing the greenbacks. If we take the course which Germany and other nations of the world have taken and recoin the silver dollars, the difference between the face value of that silver and the bullion value to-day would be $392,296,398, and the actual gain on recoinage would be $32,255,101.

The present legal limit of subsidiary coinage is $100,000,000. There is no reason why there should be any limit. The Acting Director of the mint advises me that the limit will be reached on the 1st day of November next, and that the mints will have to stop coining subsidiary then if the law is not changed. Now, what do we propose to do?

The amount of subsidiary coinage in circulation on the 1st of May was, in round numbers, $82,854,599. I will put the exact figures in the RECORD. The bullion could be coined into subsidiary coin, with the minting facilities we now have, in two years, and would make $50,320,608, making a total of $133,175,207. Can we absorb it? That is the whole question. Can we use it in the United States?

The Director of the Mint has shown that the normal increase is $5,000,000 annually, but in that normal increase he does not take into account Porto Rico; he does not take into account Cuba; he does not take into account the Philippine Islands.

I know there is a proposition pending in the Congress of the United States to have free and unlimited coinage of silver in the Philippine Islands. Sir, that would be a crime against civilization. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The last papers that came from Manila begged and pleaded that the first thing we should do there should be to withdraw the "bastard currency," as they called it, which they now have, and substitute American money. I know from personal observation there that American money is to-day in circulation. It would probably be a greater change in the commercial interests of the Philippine Islands to-day to put in any other form of currency than it would be to enact that American money should be legal tender there. I sincerely hope that no such proposition as I have just mentioned may be carried out, and if it is not we can put there from thirty to forty to fifty million dollars of American money, to our own advantage and the advantage of those people.

But we have in circulation $69,665,508 in silver certificates of the denomination of $1. If these were withdrawn, as they could be with great advantage to the country, from a financial point of view, taking into consideration the cost of circulation, as well as from a sanitary point of view, it would put all the bullion and twenty millions of silver dollars into circulation as subsidiary coin. Now, that is mere guesswork. The best way for us to judge as to what the United States can do with regard to the circulation of subsidiary coin is to see what other nations are doing. In 1878 we had $1.36 per capita circulation of subsidiary coin. Now we have $1.05. That is all.

Compare that with other nations. Great Britain has to-day $2.82; Denmark, $2.46; Switzerland, $3.24; Germany will have $3.50; Japan will have $2. With silver dollars in actual circulation it is doubtful whether we could expect to carry more than Japan. We ought to, a good deal more. That would be $2 per capita, and with a population of 85,000,000 in 1905, three years hence, when the bullion was coined, it would make $170,000,000 of subsidiary, or a recoinage of about $37,000,000 of the silver dollars in addition to the bullion.

Now, some gentlemen—the silver men—talk about the danger of eliminating our legal-tender silver dollar, when if you saturate this country with subsidiary, taking away only the one-dollar bills, you would still have 500,000,000 of silver dollars left. It is a common-sense proposition which this bill presents to you and not a political one in any sense whatever. Let us see whether we would be alone in carrying out this policy, and I want to call the attention of my friend from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], whose judgment I admire and whose honesty I respect, to this, and beg of him that he will not simply shut his eyes to everything that is going on around him and cling to his prejudices, but that he will read facts as they come along from day to day.

What are other nations doing? During the past five years the following changes have occurred—the world is not standing still: Austria has eliminated twenty-five millions of legal tender from her currency and concurrently increased her subsidiary coin from forty million to seventy-three million. Belgium has reduced her legal tender from fifty millions to thirty millions and her subsidiary from seven to four millions. France has reduced her legal tender—now note this—from four hundred and thirty-four million to three hundred and sixty-one million in the last five years

and increased her subsidiary coinage from fifty-seven millions to fifty-nine millions.

Mr. GILBERT. You mean legal tender?

Mr. HILL. I mean legal-tender silver has cut it down from four hundred and thirty-four million to three hundred and sixty-one million. Russia has eliminated all her legal-tender silver and increased her subsidiary from forty millions to one hundred and two millions. Germany has reduced her legal tender from ninety-two millions to eighty millions and increased her subsidiary from one hundred and fifteen millions to one hundred and twenty-seven millions, and is recoining all the rest she has got into subsidiary coin.

By the convention of 1898 the Latin Union has begun the process, France agreeing to recoin 130,000,000 francs from 5-franc pieces, Belgium 6,000,000, Italy 30,000,000, and Switzerland 3,000,000. The only possible argument that can be advanced against this bill is the argument presented by the honest advocate of the silver standard, that by it the volume of silver dollars will be reduced, and from this he claims that the legal tender of the country will thereby be curtailed, and the commercial interests of the country injured. That is all that can be said.

Neither the statement nor the conclusion drawn from it is justified by the facts. With a subsidiary coinage of $2 per capita we will have left 502,967,007 silver dollars after this bill is in full effect. I am sorry to say that it is so. I wish it were not so; and I want the House distinctly to understand—and gentlemen on the other side—that when they fear that the silver circulation of legal tender is to be entirely eliminated a plain statement of facts shows that when the country is saturated with subsidiary coin up to the full amount of the average nations of the world we will still have over 500,000,000 of legal-tender silver dollars so long as the $2 bills remain outstanding.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. In just a minute. At the natural normal increase it would take a hundred years to eliminate that legal-tender silver from our circulation, and while some of us are young and active and vigorous, I doubt very much whether the results of a hundred years from now will affect any of us very materially. It may some of the gentlemen who are so vigorous on the other side of the House who are advocating the cause of silver.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now, will the gentleman yield right there on his hundred-year proposition while I quote from his own report?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH (reading):

> There is no question but that the convenience of the people of this country would be served by materially increasing the volume of subsidiary coin; and considering the requirements of those parts of the country where the silver dollar is preferred to its paper representative, your committee are of the opinion that if the policy of coining the bullion into subsidiary coin is followed by the recoinage of silver dollars into subsidiary coin not many years will pass before the entire volume will be disposed of.

Mr. HILL. Exactly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is that a hundred years?

Mr. HILL. That was a broad statement.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is that a hundred years?

Mr. HILL. I have figured it out now accurately and brought it down to dollars and cents. There would be $502,967,007, and if the normal increase of five million a year be continued it would take a hundred years. As I said before, that eliminates the problem of the Philippine Islands, Cuba, Porto Rico, and so forth. That is a factor about which no man can do any more than guess.

Mr. FOWLER. And it eliminates the increase in population.

Mr. HILL. No; the increase in population is included. Now, another question. As I said before, the report of the minority was made on the first bill. They never referred to one of the provisions of the bill now pending. They took up and considered merely the question of exchangeability; but since this new bill was reported a report has been made bearing not at all upon the bill itself, but simply discussing the question of the withdrawal of the legal tenders.

Gentlemen, there is far more danger to this country and to the world to-day of inflation by reason of a glut of gold than there is of a scarcity of silver. The estimate of the world's production of gold the present year is $400,000,000, and I do not think that we need discuss this proposition on the basis that the business interests of the country are to be imperiled by the recoinage of the legal-tender silver dollar, which does not circulate and is locked up in the Treasury vaults.

The gentleman asked a question a little while ago in regard to the silver dollars. I will answer now from manuscript. What I would do, if I had the power, would be to abolish the silver certificates, except the five-dollar denomination, withdrawing all legal-tender silver dollars and lock them up in the Treasury against the five-dollar certificates, recoining the dollar piece as a token dollar, with limited tender qualities, for such dollar pieces as we needed for circulation, and holding the balance as a silver-bullion fund to be used for subsidiary, and redeeming the silver certificates, whenever they were presented for redemption, either in token dollars or in gold, at the will of the holder. That is what I would do.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Did not the gentleman say that there is far more danger to the world, in his judgment, from a possible glut of gold than from any scarcity of silver?

Mr. HILL. No; I did not say that. I said there was far more danger of inflation from a glut of gold.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Do you think that inflation by an increase of the quantity of gold would be harmful to the world?

Mr. HILL. Well, it would depend on circumstances. It would depend on the character of the inflation.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Well, gold inflation.

Mr. HILL. I would prefer not to take my time now to answer that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Upon whom would the harm of this inflation fall?

Mr. HILL. I say I would prefer not to discuss that question. I would prefer to speak to the bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I understood you that you were willing to take the entire amount of silver certificates and the silver dollars and make them a direct charge upon the Government, payable in gold.

Mr. HILL. They are now.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. By law?

Mr. HILL. No; by practice, which is better than law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no.

Mr. HILL. They are absolutely being so exchanged and have been ever since the gold standard was adopted, day after day, right straight along, and I want to say to the gentleman that one reason why I favor the exchangeability of the silver dollar for gold by law is the fear that at some time or other in the future there may be somebody in the Treasury Department who will stop that practice and bring a panic upon the country and put silver below par. That is one reason why I favor doing it by law. It is being done in practice every day, right straight along, and is the uniform current practice of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have never been able to get any such statement as that.

Mr. HILL. If you go to Mr. Roberts, United States Treasurer, he will make it to you.

Mr. SHAFROTH. He told me a month ago it was not the custom, and that they would not do it, and you could not exchange one money for the other.

Mr. HILL. I am advised by the Assistant Secretary that if the one and two dollar certificates were both taken away that probably 70 per cent would circulate as subsidiary coin and the other 30 per cent as silver dollars, and if that were done the result would be as follows——

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HILL. I would prefer not. We would then have $173,497,222 of subsidiary coin and 102,946,773 of silver dollars in actual circulation and $408,897,608 locked up in the Treasury.

Now, gentleman, I would be glad if I had the time to call your attention to just what Germany has done in this respect. We are not marking out a new course in which this Congress should go, but we are doing just exactly what other nations have done; exactly what Japan and Germany have done, who have sold very largely of their bullion, but are recoining the remainder. Now, I will read from report of the Director of the Mint:

> By the law of 1873 the German Empire adopted the gold standard. Good progress in this direction was made for several years, but, owing to the heavy fall in the price of silver, gold could only be purchased at a great loss, and the sales of silver were suspended by the Government in 1879 with the sanction of the imperial diet.
>
> Thus a large amount of silver thalers (1 thaler equals 3 marks, or 2s. 11d.) remained in circulation which, under the law of 1873, retained full discharging power the same as gold—i. e., the thalers were legal tender to any amount. The stock of thalers was somewhat reduced in subsequent years, but at the end of 1899, according to an official estimate, there were still 120,000,000 thalers left, equal to 360,000,000 marks.
>
> Therefore, although nominally the gold standard existed in Germany, a large amount of silver money enjoyed perfect equality with gold, and the standard was a limping one. When the sale of thalers was suspended in 1879 on account of the depreciation of silver, it was hoped that silver would recover, but the depreciation of this metal has continued ever since, and enormous loss would have resulted from selling the thalers, for while their face value is 2 shillings 11 pence, their market value is about 1 shilling 4 pence at a silver price of 27 pence per ounce standard.
>
> The new law provides for the abolition of the limping standard without any such loss by converting the thalers, which are legal tender to any amount, into imperial silver money, which is legal tender up to 20 marks (£1) only. This leaves the total amount of silver money practically unchanged, with this important difference, however, that when the last thaler has been recoined there will be no more silver money left which is legal tender to any amount. The whole of the silver money circulating in the Empire will then be "Scheidemuenze" (legal tender to £1).
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The Imperial Bank has spared no effort to force its large stock of thalers into circulation, but they have invariably come back within a very short time.

The Government therefrom concluded that the public will not have thalers, a statement which has met with considerable opposition on the part of bimetallists in the imperial diet.

* * * * * * *

Article 4 of the new law fixes the maximum limit for the issue of imperial silver coins at 15 marks per head of the population of the Empire. The silver required for the fresh coinings is to be provided by melting down thalers, and to bring the imperial silver money up to 15 marks per head of the population the entire stock of thalers will have to be used.

The coining or recoining of the new issues of imperial silver money is to be spread over a period of about twelve years, and the yearly coinings are limited to 30,000,000 marks on the outside. It is not contemplated to exceed this figure in order not to interfere with the regular business of the mints.

Japan has done the same thing. It started in with 78,000,000 or 80,000,000 legal-tender yen. It sold 40,000,000 and is now recoining the remainder. They eliminated the one-dollar note, the one-dollar paper, both Germany and Japan, and coined the subsidiary coin. Rather than sell the remaining bullion and make a loss they are recoining it and putting it into circulation, where it remains, and so we would with much of it.

If we could do the whole thing it would be a happy day for us. But I do believe, I believe it just as honestly as my friend from Colorado believes he is right on this proposition, that we can carry with a reasonable degree of safety the enormous amount of silver we have got and not sell it as bullion, realizing the enormous loss which we have actually made. But if we will go ahead and recoin it and use the bullion in place of the dollars we can make 7 cents out of every dollar, and we can give the people of this country better satisfaction. If we eliminate the one and two dollar bills we would hurry up the process, but by this plan we could carry this enormous amount of silver until we can use it up in a legitimate and proper way, and it ought to be eliminated in some way or another. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. COCHRAN. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the very short time given us furnishes no one an opportunity to discuss the question at all; and it is reduced to the usual policy of cutting off debate when an important question comes up before this House——

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no quorum in this Chamber, and this is a measure which ought to be discussed with the membership present.

Mr. BELL. I hope the gentleman will not cut that out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado will proceed.

Mr. COCHRAN. I make the point that there is no quorum in the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question pending before the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I rise to the question of privilege that a quorum should be present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that it has been held to be the right of the gentleman. The Chair will count.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thought probably the Chair would count.

The Chairman proceeded to count.

Mr. HILL (during the count). While the quorum is coming in I would like to state that I understand that there is a desire for more time upon the other side of the House. I do not think we shall use it on this side. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend the time for general debate one hour on each side. I will say I ask it more for gentlemen on the other side than for this. If there is no objection, I ask an extension of the time for one hour on each side.

Mr. McCALL. That can not be done in committee.

The CHAIRMAN (after completing the count). There is a quorum present.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as I before said, this resolves itself into the old practice of no time for debate when a real issue is presented in this House and unlimited time when there is nothing of importance before the House. Having only ten minutes, I can not undertake to even enter into the discussion of this bill; but I want to say that it is well known throughout the country that our friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] rides two hobbies. One is the ghost of the silver dollar, in one way, and the other is the bank's paper dollar, in the other. He never gains any faith in the silver dollar; he never loses any in the bank paper. I have no doubt that he is honest in his contention, but I wish to suggest to the gentleman that just such proceedings as he continues in this body has brought on pretty near every panic that this Government has ever suffered. They have been brought on by what Webster and other great statesmen designated as "currency tinkerers."

Now, Mr. Chairman, his arguments are a mass of figures thrown in the air and stirred up, and they are stirred up in such a way as to confuse the unthinking. He could take the same figures and apply them to gold. He could take the same system of figuring and show up in some instances as to bank paper; he could show the fact that currency for any Government is enormously expensive. If our friend, who is such an advocate and believer in national banking currency, will get down and investigate with the same acumen that he uses against the silver dollar he will find that the people of the United States have lost much of their earnings by national-bank failures, and yet they do not want to give them up. They are among the necessaries of civilization. They are necessary expenses, and if you will examine some of our deficiency bills you will see why they have been so large in this House in coining these gold certificates, in coining silver certificates. The Treasury Department gives us as the reason that we must make such enormous appropriations for the issuing of silver and gold certificates and United States notes that the life of them is only about four years.

It is not a question of the cost of the silver and getting it into circulation; it is not the cost of the gold certificate; it is not the question of the cost of the silver certificate. The question is, is it a good currency and the best that the experience of mankind up to this time has devised?

Now, the silver men are not agitating these questions. You have adopted a policy which cuts off the coinage of the silver dollar. It is the bank paper man; it is not the gold man. The gentleman from Connecticut has no more love for gold than he has for silver. Neither is sacred to him. There is only one dollar known to civilization that is sacred to our friend from Connecticut and those who lead with him, and that is a piece of bank paper.

Now, you may take the argument of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], and I will propose to him right here that if he will take the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury that I will agree, and I think I can guarantee that every man on this side will agree, to stop this debate this moment and vote upon the bill. The Secretary of the Treasury, July 30 last, said in his report that there was silver bullion enough uncoined in the Treasury to pay every outstanding note for its purchase and enough left as gain or seigniorage to coin nearly $20,000,000 in fractional or divisional currency. And the suggestion was made that we coin silver dollars enough to take up the Treasury notes outstanding, and that we apply the remainder, nearly twenty million to divisional currency. I am ready and believe every man on this side is ready to give you $20,000,000 in divisional currency and let the law stand as it is to-day.

But, sir, the object of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is to invade the domain of the existing silver dollar. He has, and his friends who work hand in hand with him have, three bills here, and this is the entering wedge. This is the least offensive to the country, and they only intend to pass this until after the Congressional elections, and then in the short session they propose to wipe out the greenback, to wipe out the Treasury notes, to wipe out the silver, and to put bank paper and a banking syndicate that will make the beef and the railroad trusts blush with shame, because it will be such a syndicate as was never seen before in this country, and it will be legislated upon the people by Congress itself.

Now, this bill, if the gentleman meant what he said, if he means that this is a harmless bill, why did he not say, in the language of the Secretary of the Treasury, coin the remainder of the dollars required to redeem the Treasury notes, and then you have enough to make nearly twenty millions in divisional coin, and coin that into divisional currency? That is what the Secretary of the Treasury said. The gentleman is not here for the purpose of coining divisional currency, he is here for the purpose of stopping the coinage of the silver dollar. He is here for the purpose of getting the right in the future of coining the silver dollars into divisional currency. We do not need the divisional coins. We do not need the divisional currency, but we would give you $20,000,000 of it.

There are four real points in this bill. The first is to remove the limit for the issuance of divisional coin and to permit the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to govern. With our long experience to guide the Secretary of the Treasury, I can see no valid objection to this change of existing custom, if the intention is in good faith, to coin what we might need only; but the onslaught by the Treasury Department for a number of years against the greenback, United States Treasury notes, and silver coin has destroyed our confidence in it. The second object is to coin what divisional currency may be needed out of the general stock of bullion on hand. I think that is quite proper under the circumstances, if the Treasury was limited to $120,000,000; but with the discretion given the Treasury, we fear it will coin $150,000,000 as a means of getting rid of our silver bullion.

The third object is to stop the further coinage of silver dollars. This I do not think wise. It is certainly not necessary, and it stops the expansion of our silver coinage while our population is constantly increasing, and it is a part of a plan to retire the silver

dollar and Treasury notes and to contract the currency, and we think this is the real object of the bill. The Treasurer asked for $120,000,000 subsidiary currency. The enemies of the silver dollar want to set aside enough bullion to make more than $150,000,000 and to cease coining the silver dollar, merely to get rid of coining more silver dollars.

The Secretary of the Treasury says, in his annual report of June 30, 1901, "The stock of bullion acquired under the act of July 14, 1890, was 51,763,642 standard ounces. If enough of this were coined into silver dollars to take up the Treasury notes issued for its cost, there would still be remaining 15,539,345 standard ounces, which, converted into subsidiary coin, would give $19,321,113." If the aims of the majority of the committee were in good faith to give the relief demanded, they would comply with the request of the Treasurer, but their main object is to stop the coining of silver dollars.

It is suggested that the limit of divisional coin be raised to $120,000,000. The act of March 14, 1900, limits the stock of subsidiary coin to $100,000,000, and the Treasurer suggests a raise to $120,000,000. This, at the request of the Treasurer, would be granted without objection, but the majority of the committee seizes the opportunity and seeks to appropriate all of the silver bullion for divisional coin and stop the coinage of silver dollars. The recommendation of the Treasurer, November 1 last, was to coin silver dollars until the Treasury notes for its purchase is redeemed; then coin the remainder of the bullion into subsidiary coin, which would make a little less than $20,000,000 more than we could absorb for many years. Doubtless the Treasurer, in his zeal to stop silver coinage, would pile up enough divisional silver to last for a generation under the provisions of the present bill.

At the time of the report of June 30, 1901, the Treasurer said: "We have a stock of $8,464,829 in the Treasury not yet used." In the Treasurer's report of November 1, 1901, he says: "The demand for subsidiary silver coin led to shipments during the past fiscal year 6.94 per cent in excess of those of 1900." The amount in circulation June 30, 1900, was $76,294,050, and a year later $79,700,088. There is no such reflux of these coins into the Treasury as of standard dollars. The increase goes on with very slight breaks, and is about 7 per cent per annum.

A hidden object in this bill is to stop the further coinage of silver dollars, and to retire the Treasury notes without replacing them with silver dollars as the law now requires. In 1891 $45,336,000 in silver was coined, and a like number of Treasury notes redeemed, thereby avoiding a contraction.

The fourth objection to this bill is that in the future no silver shall be purchased for divisional coin as heretofore purchased, but as the Government requires such it shall melt the silver dollars out of circulation and put them into subsidiary coin.

The real object of this bill is: First, under the guise of increasing the divisional currency, to stop the coinage of silver dollars; secondly, to start a raid on the coined silver and have it thrown into the melting pot and give the open field to the bankers and bank paper.

This bill will tie up what silver bullion we have for subsidiary coin, two-thirds of which is wholly unnecessary. Then the currency tinkerers will soon come along with a bill to melt down our standard silver dollars and coin them into Philippine dollars. The banking element is determined that the silver dollar shall give way to bank paper. This element is so restless under our easy money condition that it has the Calendar lined with bills, which when passed will legislate them into a money trust so flagrant that the sugar, beef, and railroad trusts will become absolutely respectable.

The Secretary of the Treasury says that on November 1 the aggregate gold in the Treasury was $542,831,849. That was never before equaled in our annals, and only for a few months some years ago has any other government ever held so much of the precious metals.

In 1901 the mints coined $136,340,781.58. The net increase of bank circulation was $99,339,457, and the per capita in circulation increased from $26.50 in July, 1900, to $28.52 to October 1, 1901, notwithstanding our great increase in population. This was the largest circulation we have ever enjoyed in actual money and bank paper in gross or per capita during our whole history, and with it we have had the greatest prosperity that we have ever enjoyed.

The Secretary of the Treasury says, in his report of November 1, 1901:

> Although the United States led the world last year in the production of gold, our imports of that metal exceeded our exports by the sum of $12,866,010. The stock of gold coin in the country, including bullion in the mints, at the close of the fiscal year, was estimated at $1,124,652,818, and the stock of silver coin at $610,447,025; United States and Treasury notes, $388,285,518; bank notes, about $360,000,000.

Why is it that the money-changing element begins to tinker with the currency every time that money becomes abundant and prosperity rife? Why is it that their move is invariably to contract the volume of all currency except national-bank notes? Why is it that their every move is to increase bank paper? Does the proposition admit of argument? Is not the cause self evident?

The money holder and dealer are affected as much by a superabundance of money as the farmer or manufacturer is affected by a great abundance of his product. The more money there is on the market in proportion to the demand the lower the price for money, just as a great crop lowers the price of cereals.

An abundant supply of money benefits the masses of the people, just as a great crop benefits the people at large. Then should the banking element be permitted to constantly keep a money famine in existence, that the owners of money may benefit at the expense of the general prosperity?

No one here can be fooled as to the object of this bill. The main object is not to increase divisional currency. There are many millions of subsidiary coin in the Treasury unused and can not be used before the December session. The subsidiary item is put forth to muddy the water while the money changers stop the further coinage of silver now going on and until they pass a provision for melting silver dollars in the future for the subsidiary coinage instead of purchasing silver for this purpose, as has always been done heretofore. It is one of the chronic contraction policies ever waged against the people as soon as they obtain a fair supply of money.

It behooves all of us to carefully look over our present condition and the probable changes of the near future. Every country in the world during the past three or four years has been running every powder mill, gun factory, navy-yard, etc., to its full capacity preparing war material; that quite a half million men of this country and of Europe have been transferred from the productive forces to the consumers; that the Spanish and Boer wars and the disturbance in China have made an unprecedented demand for our manufactured and food products, and for our horses and mules; that we have had several phenomenally large crops, and our gold production has surpassed anything ever dreamed of before; that Congress greatly increased bank paper by granting the privilege of issuing currency to the full limit of the United States bonds deposited and by allowing national banks to form on a capital of $25,000.

All of these things taken together have given us a phenomenal prosperity. It has given us such a balance of trade that we not only retained all of the gold we coined, but retained many millions imported from abroad. A change may come over our conditions; our crops may be short; peace abroad may cut off our great horse, mule, and food-product market. This would throw the balance of trade less in our favor, if not against us; would render much of our labor idle, prices would fall, and the tramp of the work hunter would be heard in the land again.

The unprecedented outburst of inventive genius, the matchless supply of labor-saving machinery, and the development of the world's resources have established standards of living that require higher wages, constant employment of labor, and remunerative business to insure peace and tranquillity throughout the country. A skilled laborer to-day earns as much in a day as a like laborer did in a week a century and a quarter ago, and has as many or more comforts to-day than the nobility had a hundred and twenty-five years ago, and his expense of living is quite as much for one day now as it was for a week a hundred and twenty-five years ago.

Sir Richard Arkwright, who did so much to establish the factory system, earned his bread in his younger days by shaving his fellows at a penny each. James Watts, inventor of the steam engine, celebrated his independence when his wages were raised to 12s. per week, less than $3 per week. Less capable artisans earn more in a day now. Those were days of low wages, cheap living, and a great scarcity of money. Sir Robert Peel, one of the first printers of calico, had quite a contention with his partner, William Yates, as to whether he should pay him for board and lodging $1.96 or $2.20 per week. They compromised on $2.08. This would not now pay for board and lodging in a third-class hotel for more than one day.

The equilibrium between money and property and the prices of labor and the expenses of living must ever be kept in mind, not according to past, but according to present conditions. The large amount of money among us for the past three years has given a great stimulus to business, to the employment of labor, to the increase of production, and to the free exchange of property. You disturb the present fortunate equilibrium and you will detrimentally affect production, labor, and exchange of property and general prosperity.

The present very favorable condition would withstand the check in silver coinage and the small shrinkage, but with a shortage of crop, peace in South Africa and the great loss of consumers we would soon receive, pacification in the Philippines and a large crop abroad, checking or turning the balance of trade against us, this check in the flow of currency would add to our troubles.

This bill, however, is but the beginning of one of those recurring policies of contraction preceding a panic. I have no doubt but this bill will be followed next session, after the fall elections are over, by the passage of the bankers' bill, retiring the greenbacks, the Treasury notes, and the silver dollars, and then with the first shake of confidence bank paper and loans will be curtailed, labor will be discharged, a panic will be precipitated, and another train of squalor, misery, and loss of property will lie at the doors of the pestiferous "currency tinkerers."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HULL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 12648) establishing a regular term of United States district court in Roanoke City; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 14189) to permit the occupancy of the public-printing building by the Grand Army of the Republic.

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

S. 5913. An act granting a pension to Cherstin Mattson.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 11535. An act for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 14018. An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes.

SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER], but before he enters upon his remarks I make the point that there is no quorum in the Chamber, and I call attention to the fact that the rule ought to be obeyed by the Chairman in making the count and stating whether there is a quorum here or not, and not have the count made as it was the last time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MANN). The gentleman makes the point that there is no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. COCHRAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is there a quorum present?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is counting to ascertain whether there is a quorum present. [A pause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. I suggest that there are no doubt lightning calculators available, paid out of the contingent fund, who might facilitate the movements of the Chair. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman that there are no arithmetical machines in the House. [Laughter.] [A pause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order.

Mr. DALZELL. The regular order is to count whether there is a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] has been recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Committee on Rules in reporting this Lilliputian financial measure to the House is a very apt illustration of the ancient fable of the mountain that labored and brought forth a mouse. The Committee on Banking and Currency, after a great deal of labor, has reported to this House a bill providing for a complete reorganization of our national banking and financial system, and which has come to be known as the Fowler bill. This bill, if enacted into law, would provide for the most radical departure from all our previous policies upon these questions that has ever been offered to the country. The Fowler bill, which yet remains upon the Calendar of the House, provides for the establishment of a board of governors in lieu of the present Comptroller of the Currency to have general executive control of our banking system.

It provides for great clearing-house associations established in appointed districts and operating with governmental powers. It provides for the retirement of the Treasury notes as credit money, the absolute cancellation of a large number of them, and the transfer of the rest of them into gold certificates. It provides for the establishment of great monopolistic banking corporations, operating from money centers, with branches scattered all over our own country, our possessions and dependencies, and if so desired, in foreign lands as well. It abandons our present policy of requiring the payment of national bank notes in lawful money only, and that they shall be secured by the deposit of Government bonds, and permits the issuance of hundreds of millions of bank notes based upon the faith and credit of the banks alone, and provides further that they shall be payable specifically in gold.

It provides for the redemption of silver dollars in gold at the option of the holder, the abandonment of their further coinage, and also for their final coinage into subsidiary coin. But the bill before the House now is not that bill. The chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures has also reported to this House and has now upon its Calendar a bill which provides for the redemption of the silver dollars in gold, for their recoinage into subsidiary coinage at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the abandonment of their further coinage; but this is not that bill.

And, finally, the Committee on Rules has laid before the House this small fragment of the entire bill, and which provides only to increase the volume of subsidiary coin by coining the silver bullion in the Treasury and the silver dollars now issued into subsidiary coin at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. So this financial legislation, which started out with promise of revolutionizing and reorganizing our entire monetary system, has so shrunken, perhaps in view of the approaching Congressional elections, that the bill which we now have before us contains only one small part of one section of a great financial bill that originally contained 23 sections. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill is, in my judgment, the sharp end of the legislative wedge by which they hope to drive home to the heart of the American people the entire monopolistic plan which is embodied in the so-called Fowler bill.

This bill is a "John the Baptist" in legislation, so to speak—a forerunner of a much greater bill which is to follow.

This bill is but one short step in a long legislative journey upon the financial question which those who are in control of financial legislation in this House would have Congress and the American people travel. Although the bill which we are now considering is only a small sliver of the entire financial plank which has been proposed, and does not go so far as did the original bill reported to the House January 6 by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, which provided for the redemption of silver dollars in gold, it does, in fact, attempt to accomplish the same end by providing for the coinage of the silver dollars into subsidiary silver.

In the speech of the honorable chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures delivered in this House on May 9, 1902, in speaking of the entire Fowler bill, he says, in reference to that portion of section 22 which provides for the coinage of silver dollars into subsidiary silver: "The committee believe that with our rapidly increasing population the whole amount can in time be converted into change money and held in daily use among the people, and with the greenbacks retired, and with no bank notes below $10, and silver certificates restricted to $5, it can be safely carried," and indicates further that the difference between the plan of redeeming the silver dollars once and melting the same and selling it as was done by Germany, and that of coining the silver dollars into subsidiary silver amounts to a matter of $300,000,000 in saving to the Government, if the plan of recoinage of silver dollars into minor coins is adopted.

This plainly shows that by this plan of converting the silver dollar into subsidiary coin they hope to accomplish the destruction of the silver dollar as real money and transform it into a token money which is redeemable in gold as completely as though they declared in this act that the silver dollar shall be specifically exchangeable for gold upon the option of the holder of the silver.

After a study and contemplation of the principles involved and the purposes proposed in the completed Fowler bill, which has been sought to be given to the American people in sectional doses from time to time in this Congress, since the powers that rule it do not seem to be willing to attempt at this time to apply the entire treatment with one radical operation, there ought not to be any misunderstanding as to the primary motive which has been behind all of the continued assaults upon the real money of the American people for a quarter of a century. There is no longer any deception attempted upon the part of those who are continually pressing for greater personal privileges. It is the last ditch and the last fight for complete corporation control of the financial system of the Government.

The battle has really never been as to whether our standard of value should be gold or silver or paper; whether our money should be yellow money or white money or green money. The real battle has been as to whether the money of the country should be issued and controlled by the General Government as declared in the Constitution, or whether it should be issued by private corporations for personal profit, power, and privilege. The gold standard has been our established measure of value for

a quarter of a century, and in 1900 we declared that the obligations of this Government should be specifically payable in gold; but that was not satisfactory to those who would surrender to private corporations the illimitable power and profit of controlling the monetary system of the country.

What have they been fighting for? They have been fighting for the priceless privilege of controlling the volume of currency necessary to carry on the business of the richest, the most powerful, and the most commercial nation upon the face of the globe, and this prize is worth the battle of more than a quarter of a century which it has cost them if they shall finally win. Those who support the financial plan proposed in this bill are constantly contending that we can not legislate value into a dollar; that we can not legislate a nation into wealth, and that we ought not to attempt to legislate money into men's pockets, but corporations possessing special privileges have been steadily legislating the wealth of this country unto themselves.

They know the value of legislation upon the financial question and the ability to control it, for they have eaten of the fruit thereof, and if they shall succeed in their declared purpose of fixing upon the statute books of this nation the plan proposed in the Fowler bill they will, with one stroke of the Presidential pen which shall approve that bill, have legislated more power and more profit into the hands of private corporations than a million of honest men could possibly earn in a lifetime of toil.

He that does not know that with the years which are beginning the present century we have come to face a new condition both in the business and the commercial world is dead to what is passing before him, and he that does not see that we must take political action upon it is blind to the portents of the future. Syndicates and monopolistic combinations of one character or another have sprung up almost as in a single night until, like some deadly nightshade, they shadow all the land. They seek to control our State and national legislatures, if necessary to the accomplishment of their purposes.

Nay, more, it has been openly charged in the public press that they attempt at times to even soil the sacred ermine of our courts, and if their growing power is not in some way checked they may yet lay the ax at the roots of the very tree of liberty itself. They long ago found that if by means of legislation they could limit and control the volume of commercial commodities in this country they could, to a certain extent, control the price of those commodities to the public as measured in money. They also know that if by means of legislation they can limit and control the volume of money in this country or its credit substitute they can just as surely control the value of this money as measured in labor or commodities, for the great law of supply and demand, acting upon the money, the labor, and commodities at one and the same time controls alike the value of each.

And thus behind the bulwark of the tariff has grown up the industrial trust which seeks to control the price of the products of labor and of industry to the public. And now behind the protection of this so-called Fowler bill it is proposed to build up a banking trust, which by means of branch banks will rapidly absorb and centralize the banking business of this country into the large money centers and which will be more powerful than either the industrial trust or the transportation trust, because it will underlie and support them both.

In order to concentrate into the hands of a few the power to convert into a commercial asset the productive capacity and profit of this great nation of 80,000,000 people, it is necessary to organize three kinds of trusts. First, it is necessary to monopolize and control the industries of the nation, and we have in the past five years accumulated more monopolistic combinations and industrial trusts than any other nation ever accumulated in five hundred years. Second, it is necessary to control the means of transportation, whereby the products of industry and of labor are transported from one section of the country to the other, for, as our Interstate Commerce Commission has stated, it is within the power of the modern railroad trust to make or mar the fortune of any man engaged in any line of business, and not satisfied with having so merged the railroad systems of this country that five or six great corporations practically control them all, they have also gone out upon the great highway of the sea and propose to form a great ocean transportation trust as well.

Mr. KLEBERG. In that connection, will the gentleman allow me to ask whether a number of bills looking to the regulation of railroads have not been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which have never been taken up and considered by the majority of the committee?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I can not state of my own knowledge, but I think such is the fact.

Mr. LESSLER. Does not the gentleman know that an effort was made by the majority in the last Congress to secure the adoption of a constitutional amendment which would have permitted the Government to deal with this question?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; and I think that those who made the effort knew very well that it was not possible to secure such an amendment, having offered it for political effect only.

Mr. Chairman, I can not yield longer, as my time is short.

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

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. Is not this bill another step in the course of the Republican party to create a money monopoly for the benefit of a few and against the inalienable rights of the many?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is what I have been trying to demonstrate.

Mr. SULZER. Then no man opposed to monopoly can consistently vote for this bill?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is my position.

And the third great source or power and profit will be to control the money and banking interests of this country. For to control the money of a people is to control the means whereby they live, the means whereby they educate their children, and whereby they maintain their independence—that spirit of individualism and American independence upon which the perpetuity and foundation of popular government must finally rest.

The provisions of this bill which we are now considering, and which empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to coin the silver dollars into subsidiary silver, have not been suggested or requested by any Department of the Government. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Mint have recommended that the 15,000,000 ounces of silver bullion now in the Treasury in excess of that required for the coinage of sufficient silver dollars to redeem the balance of outstanding Treasury notes of 1890 might profitably be coined into subsidiary money. This amount of silver bullion converted into subsidiary coin would give us an increase of about $20,000,000 of such money.

The Secretary of the Treasury further suggests that the limit of the country's stock of subsidiary coin should be raised to $120,000,000, which is sound policy, and there is no good business reason that can be given in opposition to this recommendation. But this reasonable recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury will never satisfy the advocates of a system of branch banks and a monopoly of credit money. The advocates of the Fowler bill are logical in their attempts to have the Government retire from circulation as money all the silver certificates, silver dollars, greenbacks, and Treasury notes, to-day amounting to something like $900,000,000 of real money. They know that the vacuum in our money supply which will be thus created will have to be supplied by an equal volume of credit money to be issued by the banks through their branches.

They are anxiously urging this legislation which fosters the addition of hundreds of millions of bank-made credit money to our money supply to avoid a vindication of those who oppose currency monopoly in this country. Eastern bankers, Secretaries of the Treasury, Comptrollers of the Currency, Southern Democrats, and Western Populists are all agreed as to the fact that there is a constantly growing demand for an increase in the volume of our currency as the country increases in population and expands in commerce. The sole question for us to determine now and the only one open for discussion is of what kind of money shall this increase consist?

I have pointed to the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury has not recommended the legislation offered in this bill, and its advocates are soon going to find that the great mass of the small, independent bankers all over the country are not in favor of the monopolistic principles involved in the Fowler bill. They are holding meetings of bankers' associations, especially country banking institutions, and discussing this great question and condemning the cardinal principles which underlie this whole policy. Out in western Iowa the other day, in the city of Council Bluffs, there was held a convention of bankers of that State, and this proposed legislation was thoroughly discussed, and after sounding a note of warning as to the inflation and overloaning and ballooning of credit that had been going on for the past two or three years, they passed this resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention of bankers that the proposed banking legislation now under consideration by Congress, known as the Fowler banking bill, will not tend, if enacted into law, to advance the best good of the business interests of the people of this country, especially that feature of the bill relating to branch banking, and we hereby request our Senators and Representatives from this State to use their influence against the enactment of this proposed bill into law.

A very large interstate convention of bankers of Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma was held at Kansas City a short time ago, and after full discussion of this question the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That the members of this association have carefully listened to the recent discussion of the subject of branch banks, as advocated by the able gentlemen from the East, and combated by some of the ablest and best-known members of this State association and of our neighboring State of Nebraska, and we hereby affirm our unswerving allegiance to that view of

the proposition which condemns it in all its forms as being unpatriotic, un-American, unbusinesslike, and as tending to establish a monopoly from the great and honored business of banking in the hands of a few millionaires, to the exclusion of the men of the West, old and young, who have labored so faithfully and well to make our banking system what it is to-day, the best in the known world.

The Missourians, at their meeting, also adopted resolutions condemning the establishment of branch banking, declaring it to be unwise, unsound, and detrimental to the banking interests of the United States.

Men of national reputation addressed this assembly of representative bankers from the great Central West. Among them Mr. Henry W. Yates, of Omaha, Nebr., a well-known advocate of the gold standard, whose views upon this new financial legislation is given in the extract below, taken from the report of the proceedings:

We are all conscious of the weaknesses which prevail in our banking system, and we are desirous of having them removed and the system strengthened and improved in any manner that good judgment and wise experience will dictate. But it does not follow from this that we should conclude that our banking system is so utterly bad that the only remedy for the situation is its entire extinguishment and the creation in its place of another system. This is what I believe would result from the passage of a law which would establish among us the monarchical British and continental systems of large central banks with numerous branches.

The passage of the pending bill, by destroying the harmonious relations which now exist in our banking world and by threatening the existence of our present organized banks, would not only be disastrous to the banks concerned, but it would be a national calamity.

He is again quoted upon this subject in the public press as follows:

Branch banks was the subject for discussion at the first joint session held in the afternoon of the first day of the convention. In this discussion Mr. Horace White, of New York, supported the proposed amendment which would authorize them, and I opposed it. The vote taken at the close of the discussion was unanimous against branch banks, and the resolution to that effect which has been published was the result of the vote taken at the separate sessions of the associations represented held the following morning.

The asset-currency discussion came on at the second joint session, in which ex-Comptroller of the Currency Eckels supported that proposition and ex-Comptroller Dawes opposed it.

The vote taken at the close of the discussion was equally as emphatic against asset currency as the previous vote had been against branch banks, but the separate action taken in the latter case could not be repeated, for the reason that no further meetings were held.

And I, along with the other members from Nebraska, have received the communication below from the executive board of the bankers' association of our own State:

NEBRASKA BANKERS' ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., May 24, 1902.

Hon. A. C. SHALLENBERGER, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the executive council of this association on the 21st instant the following resolution was adopted, and I was requested to send you a copy:

"*Resolved by the executive committee of the Nebraska Bankers' Association*, That we are opposed to the branch-bank feature of the Fowler currency and banking bill now pending before Congress, and we earnestly urge the Senators and members of Congress to uncompromisingly oppose the same."

Yours, very truly,

H. R. GOULD, *Secretary.*

Having determined that 95 per cent of the business is now transacted upon credit and without the use of money, the advocates of this asset banking currency seem to be convinced that it will only be a short time until we will find the need of any real money at all entirely unnecessary. The only consistent interpretation that can be put upon the teachings of those who make these continued onslaughts upon our stock of actual money is that as the demand for money increases all that we will have to do will be to put a little more stretch upon the elasticity of its credit substitute.

Blow the bubble a little bigger and no one will ever ask if its material substance will stand the strain. But the sequel of this specious tale of the beauties of credit money has often been told in ruin and desolation to those nations who have listened to the siren song of him who sings that there will be no date of payment. In the certainty of its convertibility into actual money lies the essence of the value and the honesty of the bank note.

And unless this convertibility is sure and certain beyond all fear or doubt it may become as uncertain in value as a political promise. It has been the fate of all bank notes that have ever been issued upon other securities than that of a deposit of a reasonable amount of the coin of redemption itself, or a substitute that can be instantly converted into the money of redemption, that sooner or later that doubt has arisen with a consequent unsettling of values and loss and disturbance of business. The plan proposed by the advocates of this bill, and also the Fowler bill, is to retire all the Government credit money and all standard silver dollars which now form an integral part of all bank reserves.

The necessary consequent that follows is that all reserves will then have to consist entirely of gold coin. The bank notes are not made a legal tender to any but the banks themselves, and any money that can be refused by a creditor of a bank in time of peril is not to be considered as any part of its reserve fund. The inevitable result would be that our silver must be redeemed in gold or a robbery of many millions will be perpetuated by the Government upon the holders of this kind of money by allowing it to depreciate in their hands.

Of course by so doing the Government will have only gotten rid of the paper gold notes to be in turn mulcted with the silver gold notes. The other horn of the dilemma will be to redeem the silver in gold once and then sell it upon the market and pocket a loss of many millions; and this is what will inevitably happen if we make the $500,000,000 of silver dollars redeemable in gold and retire the Treasury notes, because the banks will otherwise use the silver dollars for drawing the gold from the Treasury for export as they have hitherto used the Treasury note.

Supporters of the Banking Committee's plan have said that it would be a good thing to agree to a law to compel the banks to hold their entire reserve in gold, as that would please the opposition by imposing a hardship upon the banks, but the advocates of this feature have evidently not made an examination as to the amount of gold now held by the banks and available for their use under the system of complete gold reserves.

The national banks alone hold deposits approximating $3,000,000,000, to secure which with a legal reserve of 25 per cent would require $750,000,000. There was $194,000,000 of gold in all the national banks July 15, 1901, according to the report of the Director of the Mint, or less than one-third the amount of gold required should the reserves be required to be held entirely in gold. There are now over 4,000 banks of issue, and more than 5,000 State and private banks which we may presume will also rapidly become banks of issue if there is sufficient profit in the plan proposed and the attractive inducement is offered of making money upon their assets and drawing interest upon it.

So that the actual amount of gold reserve that would be required under this bill for the deposits alone may be fairly figured as larger than all the gold now in circulation in this country. And if the depositors' reserve was provided for there would still be no coin behind the prospective note issues. There are those who would be reckless enough to count the gold in their tills twice—once as depositors' security and again as note holders' security; but this is the acme of financial folly, built upon the faint hope of never having to use the reserve for both purposes at the same time.

That plan of gold note issuing that fails to take most carefully into consideration the amount of gold actually pledged for the redemption of the notes and for that purpose alone may speedily lead us into paths beset with greater trials than we have yet experienced. In order to escape perhaps an imagined evil we may fly to others we know not of. It has been the contention of the advocates of our present policy in regard to the payment of Government notes that it is dangerous to allow the gold reserve beyond our greenbacks and Treasury notes to fall below the $150,000,000 mark, or about a 40 per cent reserve.

By what sort of reasoning can we arrive at the specious conclusion that a 5 per cent reserve fund deposited with the Government will be sufficient when it is made specifically payable in gold? If the Secretary of the Treasury thinks it is necessary to divorce the note issuing from the fiscal department of the Treasury and set aside a specific reserve of gold for the redemption of our Treasury notes, how much more important is it for him to require the banks to do the same thing? He will find plenty of precedent for such a plan among the powerful financial nations of Europe.

With the pressure for furnishing the gold both for export and for hoarding placed upon the banks, as they see their gold pile diminishing they will have but one remedy to renew their store and to stop the endless chain. The Secretary of the Treasury has himself in the past pointed out their inevitable action. It is to call in loans, hold all the gold they may get thereby, deny new extensions, contract their note issues, thereby shutting off the siphon by which the gold metal is most readily drawn from them. The effect of such action will be a sharp shrinkage in our system of credit which will inevitably affect our values in just such proportion as that credit shall have been most highly utilized.

Banks now have no trouble with the demand for gold for export or for hoarding in times of panic, because they hold within themselves the option whether they will supply that demand or not. When they are bound by contract to supply the gold whether convenient or not, it may be another story. The element of absolute safety should be the paramount consideration in any note-issuing policy, but it is the fate of all bills that ask for special privileges that questions of political expediency often override questions of soundness and stability. The claim can not be made with any degree of truth that there is a lack of banking facilities anywhere within the nation.

The proposition to allow all the small banks in the country to share in the profits of credit-note issuing seems to be a rather cheap bid to catch votes for an otherwise unpopular measure. It is claimed by the advocates of the notes of issue that in comparison with other forms of money they have to a greater extent the

peculiar quality of elasticity, ebbing and flowing with the tide of business. Elasticity has a suggestive and pleasing sound, but elasticity in note issues is largely mythical under legal regulations.

Banks being conducted solely for private gain will, under a profitable system, continue to issue notes as long as the public will absorb them until the limit is reached. The fact that expansion would go on until a financial explosion would take place has compelled every nation to establish a dead-line limit beyond which expansion is impossible. When that limit is reached elasticity is only possible in one direction—that of contraction; and when contraction sets in there is only unlimited elasticity in the realm of credit and in the direction of constantly shrinking prices.

It is proposed as a recompense for the Government in part insuring the note holders against loss that it shall be given a first lien upon the assets of the failed bank, but the inequality in this provision lies in the fact that while this is a sweet sauce for the note holders, it is decidedly cold victuals for the depositor. At present the depositor often gets little enough from the failed bank, but with the entire amount of the capital stock appropriated to secure the notes he would often fare far worse.

The difficulty which the Treasury Department encountered during the last panic and the idea that the incubus of providing gold for export and for hoarding can be unloaded upon the banks seem to be the principal reasons advanced for the present agitation for this experimental banking policy. At present the notes of the bank are simply payable in lawful money. This acts as a complete check against their being used to gain gold for export or for hoarding. In times of panic gold is always hoarded. Everyone knows there is not enough for all, so each one gets and keeps all he can.

The principal difference between the present plan and the old State bank issues, under which suspension of payment by individual banks was the order of the hour, is the fact of the General Government's supervision and guaranty and making them indirectly legal tender to the Government for all purposes except duties upon imports. This only raises the hope that, as at present, they will never be asked to redeem them at all except as they become worn or mutilated. But all this will not make the act of redemption any easier. It only raises the hope that it will never be demanded. This is the only reasonable solution of the plan of those who advocate making gold alone the final money of payment in this country and the use of credit bank notes to entirely supply the vast volume of trade that must continue to expand to illimitable proportions, if the seeming destiny of this great country is to be finally fulfilled.

The policy of this Government should not be to contract the volume of its money by legislation, but rather to expand it, because only by building the base of its redemption money as broad as possible can it build the largest superstructure of safe credit. The plan proposed by the Committee on Banking and Currency is entirely experimental. Its policy is one of monopoly and concentration. Its chief supporters complain that it is not as centralizing in its tendency and absolutely monopolistic in its note-issuing powers as they would make it were it not for political expediency.

The chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures has said that he would prefer a bill which would limit the note-issuing power to a few large and highly capitalized banks, with branches all over the country, absorbing through its tentacles the profit that now remains to the individual banks in the small communities. Indeed, he has said that he would himself prefer one great bank alone in New York City to monopolize the entire note-issuing function of the Government. The policy has never been demanded by any political party or platform. It is purely an imperialistic financial policy.

The policy of monopoly in note issue, underlies and supports every empire of Europe. It is the banking policy of the Empire of Russia, of the Empire of Germany, of the Empire of Austria, and of the Empire of Great Britain, attempted to be applied to free America. It is not the policy of the Republic of France, which is the soundest financial government of Europe; which has always made it the foundation of its financial policy to accumulate as much as possible of real money, both gold and silver, as a base upon which to build the superstructure of her credit. There is no demand for it from the people, and to pass it now, between elections, when the people have had no opportunity to register their judgment and their verdict upon it at the ballot box, would be an act of political injustice which has no parallel in all our history upon financial questions, unless we except the act of the demonetization of silver itself. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], but before he proceeds I wish to make the point that there is no quorum in the House to hear the gentleman discuss this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TAWNEY). The Chair will count the Committee of the Whole. [A pause.] There is a quorum present. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] will proceed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is a great surprise to me, and doubtless to others—I am sure it is to my friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]—that the chairman of the Committee of the Whole, with the vigilant assistance of the gentleman from Missouri, has been unable thus far to keep a quorum in this House to listen to anybody discuss this question. It is a remarkable thing that while we have here before us a bill involving the destruction of the existing silver dollar—a full legal tender for any sum—the grinding of those dollars into subsidiary coins of limited legal tender "for $10 in any one payment," the seats in this House have been vacant to-day, when members know that this effort is but the entering wedge to turning this country over to the national banks for our paper money hereafter, and to further deprive the people of their Constitutional right to have "money," real money—gold and silver. Into subsidiary coin must go the silver dollar now doing full money duty, while to the national banks—panic makers—we must soon go for our paper money.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] seems to have been able to apply a narcotic to the other side of the House, most of whom are now absent, when he said this was an "innocent measure." He has lulled. They are sweetly smoking or sweetly sleeping in the lobby, waiting to strike the fell stroke on the roll call. I turn back the pages of history and recall the time when the very idea of turning over the issuance of paper money of this country to the national banks not only secured a vigilant attendance to this historic Hall, but almost caused a rise "to arms" for liberty and country, and Andrew Jackson was their leader. Yet here is a bill, the purpose of which, not denied by the gentleman who reports it, is to destroy existing silver dollars, and its companion piece, the Fowler bill, is to retire all greenbacks and paper money and drive the people over to bank issues for paper money.

Mr. Chairman, I will read presently only a sentence from one of the gentleman's many long and elaborate speeches made in this House, covering, all told, as I count them, about 25 or 30 pages of the RECORD. Yet in the discussion of this question here to-day the gentleman has succeeded in closing the mouths of the members of this House to the extent of allowing them only a puny little two hours, one hour on a side, for the discussion of this great question. He has discussed his side of the case fully, but we are denied a chance to do so.

Mr. Chairman, what do the many speeches of the distinguished gentleman contain? Here is the gist of this bill found in a speech which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] delivered here on the 11th of March, 1902, which will be found on page 2814 of the RECORD. I will read a part:

> From the report made it is evident that there is need for an increase in the volume of subsidiary coin in circulation to meet the needs of commerce, and in the judgment of your committee no wiser use can be made of the stock of bullion on hand than to turn it into subsidiary coinage as needed, giving the Secretary of the Treasury a free hand in reducing from time to time the volume of silver certificates or silver dollars now in circulation or lying idle in the vaults of the Treasury.

The report (No. 1425) on the Fowler bill, page 8, says:

> The total amount of silver dollars and silver certificates in circulation was, on January 1, 1902, $532,955,428.

This money is "in circulation," yet it must be withdrawn from "circulation," although "necessary to the daily transactions of the business of the country," as the Fowler bill report states, page 8. I will insert the language of the bill we are now considering, introduced March 18, 1902, and reported to the House March 20, 1902:

> A bill (H. R. 12704) to increase the subsidiary silver coinage.
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into such denominations of subsidiary silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements, and thereafter, as public necessities may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin; and so much of any act as fixes a limit to the aggregate of subsidiary silver coin outstanding, and so much of any act as directs the coinage of any portion of the bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, is hereby repealed.

This bill, No. 12704, is the first section of the original Hill bill (reported to the House January 13, 1902), which I will insert in my remarks:

> A bill to maintain the legal-tender silver dollar at parity with gold and to increase the subsidiary silver coinage.
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into such denominations of subsidiary silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements, and thereafter, as public necessities may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin; and so much of any act as fixes a limit to the aggregate of subsidiary silver coin outstanding, and so much of any act as directs the coinage of any portion of the

bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, is hereby repealed.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to maintain at all times at parity with gold the legal-tender silver dollars remaining outstanding; and to that end he is hereby directed to exchange gold for legal-tender silver dollars when presented to the Treasury in the sum of $5 or any multiple thereof; and all provisions of law for the use or maintenance of the reserve fund in the Treasury relating to United States notes are, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, hereby made applicable to the exchange of legal-tender silver dollars.

About this bill the Report No. 32, page 9, says:

Your committee believe that this bill should be adopted—

First. Because it will stop the further coinage of the legal-tender silver dollar.

Second. Because it will increase the volume of subsidiary coin, which is greatly needed.

Third. Because it will in time reduce the volume of legal-tender silver, without loss to the country.

Fourth. Because it will make every legal-tender dollar in the United States the equivalent of gold, and make more sure and certain the maintenance of the gold standard as declared by the act of March 14, 1900.

This last section is omitted in the bill pending, but is in substance included in the Fowler bill, which is to follow this. I am informed, at all events, it has been reported to the House for passage.

The whole policy or purpose of this bill is to destroy the "money" of the Constitution and, more, rob by law the people of the "right" they had until 1873 to take their bullion to the mints of this country and demand that it be made into their own money.

But not satisfied with destroying that right by Republican legislation, the great majority now in power come here and try to finish up the job by destroying the "existing" full legal tender silver dollar and turning the masses over a great ocean of subsidiary limited tender—"chicken feed," Mr. Chairman, as they called it in the Coinage Committee meetings—and that, too, is the money that they say the people use, the farmers use, the laborers of this country use.

That is what they "get" as their wage money, while the wealthy class get the gold—the best. Why pay them in the cheap money or in limited tender?

No, you do not pay them gold, and you know it, but you save that for the upper class, who do not work; neither do they spin, for they have theirs laid up safe and secure in gold, and when they are paid they demand gold and get it.

You are destroying this dollar that the people love and always have in time of peace and war, and are turning it now into limited tender, when you know, Mr. Chairman, as is shown by the letter which I have from the Director of the Mint of May 15, that we have "silver bullion now in the Mint which, if made into silver dollars, the seigniorage would be $14,128,369, and if made into subsidiary coinage, $17,385,484," without touching a single silver dollar, without interfering with the circulation of money that is silver at all. The Secretary says we only need an increase in subsidiary coin of $20,000,000 more—total, $120,000,000.

The whole object is to try to make out that we need more subsidiary silver coinage, which I neither deny nor admit; but admitting that we do, and I am willing to admit it for the sake of argument—and if we need it I want it—pray tell me where is the wisdom of coining up that which is already money—that which pays our Navy, that which pays our Army, that which pays our farmer, that which pays the members of Congress, who, many of whom, as usual, are now out of their seats and a lot of whom should be out of Congress for neglecting the constitutional rights of the people—bimetallism being one, being ground into powder here to-day.

We pay ourselves with it. Why should we destroy the existing silver dollars when we have the seigniorage lying there that is a "commodity" on the market, a menace to the silver market, that is a menace, Mr. Chairman, to the raising of the price of silver by the coinage? Why not coin this seigniorage and throw it into circulation, take it off the market, that it may itself become a valuer of values, instead of being, as it is, valued by existing money—always as if it were on the market. What is the meaning of and what is seigniorage?

(1) A charge made by a government for coining bullion bought for that purpose.

(2) The difference between the cost of bullion purchased by a government for coining and the nominal or face value of the same when coined. (Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.)

This gain or seigniorage evidently indicates so much of the bullion owned by the Government as should remain after using a sufficient amount to coin as many standard silver dollars as should equal in number the dollars represented by the Treasury notes issued in payment of the entire quantity of bullion. (President Cleveland's veto message, March 31, 1894, p. 4101.)

Mr. Chairman, I will insert a table taken from the Treasury Circular No. 99, issued November 15, 1901, showing that in July, 1901, we had in actual "circulation" of silver dollars $66,921,323, and of silver certificates (which represent silver dollars) $429,643,556; and yet it is said, "Down with the silver dollar; it will not circulate."

I will insert the table here:

July 1, 1901.

[Population, 77,754,000; circulation per capita, $27.98.]

	General stock coined or issued.	In Treasury.	Amount in circulation.
Gold coin, including bullion in Treasury	$1,124,639,062	$247,811,938	$629,790,765
Gold certificates			247,036,359
Standard silver dollars	520,399,941	23,835,062	66,921,323
Silver certificates			429,643,556
Subsidiary silver	89,822,771	10,587,557	79,235,214
Treasury notes of 1890	47,783,000	258,462	47,524,538
United States notes	348,681,016	16,635,610	330,045,406
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872			
National-bank notes	356,821,502	8,631,386	345,190,116
Total	2,483,147,292	307,760,015	2,175,387,277

Ah, Mr. Chairman, they say we need more subsidiary silver coinage. Then why not make it in full legal tender if the masses of the people of this country are the users and you say they want it? We had coined in half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes $77,015,348.50—"struck" from 1792 to June 1, 1853—all full legal tender—just as much so as our gold or silver dollars were, and they remained so down to June, 1874. I will insert a table here showing this:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1899.

SIR: As requested by you, I append herewith a statement of the coinage of fractional silver (excluding 3-cent pieces) from 1792 to June 1, 1853, and the coinage of silver dollars from 1792 to February 12, 1873.

Coinage of fractional silver, 1792 to June 1, 1853:

Half dollars	$66,492,644.50
Quarter dollars	4,606,595.50
Dimes	4,016,731.10
Half dimes	1,899,377.40
Total	77,015,348.50
Silver dollars, 1792 to February 12, 1873	8,031,238.00
	85,046,586.50

Respectfully,

GEORGE E. ROBERTS,
Director of the Mint.

Hon. J. W. GAINES, *House of Representatives.*

In addition to this we had oceans of fine legal-tender foreign silver and gold coins, which were "money" down to 1857 and possibly later.

Here is one of the records of the Coinage Committee hearings. I will read a part of a statement printed therein which says "the dollar pieces therefore actually perform a useful function in our circulation." And yet they do not circulate! This is found on page 57 of the hearings before the Coinage Committee, placed in the hearings by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who was not content to omit it. He thus preserved it for use today. And yet this distinguished son of Connecticut not only wants to stop the silver-dollar coinage, but he wants also to destroy those in existence—"in circulation."

Away back yonder when we were building our Constitution, the great men, understanding then what nature's money was, what the money of the common law was, what the money of the colonists was, what the money of the confederation was, what the money of the Revolution was, what should be the "money" of the Constitution, used the word "money" as meaning "gold and silver." They said Congress shall have the power to coin "money"—this "money"—"gold and silver" and more—"the States shall not make anything but gold and silver tender in payments of debts." They used the disjunctive "or"—"gold or silver or copper"—and not the conjunctive "and" at first, but they debated it for days and days, and finally they tied the two together and said "gold and silver," and who, Mr. Chairman, was one of the great men at that marriage, August 18, 1787?

The Hon. Roger Sherman, of the great State of Connecticut. He, in conjunction with that great jurist and patriot, James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, incorporated everlastingly into the Constitution these words: "Nor make anything but gold and silver coin a tender for debts." Yet the distinguished son of Connecticut, not content with destroying the conjunctive "and," not content with severing the ties which his great ancestor, I presume, was wise enough to place in the Constitution, wants now to wipe from the face of our Republic every silver dollar—divorce silver from gold and the people too—but "what is the Constitution" amongst Connecticut people——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] controls the time.

Mr. COCHRAN. It will have to be additional time if that is allowed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope my friend from Connecticut will lend me some of his time to talk about his distinguished "ancestors" in Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. I will state to the gentleman that I asked for additional time, but the gentlemen on the other side objected.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, at this point I renew my request for unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be extended one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri must recognize the fact that the House has fixed the time for general debate on this bill, and it is not competent for the committee to change that order.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I ask that the committee rise informally and that we deal with that in the House.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The Chair will remember, and I know my genial friend from Connecticut will, that he has made a great many speeches on this subject, that this side of the House has not had a chance nor have they discussed this question, and that we even went so far a few days ago as to permit him to place in the RECORD, by unanimous consent, his great speech on this subject to people in New York.

Mr. Chairman, under the rule, by way of extending my speech, I will insert my remarks before the Coinage Committee when both the original Hill bill and a similar bill pending, introduced by the Hon. Jefferson Levy, were under discussion. I then said:

Mr. Chairman, I have stated before that I am against both of these bills here, and shall be against either if reported to the House, because I am firmly convinced that under the Constitution we have no power or right to demonetize either gold or silver or both. I am convinced that under the Constitution the two are tied together; that under the Constitution, and as treated when the Constitution was framed, the word "money" meant and should now mean and be "gold and silver;" that during the discussions on that subject it was clearly demonstrated that the word "and" was used and to be used conjunctively and not disjunctively, and that Congress has no power by a statute to disjoin or untie the two, or, as Webster says, "displace either."

In thus contending, Mr. Chairman, I am supported by the greatest legal minds this country has ever produced, if not by the adjudications of the courts of this country.

Now, I desire to read just a few words from a speech of Senator HOAR in the Senate on August 15, 1893, which saves me the trouble of reading the original authority he cites in showing "money" to mean gold and silver, not gold or silver, from a constitutional view. After saying "gold and silver" is "nature's money," he said:

You may drive out nature with your legislative fork, but again and again she comes running back. This doctrine is recognized in the Constitution:

"No State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender." "No State shall coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

That the words "money" and "gold and silver" were regarded as equivalents in constitutional meaning is shown by the fact that the Constitution makes a separate provision as to bills of credit and does not include them in the sentence which applies to money. It is not gold or silver that a State may make a legal tender—

So said also Senators JOHN T. MORGAN and George Gray in the same debate. Here is a direct confession and authority, Mr. Chairman, that the States have the right to make gold and silver legal tender. They have no right to make either one or the other legal tender. They (the States) can make and have made both gold and silver tender by statute.

Senator HOAR continues:

It is not gold or silver that a State may make a legal tender, but gold and silver, the legal value of which, by another clause of the Constitution, is to be determined by Congress.

The "legal" value, mark you, of the two is to be controlled by Congress.

Senator HOAR further says:

Chief Justice Ellsworth and his associate—

His associate who signed the report, I may add, was Roger Sherman, who suggested the use of the words "nor make anything but gold or silver a tender in payment of debts" to the Convention, and they were from the great State of Connecticut, from which our learned friend Mr. HILL hails—

who represented Connecticut in the Constitutional Convention, in their report to their constituents of the proceedings of the Convention, say that the new Constitution provides that no State "shall make anything but money a legal tender for the payment of debts," showing that, in their judgment, the word "money" and the words "gold and silver" are identical or equivalents.

On May 29, 1787, Mr. Charles Pinckney laid before the convention a "Plan for a Federal Constitution," in the eleventh article of which it was ordained that—

"No State shall * * * make anything but gold, silver, or copper a tender in payment of debts." (Elliott's Debates. p. 71.)

On August 6, 1787, the committee on detail reported a draft of a constitution, in the thirteenth article of which the identical phase was copied, except that the word "specie" was substituted for "gold, silver, or copper" (p. 459).

On August 18 Mr. James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, moved jointly the adoption of the phrase "nor make anything but gold and silver coin a tender for debt" (p. 620).

September 12 the committee on style reported a draft and had transposed this provision to section 10 of article 1 identically as it had been, except the word "or" was used (p. 706).

September 17 the Constitution was finally engrossed and signed and the word "and" again inserted between "gold" and "silver," the convention again repudiating the disjunctive (p. 755).

The meager Journal does not show any discussion on this point; but on August 28, when the section defining treason was being considered, in the draft presented the two constituents of the crime "levying war" and "adhering to the enemy" were connected by the conjunction "and," when, on motion of Mr. Madison, it was changed to "or," thus showing that the convention had in mind the wide difference in meaning between the conjunctive and disjunctive. The only time the phrase in section 10, article 1, was ever especially discussed was just ten days before, to wit, August 18, and the convention therefore had it in mind, and so the language finally adopted could not have been accident (p. 564).

We know gold and silver both were "money" at common law, and the Constitution continued them so, and the States, too.

Senator HOAR continues:

Alexander Hamilton considered this question in his great report on the mint and the coinage.

Senator HOAR then goes on and shows, Mr. Chairman, that he (Hamilton) so treated money as gold and silver combined. We all know that in the great mint report that he wrote and submitted to Mr. Jefferson they put the unit on both metals; and here are his reasons. Mr. HOAR is still quoting Hamilton's words, approved by Jefferson, as follows:

To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from the comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation.

Either means one of two. Money means gold and silver. Here we see both Hamilton and Jefferson treated and called the two metals gold and silver as "money"—the "money."

Now, gentlemen, just to the extent that you burden gold with silver you increase the demand for gold—the disuse of silver and the unnecessary use of gold. You increase use of gold, and to that extent it takes more of the products of the sweat and muscle of this country to buy a dollar's worth of gold or a gold dollar, and hence prices go down just in proportion as you intensify the demand and increase the uses of gold.

Daniel Webster declared more than once—

Says Senator HOAR—

and with great emphasis, that the Constitution requires the coinage of both metals; and it would be a disobedience to our constitutional duty were Congress to discard either.

And so said the lamented lawyer and statesman, A. H. Garland, to me often and once in a letter.

Now, Mr. Webster, not only in the Senate, but as an advocate in one of his great cases, said that Congress had no power to stop the coinage of gold, nor did it have the power to stop the coinage of silver, and if it could stop either, it could stop both, and thus rob the people entirely of the money of the Constitution. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I submit, rob them of the money of the common law, the money of our colonial fathers, the money that the colonists had the right to have and have coined as colonists, and to take at their sweet will to the mints of England and coin free, and in America, as they claimed, and rightfully.

And I maintain that history proves the fact that they were denied this "right," and we rebelled; that when we wrested our independence from England we brought the common law and statutes to this country that suited us; and the law of that country then was that the people had the right to take their precious metals to the mint and have them made into money whenever they chose—not leaving it to the discretion of the King, or, if you please, to the discretion of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury (whether he is Democrat or Republican), or any President, to say when the people—you or I—shall have money, and when we shall or shall not have our precious money metals coined into money. That would have been slavery, not liberty.

Senator HOAR had in this speech already said:

I have been, ever since I was old enough to have an opinion on the subject, a bimetallist. I think that is true of all the American people down to 1873, with a very few exceptions. But it has been the bimetallism of Alexander Hamilton, of Washington and his Cabinet, of the framers of the

Constitution, of the members of the First Congress, and of the Constitution of the United States.

* * * * * * *

Mr. President, all our great financial authorities of both parties, from the framers of the Constitution, from Alexander Hamilton, and Jefferson, and Webster, and Calhoun, and Benton, and Chase, and Fessenden, Federalists and Republicans, Whigs and Democrats, down to the disturbed period which followed the war, have agreed upon this policy.

That is, Mr. Chairman, "bimetallism" planted in the Constitution. Senator HOAR continues:

There were differences which divided political parties. Whether Congress should authorize a paper currency, under careful safeguards, redeemable in coin, or should leave that to State discretion or to private enterprise, was a question which divided parties and made and unmade Presidents and Administrations. But down to the year 1873 it never was heard in this country that the legal tender and the standard of value should be anything but gold and silver; nor was it ever claimed until 1873 that both gold and silver could not be relied upon to perform this service.

I have no doubt that the Committee on Coinage, who reported and enacted the statute of 1873, were actuated solely by a conscientious desire for the public good. * * * They selected for their single standard what was then the cheaper metal, then gold, a metal not only then the cheaper, but of which a large and constantly increasing supply was confidently expected.

Mr. Chairman, I may add gold was in 1873 cheaper than silver.

Mr. Chairman, you know well that Mr. Gage said, in my cross-examination of him, that to make gold contracts produced a disparity between the two coins. He said it distinctly, and we have here his exact words. I asked him the distinct question. And yet we are not only permitting gold contracts to be made throughout this country, but give the maker of these contracts the sovereign's right to say what shall and what shall not be "tender" in the payment of his particular debts, when you deny that even the States have the power to say what is and shall be tender.

In this bill you are going still further, and making silver dependent entirely upon gold, thus intensifying and magnifying and strengthening the power that would disparage silver and produce a disparity—the very thing that this bill proposes to prevent, but, in fact, creates more machinery that encourages disparity.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the way you are undertaking to inaugurate and to perpetuate a parity is the very means to superinduce, intensify, and magnify a disparity; and the proof in this case clearly discloses the fact, and our common experience and common sense teach the truth of my contention. I regret now my time has expired. I wanted to speak on another branch of this bill, but that has been so fully treated in the argument of my friend Mr. SHAFROTH, which I indorse.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee will suspend for a moment. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Of course he did.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time comes out of that belonging to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee now rise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I asked unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended. That request was refused on the other side. I understand now that if the committee rises it will be impossible to secure a quorum of the House. I would ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to allow the time for general debate to expire, and then that we all be liberal in granting extensions of time under the five-minute rule within the committee without going through the formality of extending the general debate by the vote of the House. We can do that in committee, and I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, the very limited time assigned me will prevent me from going into this question as thoroughly as I should like to do. I regard this as one of the most important bills that has come before the House at this session for the reason that it is the initial legislation looking toward a radical change in our entire financial system, and I am amazed that only two hours should be allowed for the discussion of so important a question.

I have listened with great interest to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] in his clear statement of the nature and purpose of this bill. As he states, the bill is illusory in the presentation of its purpose. Whilst the ostensible purpose of it is to increase only the subsidiary coinage of the country, which now requires about $20,000,000 more, the real purpose is to retire all the silver by changing that silver into subsidiary coins, overloading the Treasury with them, and creating later on a demand for the sale of that coin as bullion.

Now, we have to-day in this country about $1,100,000,000 of gold, a little over $600,000,000 of silver, and a little over $600,000,000 of greenbacks and national bank notes. The silver, therefore, constitutes nearly one-third of the present money volume of the country. And I ask any man of judgment in this House whether this country has more money to-day than it needs for the transaction of its business? Would any gentleman in this House to-day vote to retire one-third of the money of this country? And yet this bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury practically that power, for if he carries out the purpose of this bill, he can turn every dollar of this $600,000,000 of silver into subsidiary coin, and that coin, recollect, has only a limited tender quality.

Now, what is the difference between money of limited tender and money of full legal-tender quality? Why, the difference is that the money of full legal-tender quality will satisfy all debts in any amounts, and it will also serve as the basis of credit issued by the banks. Full legal-tender money alone constitutes the reserves of the banks. Subsidiary coinage does not form a part. National bank notes do not. It is only the gold, the silver, and the greenbacks that constitute legal-tender money, and can constitute any part of the reserves of a bank. Of this total of over $2,000,000,000 of money that we have in the country, a little over one-half is in the pockets of the people. You can not diminish the amount that is in the pockets of the people, for experience has shown that that amount is essential for the transaction of their current business in the small transactions of life.

About $1,000,000,000 or a little less is in the banks, and constitutes their reserves. For every dollar of legal-tender money in a bank it is authorized under the law to issue credits from $6.50 in the country banks to $4 in the city reserve banks, the reserve in reserve city banks being fixed at 25 per cent of deposits and in other banks at 15 per cent. It is upon this $1,000,000,000 of legal-tender money in the banks that they write upon their books in the shape of credits to their customers five times that amount, or $5,000,000,000, against which their creditors draw by check, and this constitutes the check and deposit part of the credit system of the country, the part of that system which gives to every dollar of legal-tender money an efficiency on the average of $5 in the exchanges.

If you reduce the amount of legal-tender money in the country, the amount in the pockets of the people remaining the same, the reduction in legal-tender money must be in the reserves of the banks; and for every dollar of legal-tender money withdrawn from the banks you must contemplate the withdrawal of $5 of bank credits. If, then, you prepare for the retirement of $600,000,000 of legal-tender money, you provide for the reduction of five times $600,000,000, namely, $3,000,000,000 of bank credits. Are you aware that the great crisis of 1893 was caused by a reduction of the bank credits of this country only two or three hundred million dollars? Do you realize the effect of the diminution of the reserves—the bank reserves of New York?

Mr. FOWLER. Do you not know, as a matter of fact, that the reserves increased $20,000,000?

Mr. NEWLANDS. But I am talking of the effect of reducing credits. The credits were diminished to the extent of two or three hundred million dollars, and that is what caused the panic. The bank called upon its debtors, its debtors called upon their debtors, these called upon others, and thus the call for money spread over the entire country and resulted in a general liquidation of property all over the land. Why, should the statements of the banks of New York be published next Saturday showing a reduction of the bank cash of $10,000,000, then immediately there would be a reduction of the credits of those banks of fifty millions, five times the amount of the diminution of the cash—enough, perhaps, to create a panic in the great city of New York, with its vast money resources.

Now, then, every dollar of legal-tender money being the basis of $5 of bank credit, when you convert five or six hundred million dollars of legal-tender money into money of limited tender you must contemplate the retirement of $3,000,000,000 of credit. The credits now given by all the banks of the country make a credit of $5,000,000,000, and these credits issued by the banks are the basis of other credits. The wholesale merchant who receives credit from the banks extends credit to his customers. So the wave of credit stretches out to the farthest boundaries of the Republic. Credit built up upon credit. Yet these gentlemen, these tinkers of our financial system, would gradually reduce the base while they contend that the superstructure will remain the same.

Let us go back to our history immediately following the war. We had issued greenbacks during the great civil war. We passed through that war successfully. We were a reunited people, with vast resources and a great future, and every expectation has been vindicated by history. With a population of

30,000,000 (which has increased in forty years to 75,000,000) there was no reason at all for discouragement, no reason for distress. Everybody was hopeful. What took place? Our currency tinkers started in with their legislation. They commenced the retirement of the greenbacks, which were legal-tender money. Every dollar of greenbacks counted in the bank as a part of the reserve and on every dollar they could support $5 of bank credit. They substituted bank currency, which itself is a credit, not real money, and which can not be made a part of the reserve, and upon which no bank credit can be issued. What was the result? The crash of 1873, the effect of which was not entirely removed twenty years later. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill has upon its face the appearance of innocence, but I see upon it insincerity. If it had only provided for the subsidiary coin to meet the wants and convenience of this Government, then I would quickly vote for it; but as it is, I see danger in the bill. I realize this is only the skirmish line of the first fight of a war on our various moneys that is ahead of us. There is a bill from the committee in which I have the honor to sit which may not come up at this session of Congress, but which will doubtless come up at the next session. The purpose of these two bills pending, as I see it, is to destroy all the money of this country except two kinds, gold and bank notes. There is no necessity for this bill. It is insincere; and to show the reason why this bill should not become law, I desire to give some statistics. The Secretary of the Treasury only asked that we increase the subsidiary coin from $100,000,000, under present law, to $120,000,000; but this bill goes further and makes our wants unlimited. But as I was about to say, to show the lack of necessity for additional subsidiary coin, I now give some statistics.

Of all the general stock of money issued by the Government I find there are 537,000,000 of silver dollars, and of that amount $13,000,000 are in the United States Treasury, only 3½ per cent of the total amount of silver money being in the Treasury, the balance of it being in circulation among the people as silver dollars and silver certificates based on silver dollars. Out of $346,000,000 United States notes outstanding only $8,000,000 are in the Treasury, all being out circulating among the people of this country, except the 2½ per cent of it which lies in the Treasury to-day. This class of money, commonly called "greenbacks," is a form of currency that some of our Republican friends are very hostile to.

Of the general stock of $32,000,000 Treasury notes, these notes being based on or covered by silver bullion stored in the Treasury, issued by the Government, there are $95,000, or only 2½ per cent of the total amount now in the Treasury, the balance being out in active circulation.

The general stock of subsidiary silver in the United States to-day is $95,000,000 ($100,000,000 being authorized by the present law), of which amount there are to-day in the Treasury $12,807,000, or 13 per cent of the total amount. Therefore it will be seen that there is one-seventh of this class of money left idle in the Treasury of the United States. My friend from Connecticut, Mr. HILL, made the statement that there were two or three million dollars of that worn-out silver.

Mr. HILL. To-day there are three million, so I was told at the Treasury this morning. The ordinary stock of worn out and abraded is about five to seven millions.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. That looks unnecessary. Why do they not recoin the money as fast as received, and put it into circulation again?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman from Georgia must remember that it is coming into nine different subtreasuries all the time, and is gradually accumulating. Then it is recoined and sent out. It is not as though it was all centered in Washington. These figures cover all the nine subtreasuries throughout the country.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I accept that statement. But we want money that is needed for circulation, money that the country seeks. The silver certificates are desirable while the subsidiary coin is not desirable, only to the extent of making change. This bill is unnecessary. It is a step to divert the coinage of the bullion in the Treasury from silver dollars into subsidiary coin.

The worst aspect of the bill is that it strikes at the silver dollars, and aims eventually to melt them down and recoin them into subsidiary coin.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question right there, for I know he is honest?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Which would the gentleman rather have in his country, a single silver dollar that will not circulate or two half dollars and seven cents besides that will circulate?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Oh, the way the gentleman puts the question, if the silver dollar would not circulate I would take the half dollars, but that is not the case.

Mr. HILL. Absolutely, because the bill limits the recoinage of the silver dollars to the public requirements, and the Secretary of the Treasury has no power to go beyond what the public demand.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. But the silver certificates against the silver dollars are the most desirable currency, and only 2½ per cent of the silver certificates are lying idle in the Treasury and the balance are eagerly sought for and taken up by the people, while you have 13 per cent of the subsidiary coin in the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury only asked for $120,000,000, and I would be willing and glad to vote for that. I desire to submit the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, made to this Congress December 2, 1901, relative to subsidiary coin.

The estimated stock of subsidiary coin in the country March 1, 1900, was $80,348,414, of which $5,308,841 was in the Treasury. The estimated stock on November 1, 1901, was $90,613,512, of which $8,464,829 was in the Treasury, which shows a net absorption by the country of $7,111,110 in twenty months. The act of March 14, 1900, limits the stock of subsidiary coin to $100,000,000, and in view of the steady demand upon the Treasury it is apparent that this limit should be raised. It is not improbable that before another Congress shall have opportunity to act the growing needs of the country will have absorbed the entire coinage authorized. On November 1, 1901, the stock of bullion acquired under the act of July 14, 1890, was 51,763,642 standard ounces. If enough of this were coined into dollar pieces to take up the Treasury notes issued for its cost, there would remain 15,539,345 standard ounces, which, converted into subsidiary coin, would give $19,321,113. It is suggested that the limit of the country's stock of subsidiary coin be raised to $120,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman know why he only asked for a hundred and twenty millions? I have the official statement, and the reason he did not ask for more, although he thought there should be more, was that he did not want to create any opposition, and so he asked for what he absolutely had to have. Now, he says that it is far better to go on and take off the limit because there is no way in which the discretion can be exercised injuriously.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. The gentleman has spoken to-day in antagonism of the silver dollar. If an antagonistic Secretary of the Treasury should occupy the chair what would be the result? Many bad things have been done financially by a hostile official occupying a position like that. Under this bill, giving unlimited power to coin the silver dollar into subsidiary coin, what a power the Secretary of the Treasury would have. Suppose the gentleman from Connecticut was the Secretary of the Treasury, and as he is hostile to the silver dollars, what would he do?

Mr. HILL. Precisely what the bill says I should do. I would coin the dollars just as fast as the public demanded the subsidiary coin, and no faster, and no Secretary of the Treasury could do anything different, because he is limited in his power to the requirements of the public. There is no other way.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Did I not understand my friend to say that if he had it in his power he would melt the silver dollars into bullion?

Mr. HILL. I would if I had it in my power, but this law does not give any such power.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. You have just stated that the Secretary of the Treasury thought best to go further and take off the limit to the amount of subsidiary coin, and your bill does remove the limit. If you were the Secretary of the Treasury, and with a Congress in your favor, you might do it, you might carry out your wish.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is only the skirmish of what is coming. We have another bill, it may not come up at this session, but the great probability is that it will come up in the next session, destroying forever a favorite money of the people—and that is the greenback. It may not come up now, but it will no doubt have the consideration of this Congress at the next session. It was only two years ago that this Congress passed an act regulating the money of this country. It was prior to the Presidential election, and all the Republican stump speakers in the country went upon the stump telling the people that we had at last settled the money question. They said we have established and fixed the gold standard and that the money question was forever settled and everything was in good condition. Here it is two years hence we see bills introduced and we hear of trouble with our different kinds of currency, that everything is wrong, and the whole financial system needs perfecting. How can we have confidence in our friends on the other side when they change so very rapidly. I believe in a liberal amount of change money. But we have a large amount, certainly we will have legislated for a sufficient amount when we have carried out the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing that we should pass legislation as recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, and am willing that we go even farther by authorizing him to use all of the silver bullion in the Treasury for subsidiary coin to meet the demands of the country, but I can never consent to give him the power to melt

down silver dollars into small coin. The amount of this bullion on hand is sufficient to increase the small coin some $60,000,000, which increase would be ample to meet the country's wants for some years to come. But my friend from Connecticut tells us what foreign countries are doing. It seems to be implied that we must imitate and ape foreign countries in our financial affairs. I believe the gentleman spoke of Germany, with two or three dollars per capita of subsidiary coin.

Mr. HILL. Three dollars and a half.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I want to say that the United States has more banks and depends more upon checks than any other country, and does not need so much subsidiary coin. And, then, what occasion is there for conferring this great power upon the Secretary of the Treasury to coin these dollars into subsidiary coin? Suppose he should decide that we need $3 or $4 per capita, and should accumulate a surplus which would lie dormant in the Treasury and cease to be useful for active circulation. Under the present system the bullion and the silver dollar are performing a most desirable service as a medium of circulation. When the dollar is not used then silver certificates are issued against them, as well as against the bullion, in bills of small denominations, which are eagerly sought after as a most convenient and desirable circulating medium, only 2½ per cent of the entire stock of silver certificates of the Government, as I have shown in the earlier part of my remarks, remaining in the Treasury, that amount being really necessary, the balance being out in active circulation. Now, I desire to give a statement of the general stock of money of the Government, showing the amount in the Treasury and in circulation May 1, 1902.

	General stock of money in the United States.		Held in Treasury as assets of the Government.	
	Apr. 1, 1902.	May 1, 1902.	Apr. 1, 1902.	May 1, 1902.
Gold coin (including bullion in Treasury)	$1,178,540,790	$1,183,652,727	$244,858,050	$242,945,286
Standard silver dollars	536,113,305	537,603,809	19,351,261	19,076,975
Subsidiary silver	93,417,944	95,299,190	10,725,509	12,444,591
Treasury notes of 1890	33,963,000	32,638,000	81,881	89,427
United States notes	346,681,016	346,681,016	9,987,171	8,572,902
National-bank notes	357,476,407	356,987,399	9,141,233	8,982,718
Total	2,546,192,462	2,552,862,141	294,145,105	292,111,899

	Money in circulation.			
	Apr. 1, 1902.	May 1, 1902.	May 1, 1901.	Jan. 1, 1879.
Gold coin (including bullion in Treasury)	$635,194,761	$637,432,952	$629,240,795	$96,262,850
Gold certificates	298,487,979	303,274,489	253,259,799	21,189,280
Standard silver dollars	69,179,452	69,403,330	68,846,545	5,790,721
Silver certificates	447,582,592	449,123,504	430,573,522	413,360
Subsidiary silver	82,692,435	82,854,599	80,253,077	67,982,601
Treasury notes of 1890	33,881,119	32,548,573	51,795,097	.....
United States notes	336,693,845	338,108,114	337,610,118	277,098,511
Currency certificates, act of June 8, 1872	.....	.....	.....	33,190,000
National-bank notes	348,335,174	348,004,681	343,725,282	314,339,398
Total	2,252,047,357	2,260,750,242	2,195,304,235	816,266,721

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the clause in this bill to melt down silver dollars and convert them into subsidiary coin is rather intended as a stab at or the beginning of the destruction of the legal-tender silver dollar than an honest effort to supply a really needed increase in the minor coin of the country. While this attack is being waged against the silver dollar, a bill favorably reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, known as the Fowler bill, to which I have already alluded, is pending. That bill covers four distinct propositions, as follows: To redeem the silver dollars in gold; to permit national banks to issue their own currency, based on assets; to allow the establishment of branch banks in all parts of the United States, and to retire or destroy United States notes commonly known as "greenbacks." That bill is far reaching, most objectionable, and dangerous. It is the beginning of a well-ordered plan to upset all of our present financial laws, to strike down all classes of our money but gold and bank currency. Why should we interfere with the $537,000,000 silver? It is performing a noble service and is dependent upon itself. The amount is fixed by law, and the most rabid monometallist can not now have any apprehension as to its safety and soundness. It adds to our circulation $7 per capita. And why retire the $346,000,000 greenbacks, one of our most convenient and favored moneys, a money that has taken such high position and stood the test since 1879? It costs the Government no interest to circulate it and adds $4 per capita to our circulation.

The total per capita of silver and greenbacks is $11 and fixed in amounts; therefore I will ever vote to maintain this circulation, for I can not see anything better to take its place.

I am discussing the Fowler bill as well as the Hill bill, because the two are closely connected, both having the same identical purpose, namely, the complete change and overthrow of our banking and money system. What is to take the place of greeenbacks when retired? Here comes the serious and dangerous part of the Fowler bill. It gives power to the national banks to replace it with an issue of currency equal to the amount of the banks' capital. In addition to that, it empowers these national banks to establish branch banks over the county, thereby enabling a few of the large city banks soon to control all the banking business of the country.

In fact, it is expected that the ultimate result will be that one large parent bank, with agencies all over the entire country, such as now exists in Canada, Germany, France, Russia, and England, will be established. This provision of the bill would strike down our original American system of finance and banking. Why are we called on to give up all of our original system and follow others when we have been so prosperous, rapidly outgrowing all other countries not only in great enterprises and wealth, but in our banking system. Great stress is paid to the Canadian system of branch banking. We find the capital of these banks twenty-five years ago was $66,800,000, and to-day it is $67,480,000, showing an increase of but little over half a million dollars and a total surplus to date of $36,900,000, while the national banks under our system have grown in the past twenty-one years as follows:

	1880.	1901.
Capital	$457,000,000	$655,000,000
Surplus	120,000,000	279,000,000
Deposits	967,000,000	3,661,000,000

The act of March 14, 1900, specially encouraged country banking by permitting the establishment of national banks in small towns with the small capital of $25,000. Just two years later we are asked to reverse this position and destroy these banks by authorizing the large city banks to establish branch banks over the country.

Who controls the great banking institutions to-day? It can not be successfully disputed that half a dozen of the largest banks of New York City, which have already absorbed some of the smaller banks of the same city, with capitals ranging from five to eleven million dollars, with deposits of fifty to one hundred and twenty-five million dollars each, are now owned and controlled by and known as the banks of the oil, sugar, and steel trusts and great railroad mergers. Now, Congress has passed laws antagonistic to these same trusts. The Fifty-sixth Congress, at its last session, passed a bill to subdue trusts; yet they grow daily in defiance of all law. The President, through the Attorney-General, is now prosecuting the railroad mergers and the meat trust; yet in the face of these efforts, by the provision of the Fowler bill, you would give power, invite, and legalize the consolidation of banks, with full power to issue money, to establish branch banks, and control the entire banking business of the United States. These banks would issue all the paper money, thus forming one of the most extensive, gigantic, and legalized money trusts. It would be but natural under the invitation extended by this provision of the bill for these large banks at once to form themselves into such immense corporations to control the banking business of the country. It would be one of the greatest trusts of the world.

It is a most serious matter that oil, sugar, steel, meat, and many other commodities of the country are monopolized and controlled by trusts. What will be the consequences when the circulation of all our paper money is in the hands of these same trusts? They could contract or inflate the currency, name the rate of interest at will, produce panic, destroy country banks, and take the money from the country to the cities, the people having but two privileges, one to deposit, the other to borrow at the rate named by the banking trust.

The independent banks of the country are owned by local capital and feel the deepest interest in and encourage and promote all enterprises that tend to build up the home town or city and surrounding country, while the concentrated or parent city banks, dominated and owned by these large trust schemes, would naturally supply the wants of these enterprises first and let the country have the overflow. The concentrated banks' only interest in the country would be to make money through its many agencies. This provision of the bill aims a blow at the liberty and independence of the people.

Let us not legislate to concentrate and to "Morganize" the banks and money of our country, thereby creating great money

barons, but rather let the Government control the money and only permit banks to issue notes when properly secured and safeguarded by the Government. The production of gold in the world the past few years has been great, but in the United States it has been phenomenally so, reaching the high point in January last of $1,110,800,000. This, added to our other money, gives us the liberal and splendid circulation of $28.48 per capita. With this large stock of gold on hand, which grows daily, with every prospect of a continued increase, strongly protecting every phase of our finances, we should cease continually tinkering with the greenbacks and silver dollars, both fixed in quantity by law, and like every dollar of all our money, good beyond criticism. [Loud applause on Democratic side.]

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask a similar privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada asks permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the time for general debate on the other side has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. It has; and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has three minutes.

Mr. HILL. I will surrender those three minutes and ask that the bill be taken up under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into such denominations of subsidiaty silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements, and thereafter, as public necessities may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin; and so much of any act as fixes a limit to the aggregate of subsidiary silver coin outstanding, and so much of any act as directs the coinage of any portion of the bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, is hereby repealed.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. The discussion of this bill to-day has covered a wide field; and it is well to bear in mind that in one section this bill provides for three specific things: First, that the bullion now in the Treasury shall be coined into subsidiary coin; second, that after that silver bullion shall be so coined and when the public necessity shall require it the Secretary of the Treasury may cause standard silver dollars to be coined into subsidiary silver coin; third, that the limit of $100,000,000 upon the amount of subsidiary coin shall be repealed. The Government has now on hand an amount of silver bullion——

Mr. BELL. Does not the bill provide that no further silver bullion shall be coined into silver dollars?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I have stated that the bill provides for coining the present stock of bullion into subsidiary coin. As that is all the silver bullion out of which silver dollars could under existing law be made, my statement necessarily included that of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BELL. Yes; if you coin it all now.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The silver bullion now in the Treasury, when coined into silver dollars, would make $47,063,493. It would, if coined as subsidiary coin, make $50,320,608.

The first question is whether this bullion ought to be coined into standard silver dollars or into subsidiary silver coin. We find that it will produce more when coined into subsidiary coin than it will as standard silver dollars, and to that extent it is an inflation of the currency of the country, not a contraction, as complained of on the other side of this Chamber. Let us see, then, which would be the more advantageous for this Government—to coin it into standard silver dollars or into subsidiary coin.

In determining that question it becomes desirable to know what demand there is for these various forms of money. The United States Government now has coined 539,791,805 silver dollars. Of these, $69,403,330 are in circulation, or about one-seventh. The United States has coined into fractional currency now a little over $95,000,000. Of these, six-sevenths are in circulation among the people. Look at the contrast. Of the silver dollars six-sevenths are in the Treasury and one-seventh among the people; of the subsidiary silver coin six-sevenths are circulating among the people and one-seventh is in the Treasury.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I scarcely have the time, but I will yield for a moment to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Are not the silver dollars in the Treasury represented and in circulation through the medium of the silver certificates?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That question has been answered repeatedly to-day, and therefore I decline to answer it again.

I have here before me a statement, which I will insert in my remarks, of the subsidiary silver coin in circulation, in the Treasury and in the country on July 1 of each year from 1890 to 1901, and on May 1, 1902.

Statement of subsidiary silver coin in circulation in the Treasury and in the country July 1 of each year from 1890 to 1901 and May 1, 1902.

Date.	In circulation.	In Treasury.	Total.
July 1—			
1890	$49,507,786	$27,317,519	$76,825,305
1891	53,195,300	24,653,400	77,848,700
1892	57,714,402	19,807,076	77,521,478
1893	59,350,291	18,064,832	77,415,123
1894	52,567,373	23,682,552	76,249,925
1895	54,415,773	22,438,661	76,954,434
1896	54,584,997	21,386,510	75,971,507
1897	53,860,303	21,958,066	75,818,369
1898	57,722,767	18,404,843	76,127,610
1899	62,522,398	12,344,154	74,866,552
1900	68,942,869	13,920,873	83,863,742
1901	71,634,112	18,188,659	89,822,771
May 1, 1902	82,854,599	12,444,591	95,299,190

This covers the end of the fiscal year for each of the years enumerated and covers the 1st day of this month, and it shows that there is less subsidiary coin in the Treasury on the 1st of this month than there was on the 1st day of July of any year since the year 1890, save only July 1, 1899.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we find, then, that this Government, having coined nearly 540,000,000 standard silver dollars, is only able to keep in circulation about 70,000,000 of them. Can there be any question as to whether the most demand is for subsidiary coin or for standard silver dollars?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. How much of our gold is in circulation in the shape of gold certificates?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, several hundred million dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It has varied from almost nothing to some hundreds of millions.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If it is objectionable to circulate our silver in the form of silver certificates, why is not it objectionable to circulate our gold in the form of gold certificates?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is no objection to circulating silver in the form of silver certificates that I know of.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thought the gentleman was objecting to it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That he was trying to get rid of the silver dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is mistaken. I was not trying to get rid of the silver dollars. The truth is, we have two uses to which we could apply this bullion. If we apply it in one line, there is a demand for it, and if we apply it in the other line it appears there is no demand for it. It further appears that if we apply it in the line in which there is no demand, we have then got to buy silver in order to use that silver in the place where the demand does exist, and I submit that the real object and the real purpose of these gentlemen in opposing this bill is to force upon this Government further silver purchases to make fractional currency.

They say that the silver certificates are in circulation, but what is the function of the silver? The silver dollar is a standard dollar by law, but it is a token dollar in fact, and what is the object of issuing paper certificates to represent token dollars? If the paper certificate is good to represent 61 cents, why may it not just as well represent 100 cents? What is the utility in a 39-cent dollar as a basis for the issuance of paper currency? If the Government is able to maintain by its fiat money at 100 cents that is intrinsically worth 39 cents, I am unable to see why it could not by its fiat maintain at par an equal amount of money that had no intrinsic value.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is not the silver dollar full legal tender for debts?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And subsidiary coin is only limited legal tender?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then for what reason should we convert full legal-tender money, as the silver dollar is, to limited legal-tender money, as the subsidiary coin is?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman was giving attention to what I was saying he would have discovered that I was discussing the proposition of coining the silver bullion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The gentleman was discussing also in favor of coining the silver dollar into subsidiary coin.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will give my reasons for that, if I am not interrupted. Now, this bill further provides that when that silver bullion shall have been exhausted, that if the public necessities require it, silver dollars may be coined into fractional currency. Not until the public necessities require it, and not until all the bullion has been exhausted, does this bill provide for that, and when that time comes for every dollar of money that is destroyed in this way, $1.07 will be issued by the Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. How soon does the gentleman think that necessity will arise?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not know when, nor do I care. Whenever that does come, in place of resulting in contraction, it means that for every silver dollar retired $1.07 of fractional currency shall be issued and added to the circulating medium of this country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which is not full legal-tender money.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Which is a legal tender for a limited amount, and redeemable in full legal tender, so that one who has it can get legal tender for it at any time he wants to and to any amount that he wants to.

Now, I am surprised at the attitude of gentlemen upon the other side, because they seem to think this is a contraction measure, when to a limited extent it is an inflation measure. This bill provides for coining silver into subsidiary currency, and subsidiary currency not being of the full weight of the standard, it will make more subsidiary currency than it would standard currency, and more of this blessed silver money we have been hearing so much about than would be made under existing law.

Now I have gone over most of the reasons why I think this bill ought to pass. It ought to pass, because this silver bullion is demanded in subsidiary currency and is not demanded in standard dollars.

Mr. THAYER. Will the gentleman allow a question?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. THAYER. The gentleman from Connecticut, in discussing this bill this morning, said that the bullion which would be coined into subsidiary coin would supply the needs of the country for the next ten years.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; I did not.

Mr. THAYER. Or nearly that.

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. THAYER. And that as a physical proposition it would require about that length of time to coin it.

Mr. HILL. I did nothing of the kind. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I decline to yield any part of my time to a settlement of the question between these two gentlemen as to what the gentleman from Connecticut said.

The bill provides that dollars that do not circulate may be taken and utilized by being coined into money that will circulate. It further provides that there shall be no arbitrary limit upon the amount of subsidiary coin. Why should there be such a limit? There is no such limit upon gold. Why should this country put a limit upon the amount of money of a given denomination that can be issued by law? Why should the Government by law provide that not more than $100,000,000 of subsidiary silver shall be issued, if as a matter of fact the public necessities require more? This does not authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to coin any of these silver dollars until the public necessities so require.

Now, there is one matter that I should like to call attention to, and then I am done. A minority member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, Mr. COCHRAN, has filed a report in which he says this measure is in furtherance of the general policy of contraction which has been observed by the Treasury Department for over thirty years. I want to say first that this bill provides for no contraction; that in so far as it affects the volume of the circulating medium of this country it provides for its increase; that it provides that every dollar issued under it shall be a limited legal tender, and fully redeemable in full legal tender, and does not operate in any sense to contract the cur-rency.

But that statement, made in this report, is of equal fairness and equal accuracy with the rest of the statement made in the report to which I refer. In the thirty years to which the gentleman refers there has been no contraction of the currency at any time, except during the Administration of President Grant, to the extent of $35,000,000, and from the date of that contraction to this hour there never has been such a contraction.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understood the gentleman to say that this works no contraction of the currency.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is what I said.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And that if all these silver dollars are turned into limited-tender silver, that that limited-tender silver will be redeemable in full legal-tender money?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, take the condition to-day. We have about $2,000,000,000 of legal-tender money, of which $600,000,000 are silver dollars. Now, assume that that $600,000,000 are turned into subsidiary silver and are redeemable, as the gentleman says, in full legal-tender money. I will ask whether there will not then be of full legal-tender money only $1,400,000,000 instead of $2,000,000,000?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would answer that that would not be true for numerous reasons.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And whether that would not work a contraction of the legal-tender money to the extent of $600,000,000?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would answer that if the gentleman's first proposition is incorrect, as I have said it is, it follows that a deduction based upon the assumption of its truth would be filled with the original error.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I did not catch what the gentleman said.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. You ask me if a certain matter is true and I tell you no; and then you ask if the condition you have assumed would result in a certain and particular way.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Why is it not true?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like the gentleman to point out the fallacy in my statement.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The fallacy is that this bill does not provide for coining all the silver dollars into fractional currency. It expressly prohibits it except to the degree authorized by this bill.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. And therefore it can only be done to the extent that the public necessities require.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And who is to be the judge of the public necessity?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And that puts the power into his hands to coin it all if in his judgment there is a necessity for it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MCCLEARY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

On May 26, 1902:

H. R. 2316. An act to correct the military record of Albert Boker.

On May 27, 1902:

H. R. 11353. An act making appropriations 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, 1903, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution fixing the time when a certain provision of the Indian appropriation act for the year ending June 30, 1903, shall take effect; and

H. R. 8587. An act for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes.

On May 28, 1902:

H. R. 750. An act granting a pension to Martin Essex;

H. R. 3829. An act granting a pension to Mary Ann Merrow;

H. R. 4089. An act granting a pension to Ada L. McFarland;

H. R. 4204. An act granting a pension to Hester A. Furr;

H. R. 5553. An act granting a pension to Nancy E. Hardy;

H. R. 5554. An act granting a pension to Egbert A. Stricksma;

H. R. 6021. An act granting a pension to William Kaste;

H. R. 6663. An act granting a pension to John York;

H. R. 7085. An act granting a pension to Hannah H. Graham;

H. R. 7541. An act granting a pension to Annie Shinn;

H. R. 8341. An act granting a pension to Hannah C. Chase;

H. R. 12054. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burrill;

H. R. 307. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Branson;

H. R. 671. An act granting an increase of pension to Orra H. Heath;

H. R. 1046. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin;

H. R. 1129. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Shaffer;

H. R. 1695. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Perry;

H. R. 1696. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Condon;

H. R. 1715. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Hudson, formerly Henry P. Dow;

H. R. 1724. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Thompson;

H. R. 2563. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Strong;

H. R. 2661. An act granting an increase of pension to Oswald Ahlstedt;

H. R. 3238. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Weeks;

H. R. 3292. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur H. Perkins;

H. R. 4451. An act granting an increase of pension to George K. Thompson;

H. R. 5020. An act granting an increase of pension to Courtland C. Matson;

H. R. 5219. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Donne;

H. R. 5865. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Campbell;

H. R. 5911. An act granting an increase of pension to Gilbert G. Gabrion;

H. R. 6063. An act granting an increase of pension to John Brill;

H. R. 6172. An act granting an increase of pension to Friedrich Weimar;

H. R. 6721. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ray;

H. R. 6750. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hoxie;

H. R. 7228. An act granting an increase of pension to Christian Christianson;

H. R. 7229. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Dunning;

H. R. 7401. An act granting an increase of pension to William Brown;

H. R. 7897. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Daly;

H. R. 7918. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Pettee;

H. R. 8106. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Mahoney;

H. R. 8401. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Murphy;

H. R. 8409. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrenus Larrabee;

H. R. 10488. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate W. Milward;

H. R. 10821. An act granting an increase of pension to Abby T. Daniels;

H. R. 11133. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Lafferty;

H. R. 11170. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kunselman;

H. R. 12978. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Smith;

H. R. 13019. An act granting an increase of pension to Marietta Elizabeth Stanton;

H. R. 13036. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Greenhalgh; and

H. R. 13371. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Palmer.

SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GROW. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "coin," in line 9, add "*Provided*, That the subsidiary coins shall be half dollar, quarter dollar, and 10-cent, and 5-cent pieces; each of the aforesaid pieces shall be an aloquit part of a dollar of 412½ grains."

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, the present subsidiary coins in silver are proportionate parts of a dollar, 384 grains instead of 412½ grains. If I understand aright, for coins that are used in the Philippine Islands, if we made the half dollar of this proportion of 412½ grains, they could be used in place of the coin that is now being used there. In that case our American coin would go into circulation, taking the place of the Mexican coins they use there; and in that way we could put a large amount of silver in circulation that would probably never come home.

Now, we redeem the subsidiary coins in gold, and therefore the weight would make very little difference with us. It circulates with us with very little trouble, because it is redeemed in gold. But if we have to have a coinage circulate with that of another country, it must have the same weight of silver, otherwise it would not circulate with it. It would be redeemed in gold as our present subsidiary coin is. Then we could make our 5-cent pieces of silver instead of nickel, and the nickel could be used for cents instead of copper. The copper is not worth now the amount it circulates for, and we are using a subsidiary coin that is worth less than the amount it represents. We want to circulate silver in money by making it in the proportionate parts of a dollar—2 halves, 4 quarters to the dollar, and 10 dimes to the dollar, and 20 5-cent pieces to the dollar—thus giving a silver coin for a nickel coin, so that our large 5-cent pieces can not be confounded with a quarter. You can not tell as to which it is if a man's eyesight is poor, without close inspection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I offer another amendment, on line 9, after the word "coin," "which shall be full legal tender for all debts, public or private." Now, I wish to test the sincerity of the gentleman from Iowa, who says that if all the silver is coined into subsidiary coin——

Mr. OVERSTREET. I desire to make the point of order against that amendment.

Several MEMBERS (on the Democratic side). Too late.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I asked recognition of the Chair as soon the gentleman stated his amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I submit the point of order is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman's point of order to be that the amendment is not germane to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I have not stated my point of order.

Mr. NEWLANDS. My point is that the point is made too late.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I addressed the Chair, and the Chair did not hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment now pending, and the amendment of the gentleman from Nevada would not be in order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is the point I make.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I ask that the amendment be again read. We could not hear it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would like to know what amendment is pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which the Clerk will report for the information of the gentleman from Nevada.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then I move to amend the amendment by adding the following words: "which shall be full legal tender for all debts, public and private."

Mr. HILL. I make the point of order against the amendment to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania the following words: "which shall be full legal tender for all debts, public and private."

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I wish to test the sincerity of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HILL. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. [Cries of "Too late!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can make his point of order. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a bill to increase the subsidiary coin, not to change its character in any way whatever.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I want to inquire whether it is in order to make a point of order after discussion has commenced?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman made the point of order before any discussion had commenced on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. COCHRAN. The point of order was made after the gentleman from Nevada had addressed the Chair.

Mr. HILL. The point of order was made before the amendment was read.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman made the point of order after the gentleman from Nevada had addressed the Chair and was proceeding with his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. This matter is entirely within the discretion of the Chair, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Connecticut to make the point of order before any discussion occurred on the amendment. The Chair will now hear the gentleman.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The gentleman from Connecticut made his point of order first before the reading, and then after it was read, so that the gentleman is correct when he said he made it before the amendment was read.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the bill now pending before the House is a bill to increase the subsidiary coin, and the amendment provides for giving it an entirely different character. I think it would be just as proper under the provisions of this bill to move, as an amendment, to take away the legal-tender quality of the outstanding silver dollars simply because the item of "silver dollar" is mentioned in the bill. The bill contemplates no such action, and the amendment offered does not seem to me to be germane to the bill for increasing the existing form of currency. I do not question the germaneness of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I would like to be heard on it before it comes to a vote.

Mr. NEWLANDS and Mr. COCHRAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. COCHRAN. To speak to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I purpose discussing the point of order, and I presume it will be in order after I am through for the gentleman from Missouri to take it up. This bill provides for the coinage of subsidiary silver. What is subsidiary silver? Subsidiary silver is silver money of a smaller denomination than one dollar. We are providing for this subsidiary coinage, and it is entirely competent for us to determine its legal-tender quality, whether it shall be unlimited or whether it shall be limited.

In addition to that it is proposed by this very bill to change the full legal-tender silver into limited-tender silver. It is entirely competent for us to declare that in making the change into the silver of the smaller denomination the legal-tender quality of the silver shall not be lost. Here is a clear question under this law as to whether this silver that is to be coined is to be full legal tender or limited legal tender. That is not settled by the bill as it stands, and an amendment making the point clear is plainly in order. Subsidiary coin is not now full legal tender, but it has been so in the past, and it would be strange indeed if we could not by amendment make the subsidiary coin contemplated by this bill a tender for all debts. To my mind the amendment is clearly germane.

The gentleman from Iowa insists upon it that there would be no contraction, if this bill passed, if $600,000,000 of silver dollars were changed into subsidiary silver of limited tender; that the volume of money would not be contracted. While it is true that the total volume of the full legal tender and limited tender will not be changed, it will still remain $2,000,000,000, but it will not be two billions of full tender money. What will we have? Fourteen hundred millions of full legal tender and six hundred millions of limited legal tender—$2,000,000,000 under our present system of full legal-tender money—greenbacks, gold, and silver, every dollar of which can be held as bank reserve, every dollar of which can be used as the basis of bank credit, every dollar of which can be given an efficiency of $5 in the credit extended by the bank check and deposit system, and yet the gentleman insists that when he has diminished this legal-tender money to the extent of six hundred millions that can be held in bank reserves, money that can be used as the basis of credit—that in reducing it from $2,000,000,000 to $1,400,000,000 he is not working a contraction of the currency.

I call it trifling with reason to present such arguments as that, and I wish to test the gentleman's sincerity as to his contention that there is no difference between limited tender and full legal tender. If one is the counterpart of the other, one just as good as the other; if he intends to work no contraction of the volume of legal-tender money in this country, let him vote for this amendment, which places every dollar of this small silver on a basis with the other money of the country, retaining the volume of legal-tender money at two billions instead of reducing it to fourteen hundred millions. It is an amazing contention, Mr. Chairman, that in changing the form of our silver coinage we may not at the same time provide that the full legal tender of the coin shall be preserved.

Mr. COCHRAN. This bill is supplementary to existing legislation relating to subsidiary coinage. Existing laws define the legal-tender qualities of subsidiary money. It seems to me that a ruling to the effect that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] is not germane would be most extraordinary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to be heard for just a minute on this point of order.

It will be observed by the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW], and also the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], to that amendment take effect after the word "coin," in line 9; and the words preceding the amendment are these:

And thereafter, as public necessity may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin.

There is no question that silver dollars are full legal tender. Is it possible, then, that when we are providing for the melting down of coinage which is full legal-tender money and recoining it into other money we can not say that the money thus recoined from legal-tender dollars shall also be full legal tender? That is all I wish to say.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule and does not desire to hear any further discussion on the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All right, if the Chair is going to rule my way.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania follows the word "coin," in line 9, and to that amendment the gentleman from Nevada offers an amendment providing that this subsidiary coinage shall be full legal tender. The coin that this amendment proposes to declare shall be full legal tender is to be made or recoined from full legal-tender silver dollars. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment of the gentleman from Nevada is germane to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and therefore the Chair holds it in order. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment of the gentleman from Nevada would be to practically restore the legislation which existed prior to 1853 on the question of the full legal-tender quality of subsidiary silver, and it would put the United States in opposition to the experience of the civilized world.

Now, I have simply to represent the case as it is, that while other nations are decreasing their legal-tender silver this amendment proposes that our silver 5-cent pieces, our dimes, our quarters, and our half dollars shall immediately be transformed into legal tender; not only legal tender but unlimited legal tender beyond the extent of the standard silver dollar. I want the gentleman from Nevada to understand the full purport of his proposition, that under the terms of his amendment, if it passes, the United States bonds can be paid in 25-cent pieces. With that statement of the case I am perfectly willing to leave it.

Mr. GROW. Did the Chair rule that the amendment of the gentleman from Nevada was in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has so decided—that it is germane and in order.

Mr. GROW. Then I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CLAYTON and others objected.

The CHAIRMAN. There being objection, the amendment, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is doubtless aware, can not be withdrawn.

Mr. HILL. I call for a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Nevada.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not follow my friend from Missouri in going over questions from Coin's Financial School, but I would like to call the attention of the committee to the amendment and the specific proposition now before the committee.

The motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] is to insert in line 9 a proposition to coin from 50-cent pieces down to 5-cent pieces of subsidiary coin under this act, that the silver bullion at present may be thus coined, that silver dollars may be also coined into the same kind of subsidiary coin if needed hereafter. That is his proposition, providing for 50-cent pieces down to 5-cent pieces. The gentleman from Nevada offers an amendment to the amendment, which is as follows:

Which shall be full legal tender for all debts, public and private.

The effect of this will be that this subsidiary coin we provide for would be legal tender for all debts public and private. You might have half dollars in your pockets which would be a legal tender for all debts public and private, but if you had a half dollar coined under the former law, it would not be legal tender except in limited amounts. So you would have the absurdity of having two kinds of subsidiary coin, one of which would be legal tender for all debts public and private and the other a limited tender.

It seems to me that is all the question there is before the committee. Gentlemen go back into the discussion of 1894, 1895, and 1896. That has been relegated to the tomb of the past, never to be revived on either side of the Chamber. But we should address ourselves to the specific question that is before the committee, and it seems to me no gentleman, even though a Democrat or a Populist, ought to vote for this amendment.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. LACEY. I suppose I shall have to.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The Director of the Mint, Mr. Roberts, stated to the Coinage Committee that this "chicken feed" of 5-cent pieces, quarters, dimes, and half dollars are taken

into consideration in making up the per capita of circulation. Does not the gentleman think that if that is done that this "chicken feed" or subsidiary coin should be made full legal tender?

Mr. LACEY. I think not, because it has less metal in it. We put less silver in it away back fifty years ago, in order to keep it from being melted down or sent abroad.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman want the silver sent abroad anyway—get rid of it?

Mr. LACEY. We are not needing to send it abroad. We have use for it here. The purpose of the bill is this: There is frequently not enough of small change. My friend from Tennessee will remember that he spends more of this small change than anything else. He has to break his bank bill and put it into small coin.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; I am not one that goes through the gilded halls or through Wall street with the very rich, like my friend from Iowa. I am down on the ground floor with the plain people, and I feel very much at home there. [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I am glad to see that my friend is down among the plain people. I supposed he was a plutocrat, for he carries that unctious look most of the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, the gentleman from Iowa is the first man that I ever deceived with my looks. [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. But seriously, Mr. Chairman, I want to get the House down to the plain proposition before us. It is now proposed to have another kind of legal-tender money as subsidiary silver coinage. I will ask my friend whether he thinks that there ought to be two kinds of subsidiary coinage—one 25-cent piece, for instance, which will be a limited legal tender, and another 25-cent piece an unlimited legal tender?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman does not state correctly the effect of the amendment. Now, here is a letter from the Director of the Mint dated May 15, 1902, which says:

Subsidiary silver coin—dimes, quarters, and halves—are legal tender for $10 in any one payment.

That is the present law, he says.

Now, we do not have two kinds——

Mr. LACEY. The proposition here is that we shall have two kinds. I hope my friend will come up with the "plain people"——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LACEY. I will not use that much time, unless I have the assistance of my friend from Tennessee, which I hope I shall have.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, this official letter dated May 15, addressed to myself, states that we have but one kind of subsidiary coin——

Mr. LACEY. That is not a legal tender except for a limited amount.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It is a legal tender to the amount of "$10 in any one payment."

Mr. LACEY. Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] provides that this particular coinage to be put into circulation under this bill shall be a legal tender for all debts to an unlimited amount. Consequently, if the amendment becomes law, we shall have two kinds of subsidiary coinage. Is not that correct?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Not at all; because this act amends or repeals all laws inconsistent with it.

Mr. LACEY. Oh, no.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It is so declared at the end of the bill.

Mr. LACEY. The language of the amendment is "such coin."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If the construction of the gentleman from Iowa is correct, we can easily remedy that by further amendment.

Mr. LACEY. I think my friend from Tennessee would certainly be willing to concede, when his attention is called to the plain letter of this amendment——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Can we not change that, if necessary, by further amendment? Up to 1853, half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes were legal tender in "all payments whatsoever." Now, does the gentleman think that we are any better than those people who made that law and continued it in force down to 1853. And these coins struck before 1853 remained full legal tender up to June, 1874. Should not we have the benefit of making that currency full legal tender, inasmuch as we are the people who have to use it?

Mr. LACEY. We may not be any better; but we are alive and able to attend to these things in this day and generation in the light of later experience, which has taught us that it is best to have a subsidiary coinage a little lower in its legal-tender character than other money, so that it may be treated as a token, and may stay at home.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But the gentleman wants to get rid of it. If my friend wants to send it abroad and get rid of it, let him vote that way and send it abroad. We have plenty to spare, I dare say.

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand, the gentleman from Iowa objects to my amendment——

Mr. LACEY. I object to the form of it, because I think it will effect perhaps what the gentleman has not intended.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The gentleman, as I understand, objects to the amendment upon the ground that if it be adopted there will be two classes of subsidiary money—one the $86,000,000 now in circulation and bearing a date prior to the present, and the other the $600,000,000 authorized by this act and bearing a date subsequent to the enactment of this bill. Now, I ask the gentleman whether he is in sympathy with the purpose of this amendment, which is to prevent the $600,000,000 of full legal-tender silver now existing and about to be converted into subsidiary coinage by this bill from being reduced to a limited legal tender and thus losing its debt-paying capacity? I ask the gentleman whether he is in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment; for if he is, the form may be readily modified, if it be defective.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask the gentleman a question. I think there may be time for him to answer before my five minutes expire. I will ask him whether the effect of his amendment will not be to make two kinds of subsidiary coinage—one a legal tender generally and the other not?

Mr. NEWLANDS. But, admitting that——

Mr. LACEY. I would like the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Admitting for the sake of argument that the $86,000,000 already issued would be a limited legal tender, but that the $600,000,000 to be issued under the amendment would be a full legal tender, I ask the gentleman whether he is in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment, which is to retain the debt-paying capacity of the $600,000,000? If the gentleman is in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment, it can be readily changed in form so as to suit his views.

Mr. LACEY. If the gentleman asks me whether I am in favor of issuing $600,000,000 of fractional silver currency, I will answer, certainly not. No such amount will be needed. He is assuming now something will be done that no one ever thinks of doing and that the bill does not contemplate, that is not involved in the bill, and then says, if that is so, what would you think about it? I am trying to bring my friend down to the plain proposition that he has brought before this committee, and am trying to find out whether he is in favor of it in the form in which he has drawn it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is the gentleman in favor, I ask him——

Mr. LACEY. I am in favor of making the subsidiary coin a limited legal tender.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of giving the Secretary of the Treasury discretionary power——

Mr. LACEY. Oh, certainly; it is perfectly safe.

Mr. NEWLANDS. To change six hundred millions of whole debt-paying money into six hundred millions of limited debt-paying money—token money?

Mr. LACEY. There is no such proposition.

Several members asked for a vote.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an opportunity to argue the amendment which I have had the honor of introducing. My previous argument was to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to state to the gentleman that the purpose of this amendment is to prevent $600,000,000——

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield to a single question?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes, if the gentleman will extend my time.

Mr. HILL. I will ask that your time be extended.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I would like to know from the gentleman himself whether his amendment applies simply to the subsidiary coin which is to be recoined from the dollar, or whether it applies to the whole volume of subsidiary coinage?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the gentleman that as framed it will probably be construed to apply only to the silver coined under this act—the new coinage.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one more question? Does the gentleman himself think it would be a wise proposition to have two kinds of subsidiary coin?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would rather extend the full debt-paying capacity to all of it.

Mr. HILL. Then why does not the gentleman change his amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well, I will change it if the gentlemen on that side will give me any sympathy or support at all, but this is a mere quibble. You are endeavoring to defeat my proposition.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman from Connecticut would raise the point of order.

Mr. HILL. Of course I shall.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The gentleman is trying to defeat my amendment. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is endeavoring to defeat the beneficial operation of this amendment by mere quibbling. He proposes to allow the proposition robbing $600,000,000 out of two billions of its full debt-paying capacity to go through simply because he fears that there may be two kinds of subsidiary coinage. They are perfectly distinguishable—the currency heretofore issued and the subsidiary coin hereafter to be issued. It will be merely a question of dates. I say it will be perfectly easy to make it extend to both, but I do not propose to be trapped into an amendment which may be declared out of order by the Chairman upon the ground that it relates not only to the silver to be coined under this act, but to the silver heretofore coined.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is clearly distinguishable.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would rather have two kinds of subsidiary coin, a small part of it without full debt-paying capacity and a large part with full debt-paying capacity, than to have it all with a limited debt-paying capacity. I would rather have this contradiction in the subsidiary coin than rob $600,000,000—one-third of the present money volume of the country—of its full debt-paying function. That is the proposition I want the gentleman to face, and not evade it by quibbling. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, then, in my remarks upon the main bill I called the attention of the House to the fact that at the close of the civil war we attempted this currency tinkering, this retirement of full legal-tender money and the substitution of something that was not full legal tender, just as you propose to do now. At the close of the war, having passed through that great struggle successfully, with a bright and brilliant future before the entire country, we concluded to retire the greenbacks which had been issued and which had a full debt-paying capacity, and what did you propose to do? Back those greenbacks gradually, as France did with her paper money after her great war with Germany, by both silver and gold? No.

Your effort was to substitute bank currency which had not a full debt-paying power, which was not a legal tender, and what was the result? You destroyed about $300,000,000 of greenbacks and you substituted five or six hundred millions of national bank notes, and the five or six hundred millions of national bank notes did not fill the place of the three hundred millons of greenbacks, because the bank notes were not legal tender. Why? Because every dollar of those greenbacks in the reserve at the banks was the basis of $5 of credit. Three hundred millions in the banks meant fifteen hundred millions of bank credits, credits to customers against which they could draw their checks, and as you drew out that three hundred millions of greenbacks and destroyed them you destroyed fifteen hundred millions of bank credit, and what did you substitute for it? Four or five hundred million dollars of other bank credits, differing only in form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from Nevada be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks that the time of the gentleman from Nevada be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, by retiring the three hundred millions of greenbacks you destroyed fifteen hundred millions—five times the quantity of bank credits—and what did you substitute for it? You substituted a different form of bank credit in the shape of a national-bank note, of no full legal-tender quality, not entitled to be considered as the reserve of a bank.

No bank could take a dollar of it and issue $5 of credit upon it, as it could against a greenback; and so for $1,500,000,000 of bank credits, of which the $300,000,000 of greenbacks were the base, you substituted four or five or six hundred million dollars of bank notes, not having the same debt-paying capacity, not having the same full legal-tender quality, and the entire country went upon the shoals of bankruptcy from 1873 to 1878, from which the country was only rescued by the moderate increase in the metallic volume of the currency of the country, brought about by the passage of the Bland Act. And so in 1893 you sought to do what? Not to substitute some instrument of credit for legal-tender money, but you sought to repeal the Sherman Act, the successor of the Bland Act, and to put a stop to that moderate and sustained flow of new money that was entering this country.

Panics are created in two ways. One is by a checking of the accustomed supply, the other by a retirement of a portion of the existing volume. In 1893 you checked the moderate and accustomed supply by the repeal of the Sherman Act. In 1873 you not only checked the moderate supply by refusing coinage to silver, but you substituted, as you propose to do now, for a portion of the full legal-tender volume of money a credit device of no full debt-paying capacity. Just as you propose to substitute now for $600,000,000 of silver, having a full debt-paying capacity, $600,000,000 of small coin that can only be used in the small transactions of life in the payment of debts amounting to not more than $5.

How paltry are the five-dollar debts as compared with the great masses of debts—the debts of a hundred dollars, of a thousand dollars, of a million dollars, of billions of dollars that are pressing upon this world. While only a small amount of limited legal tender is required to satisfy these small debts, it requires a very large amount to satisfy these large debts and sustain the great volume of credit based upon it. So, I tell you, that although the application of the same principle of contraction under this bill may be moderate and gradual and its accomplishment may take a series of years it will have the same effect as the substitution of bank notes for full legal-tender money in 1873 and the same effect as the stopping of the accustomed flow of new money in 1893. Whether you prevent the new from coming in or whether you destroy the old, both are contractions, having in view the increasing population and the increasing demands of business.

If you are with us in a disposition to defeat the retirement of $600,000,000 of legal-tender money, we can easily make it effective by framing a substitute here for this amendment, assuming that no point of order is made against it; but I refuse to present a substitute to which, perhaps, a point of order may be made. The amendment which I have offered will make the present bill harmless by preserving the full legal-tender quality of all the money coined under it, and for that reason the amendment should receive the support of every member who is honestly opposed to a contraction of our money supply.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on July 1, 1901, there was of general stock of subsidiary silver in the Treasury and in circulation only $89,822,771, the sum of $10,587,557 being in the Treasury and $79,235,214 in circulation.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. There would be the same propriety in making copper cents legal tender for the payment of all debts, public and private, as to make 5-cent pieces full legal tender. The idea, from a business standpoint, of providing by law that a debtor might pay a debt of a million dollars in 5-cent pieces! It would make the legislation absurd and ridiculous.

As to two kinds of subsidiary coin, supposing the amendment I propose is adopted. It does not apply to any coinage already made. It only applies to future coinage, and either one of them under existing law in certain amounts would be legal tender. That would not be changed. Certain amounts of them could be used, but you could not apply 5-cent pieces to the payment of a large debt, which would make a ridiculous business transaction.

Subsidiary coinage is not for large business transactions. Therefore its legal-tender quality is only applied to small amounts, and they would be redeemable in gold. Whether there was the same amount of silver in one case as in another would make no difference. Both would circulate with us, one just as well as the other; but if they were to circulate outside of this country, the coin must have about the weight of the coin you want it to displace in other circulations; and my only object was that we should make the American coin in such shape and form as to be adapted to the Eastern trade—coins that they are accustomed to. And if I was right in my opinion about our 50-cent piece made in this form, it would have about the same quantity of silver as similar coins now circulating in China and India. If they came back again, they would be redeemable in gold, and if they went into use there it would absorb so much of our surplus silver. But to make subsidiary coin full legal tender without limit for all debts, public and private, would be, as a business proposition, ridiculous and absurd.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HILL. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. DALZELL having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. TAWNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12704, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 6037. An act granting increase of pension to William C. Holcomb;

H. R. 7560. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Butler;

H. R. 2623. An act granting increase of pension to John Smith;

H. R. 12779. An act granting an increase of pension to George Chamberlin;

H. R. 12422. An act granting an increase of pension to David Topper;

H. R. 11288. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Ball;

H. R. 11124. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Scott;

H. R. 5475. An act granting increase of pension to August Schill, alias August Silville;

H. R. 5551. An act granting increase of pension to Charles Edward Price Lance, alias Edward Price;

H. R. 12983. An act granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Emerson;

H. R. 5248. An act granting a pension to Francis A. Tillotson;

H. R. 9794. An act granting a pension to Zebulon A. Shipman;

H. R. 4542. An act granting pension to Eliza J. West;

H. R. 9833. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret McCuen;

H. R. 13614. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. White;

H. R. 8487. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Crist;

H. R. 13037. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Anderton;

H. R. 9695. An act granting an increase of pension to Evaline Jenkins;

H. R. 13211. An act granting a pension to Melissa Burton;

H. R. 6718. An act granting increase of pension to Andrew R. Jones;

H. R. 2286. An act granting increase of pension to Mary Etna Poole;

H. R. 2289. An act granting increase of pension to Pitsar Ingram;

H. R. 8134. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Dunn; and

H. R. 12428. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Getty.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 3208. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to refund certain license taxes; and

S. R. 87. Joint resolution to permit steam railroads in the District of Columbia to occupy additional parts of streets in order to accommodate the traveling public attending the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in October, 1902.

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. 5913. An act granting a pension to Cherstin Mattson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, for ten days, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. NEEDHAM obtained leave to extend his remarks on the bill H. R. 14511, this day passed.

SALMON FISHERIES OF ALASKA.

By unanimous consent, the reference was changed on the bill (H. R. 14464) to amend the laws relating to the salmon fisheries of Alaska from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to the Committee on the Territories.

OMNIBUS PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the conference report on the bill H. R. 14018, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The report and statement will be printed in the RECORD under the rule.

The report of the conference committee is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 7, 10, 12, 23, 33, 39, 42, 43, 47, 50, 57, 62, 63, 71, 73, 74, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89, 95, 96, 112, 114, 117, 124, 125, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, and 161.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 86, 92, 93, 94, 100, 105, 107, 109, 113, 115, 120, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 154, 155, and 157; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may exchange the present site for a new site, without additional cost or expense therefor to the Government, and erect the said building thereon;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "value," in line 2 of the amendment, insert ", not exceeding $175,000,;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 10, line 12 of the bill, strike out the word "fifty-four" and insert in lieu therof the word "four;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the amendment after the word "therein," in line 4 of the amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert "United States post-office and custom-house at Jacksonville, Fla., from $278,881.38 to $328,881.38;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert: "United States post-office at Kalamazoo, Mich., from $78,236.74 to $128,236.74;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "from," in line 2 of the amendment, strike out the words "fifty-eight thousand four hundred and fifty-seven dollars" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$71,807;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "drawn," in line 7 of the amendment, strike out the words "by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert in section 5, page 25, after line 12, in the bill, the following: "United States post-office at Moberly, Mo., $5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert in section 5, page 25, after line 16, in the bill, the following: "United States post-office at Columbia, Mo., $5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "and ten" in the amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from is disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$65,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in section 5, page 25, after line 10, in the bill, the following: "United States post-office and other governmental offices at Crookston, Minn., $4,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "eighty," in the amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the word "seventy;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in section 1, page 4, after line 11, in the bill, the following: "United States post-office and court-house at Scranton, Pa., from $273,190.85 to $363,190.85;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert as a paragraph the following:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall not purchase a site in

either of said cities until satisfied that the price therefor will permit the execution of all the provisions of this section in each of said cities within said limit of cost for site and building, respectively."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment strike out the words "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the site selected shall consist of not less than an entire block or square of ground in said city;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the site selected shall consist of not less than an entire block or square of ground in said city;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out insert the following: "United States post-office and custom-house at Traverse City, Mich., $6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the words "United States," in line 1 of the amendment, insert the words "post-office and;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the words proposed to be stricken out by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment and insert after the word "company," in line 16, page 27 of the bill, the following: ", and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the supreme court of the District of Columbia upon petition of said company to inquire into, hear, and determine the amount of the actual cost and expense to the company for the removal of its tracks from E street by reason of the provisions herein contained, and to enter judgment against the United States and the District of Columbia jointly, in such sum as may be so ascertained as aforesaid, and either party shall have the right of appeal from such judgment as in other cases;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 28, line 2, of the bill, after the word "he," insert the following: "and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting jointly;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That 'An act to provide for enlarging and improving the United States Government building at Macon, Ga., and to appropriate $48,000 therefor,' approved March 2, 1899, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"'That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the post-office and court-house building at Macon, Ga., to be extended and enlarged so as to provide necessary accommodations for the post-office, courts, and other branches of the Government service, and to purchase additional ground on Third and Mulberry streets, in his discretion, for this purpose, and that the total cost of all said improvements, changes, and repairs, including the purchase price of such additional ground, shall not exceed the sum of $156,000: *Provided*, That the limit of cost of such additional land shall not exceed $31,000.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert "and seventy-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$675,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment, after the word "settlements," strike out the words "is hereby appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall be paid from the amount herein authorized;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert in line 19, page 42, after the word "at," the following: "Honolulu and Hilo, Territory of Hawaii; Albuquerque, N. Mex., and;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the amendment strike out the words "have prepared" and insert in lieu thereof the word "prepare;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 162: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Change "Sec. 25" to "Sec. 24;" and in line 1 of the amendment, after the word "constructed," insert the words "enlarged, or extended;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Change "Sec. 24" to "Sec. 25;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Change "Sec. 25" to "Sec. 26;" and the Senate agree to the same.

DAVID H. MERCER,
CHARLES W. GILLET,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,
F. E. WARREN,
J. L. RAWLINS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report on each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Increase over House bill of $25,000 for public building at Anniston, Ala.

On No. 2: Senate recedes.

On No. 3: Increase over House bill of $100,000 for branch mint at Denver, Colo.

On No. 4: Increase over House bill of $15,000 instead of $90,000, as requested by the Senate, at Beaumont, Tex.

On No. 5: Increase over House bill of $20,000 for public building at Burlington, Iowa.

On No. 6: Change in phraseology; no additional expense.

On No. 7: Senate recedes.

On No. 8: Increase over House bill of $15,000 for public building at Joplin, Mo.

On No. 9: Increase over House bill of $25,000, instead of $75,000, as requested by the Senate, for public building at Butte, Mont.

On No. 10: Senate recedes.

On No. 11: Increase over House bill of $500,000 for custom-house at New York City.

On No. 12: Senate recedes.

On No. 13: Allowing an exchange of site without cost to the Government, instead of allowing an unlimited price for new site, as provided by Senate, at Elizabeth City, N. C.

On No. 14: Limits condemnation proceedings to $175,000, instead of no limit, as provided by the Senate, in Richmond, Va.

On No. 15: Increase over House bill of $50,000, instead of $100,000, as requested by the Senate, for court-house at Portland, Oreg.

On No. 16: Retains United States courts in building.

On No. 17: Increase over House bill of $100,000 for public building at Memphis, Tenn.

On No. 18: Increase over House bill of $50,000 for public building at Dallas, Tex.

On No. 19: Change in phraseology limits size of ground.

On No. 20: Increase over House bill of $2,000 for public building at Rome, Ga.

On No. 21: Increase over House bill of $2,000 as limit of cost for additional ground at Rome, Ga.

On No. 22: Increase over House bill of $50,000 for public building at Springfield, Ill.

On No. 23: Senate recedes.

On No. 24: Senate recedes.

On No. 25: Increase over House bill of $50,000, instead of $80,000, as requested by the Senate, for public building at Kalamazoo, Mich.

On No. 26: Increase over House bill of $45,000 for public building at Omaha, Nebr.

On No. 27: Increase over House bill of $62,000 for public building at Greensboro, N. C.

On No. 28: Strikes out the word "provided."

On No. 29: Strikes out lines which are included elsewhere in the bill.

On No. 30: Insertion of language construing parts of section No. 1.

On No. 31: Increase over House bill of $300,000 for custom-house at San Francisco, Cal.

On No. 32: Substitution of language eliminated elsewhere in the bill.

On No. 33: Senate recedes.

On No. 34: Authorizes public buildings at Oklahoma City, Okla., at a cost of $50,000.

On No. 35: Limits cost of public building at Guthrie, Okla., to $50,000, instead of $100,000, as carried in the House bill.

On No. 36: Eliminates language which is inserted elsewhere.

On No. 37: Increase over House bill of $75,000 for public building at Ogden, Utah.

On No. 38: Striking out provision for Oil City, Pa., and inserting the item in section No. 4.

On No. 39: Senate recedes.

On No. 40: Transferring Rock Hill, S. C., to section No. 4.

On No. 41: Transferring Martinsville, Va., to section No. 4.

On No. 42: Senate recedes.

On No. 43: Senate recedes.

On No. 44: Reduction of $5,000 from House bill providing for public building at Harrison, Ark.

On No. 45: Increase over House bill of $20,000 for public building at Batesville, Ark.

On No. 46: Striking out the words "and court-house," at Colorado Springs, Colo.

On No. 47: Senate recedes.

On No. 48: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Torrington, Conn., instead of $20,000, as requested by Senate.

On No. 49: Increase over House bill of $25,000 for public building at Athens, Ga.

On No. 50: Senate recedes.

On No. 51: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Ottawa, Ill.

On No. 52: Provides for public building at Meriden, Conn., at a cost of $100,000.

On No. 53: Provides for Oil City, Pa.; transferred from section No. 3.

On No. 54: Provides for public building at Kirksville, Mo., at a cost of $40,000.

On No. 55: Provides for a public building at Marblehead, Mass., at a cost of $40,000.

On No. 56: Provides for a public building at Oak Park, Ill., at a cost of $35,000.

On No. 57: Senate recedes.

On No. 58: Provides for a site at Moberly, Mo., to cost not exceeding $5,000, in lieu of Senate provision for building and site to cost $40,000.

On No. 59: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Stillwater, Minn.
On No. 60: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Greenville, Tenn.
On No. 61: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Maysville, Ky.
On No. 62: Senate recedes.
On No. 63: Senate recedes.
On No. 64: Provides for a site for public building at Columbia, Mo., at a cost not to exceed $5,000, in lieu of Senate provision for building and site to cost $40,000.
On No. 65: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Elkhart, Ind.
On No. 66: Increase over House bill of $5,000 for public building at Muncie, Ind.
On No. 67: Provides for a public building at Dekalb, Ill., at a cost of $65,000.
On No. 68: Increase over House bill of $5,000 for a public building at Richmond, Ind.
On No. 69: Provides for a public building at Anderson, Ind., at a cost of $80,000.
On No. 70: Increase over House bill of $15,000 for a public building at Hammond, Ind.
On No. 71: Senate recedes.
On No. 72: Transfer of a proviso.
On No. 73: Senate recedes.
On No. 74: Senate recedes.
On No. 75: Increase over House bill of $25,000 for a public building at Sherman, Tex., in lieu of Senate increase of $50,000.
On Nos. 76 and 77: Transfers from section No. 3 provisions for public buildings at Rockhill, S. C., and Martinsville, Va.
On No. 78: Increase over House bill of $20,000 for public building at Battle Creek, Mich., in lieu of Senate increase of $30,000.
On No. 79: Increase over House bill of $25,000 for public building at Biloxi, Miss.
On. No. 80: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public bilding at Nashua,u N. H.
On No. 81: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Atlantic City, N. J.
On No. 82: Senate recedes.
On No. 83: Senate recedes.
On No. 84: Increase over House bill of $40,000, instead of $55,000, requested by Senate, for public building at Grand Forks, N. Dak.
On No. 85: Senate recedes.
On No. 86: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for a public building at Westchester, Pa.
On No. 87: Senate recedes.
On No. 88: Senate recedes.
On No. 89: Senate recedes.
On No. 90: Increase over House bill of $10,000, instead of $20,000, as requested by Senate, for public building at Georgetown, S. C.
On No. 91: Increase over House bill of $5,000, instead of $15,000, as requested by Senate, for public building at Flint, Mich.
On No. 92: Increase over House bill of $25,000 for public building at Charlottesville, Va.
On No. 93: Increase over House bill of $75,000 for public building at Superior, Wis.
On No. 94: Increase over House bill of $10,000 for public building at Baraboo, Wis.
On No. 95: Senate recedes.
On No. 96: Senate recedes:
On No. 97: Increase over House bill of $50,000 for public building at Huntington, W. Va., in lieu of Senate increase of $75,000.
On No. 98: Allowing $4,000 for site at Crookston, Minn., instead of $75,000 for site and building, as provided by Senate, and transfers item of Crookston to another section.
On No. 99: Provides for public building at Gainesville, Tex., to cost $70,000, instead of $80,000, as requested by the Senate.
On No. 100: Provides for a public building at Laramie, Wyo., to cost $100,000.
On No. 101: Decreases cost of public building at Scranton, Pa., to $90,000, instead of $100,000, as requested by the Senate.
On No. 102: Increase over House bill of $25,000, instead of $35,000, as requested by the Senate, for a public building at Laredo, Tex.
On No. 103: Strikes out item limiting cost of sites.
On No. 104: Provides for site at Yankton, S. Dak., to cost $7,000, instead of $7,500, as requested by Senate.
On No. 105: Provides for site at Muscatine, Iowa, to cost not to exceed $15,000.
On No. 106: Provides for site at Albuquerque, N. Mex., to cost not to exceed $10,000.
On No. 107: Increase over House bill of $40,000 at Spokane, Wash.
On No. 108: Senate recedes, with an amendment.
On No. 109: Increase over House bill of $40,000 at Tacoma, Wash.
On No. 110: Senate recedes, with an amendment.
On No. 111: Substitutes Traverse City, Mich., for Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and provides for site.
On No. 112: Senate recedes.
On No. 113: Increase over House bill of $8,000 for public building at Hamilton, Ohio.
On No. 114: Senate recedes.
On No. 115: Provides for site at Champaign, Ill., to cost not to exceed $15,000.
On No. 116: Provides for site at Natchitoches, La., to cost not to exceed $5,000.
On No. 117: Change in phraseology, without affecting limit of cost, Washington, D. C.
On No. 118: Limits cost of site, Washington, D. C.
On Nos. 119, 120, and 121: Change in phraseology, without affecting limit of cost, Washington, D. C.
On Nos. 122 and 123: Decreasing limit of price of sale of public building at Kansas City, Mo., from $300,000 to $260,000.
On Nos. 124, 125, 126, and 127: Affecting the public building at St. Louis, Mo., without changing the limit of cost.
On No. 128: Strikes out limit of cost for site at Wheeling, W. Va.
On Nos. 129 and 130: Limits price for sale of old public building at Wheeling, W. Va., to $125,000.
On No. 131: Increase over House bill for public building at Macon, Ga., from $72,000 to $154,000.
On No. 132: Increase over House bill of limit of cost for additional ground in Toledo, Ohio, $12,000.
On No. 133: Increase over House bill of $25,000 instead of $40,000, as requested by Senate, for site in Des Moines, Iowa.
On No. 134: Decreasing size of site.
On Nos. 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, and 147: Relates to public building at Los Angeles, Cal., and makes an increase over House bill of $350,000.
On No. 148: Amendment for public building at Winston-Salem, N. C., which was stricken out in conference.
On Nos. 149, 150, 151, and 152: Are simply changes in section numbers.
On Nos. 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, and 159: Refer to investigation of postoffices in different parts of the United States.
On No. 160: Provides for plans for public building at Columbus, Ohio, to cost not to exceed $5,000.
On No. 162: Provides fire limit.
On Nos. 161, 163, and 164: Change in section numbers.

Net authorization as passed by House	$15,820,450
Net authorization as passed by Senate	19,889,150
Net authorization as reported from conference	19,425,450
Decrease on Senate amendments in conference	1,149,500

DAVID H. MERCER,
CHARLES W. GILLET,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
Managers on the part of the House.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place this letter from the Director of the Mint in the RECORD, so that it may be read by members of the House for their information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from the Director of the Mint. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear what the request was.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The request is to print in the RECORD, for our information, a short letter from the Director of the Mint touching the pending matters in the bill that we have been considering in the Committee of the Whole to-day.

The letter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 15, 1900.

Hon. GEORGE E. ROBERTS, *Director of the Mint, City.*

DEAR SIR: Will you please, to-day, if possible, and if not, as quick as you can, answer the following questions for me?

1. What is the amount of seigniorage (and in what metal) now in the Treasury of the United States?
2. How did it get there, and under what law?
3. What is the value of same in ounces (and what measure do you use)?
4. How many dollars can be coined of this silver bullion?
5. To what amount is our subsidiary or fractional coinage legal tender?
6. Please give the names of these coins and let the amount for which they are legal tender follow after each name. For example: Nickel tender for $—. Dime, tender for $—.
7. What is the amount of such coinage or coins now in the Treasury of the United States? How much is in circulation?
8. What season of the year is this coinage most in demand?

Yours, very respectfully,

JNO. W. GAINES.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, May 15, 1902.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, *House of Representatives.*

SIR: In reply to your inquiries of current date the following is respectfully submitted:

As to questions one, two, and three you are informed that the amount of silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, on hand at the mints May 1, 1902, was 36,400,670.47 fine ounces troy. The cost was $32,935,134. This bullion would coin in silver dollars $47,063,493; in subsidiary silver coin $50,320,608. All silver bullion purchased by the Government is carried on the books of the Treasury at cost and the seigniorage declared on each month's coinage and paid into the Treasury. If the silver bullion on hand May 1 were coined into silver dollars it would give a seigniorage of $14,128,369, and into subsidiary silver $17,385,484.

The amount of silver subsidiary coin outstanding May 1 was $95,299,190. Minor coins—that is, 1-cent bronze and 5-cent nickels—are legal tender for 25 cents. Subsidiary silver coin, dimes, quarters, and halves are legal tender for $10 in any one payment. The amount of subsidiary silver coin in the Treasury on May 1, as per circulation statement inclosed, was $12,444,591. The season of the year which calls for the greatest amount of subsidiary silver and minor coins are the months of August, September, October, November, and December, and the mints are frequently pressed to their utmost capacity during these months to meet the demand for small coins.

Respectfully,

R. E. PRESTON, *Acting Director of the Mint.*

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members be allowed to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill for five days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that all members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill for five days. Is there objection?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want this to go into the RECORD for the benefit of the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 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 assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of

William A. Walker against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mary C. Slosson, administratrix of estate of John N. Slosson, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of H. B. Lansden, administrator of estate of Martha W. Lansden, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MOODY of Oregon, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2003) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2277); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana, from the Committtee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14383) to validate certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico with reference to the issuance of certain bonds, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2278); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8325) to finally adjust the swamp-land grants, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2279;) which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 238) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit to the House results of recent surveys of the Uintah Indian Reservation in Utah, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2280); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2769) to fix the fees of United States marshals in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2281); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McCLEARY, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16) to provide for the erection of a bronze equestrian statue to the memory of the late Brigadier-General Count Casimir Pulaski at Washington, D. C., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2282); 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, 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. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3745) granting an increase of pension to George Kerr, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2260); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 305) granting an increase of pension to George Heinzman, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2261); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5869) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin White, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2262); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5907) granting a pension to David S. Taylor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2263); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8447) granting an increase of pension to John McArthur, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2264); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12026) granting an increase of pension to Bailey W. Small, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2265); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12039) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Brown, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2266); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUMPLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12921) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Adams, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2267); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13457) granting an increase of pension to John S. Crosser, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2268); 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 House (H. R. 13468) granting a pension to Joseph S. Hess, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2269); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14140) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hunterson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2270); 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. 4300) granting an increase of pension to Ann Comins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2271); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3997) granting an increase of pension to Otis A. Barlow, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2272); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3032) granting a pension to Samuel J., Christopher, and Jane Vickers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2273); 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. 5206) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wheeler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2274); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5065) granting a pension to Jemima McClure, reported the same without amendment, acccompanied by a report (No. 2275); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4064) granting an increase of pension to Betsey Gumm reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2276); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14205) granting an increase of pension to John Hendrick—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10543) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbel—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPRON (for Mr. BULL): A bill (H. R. 14761) for the purchase or construction of four or more submarine torpedo

boats of the most improved design—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 14762) amending section 963, chapter 22, of the code of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 14763) to reimburse the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in 1864 for militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 14764) to establish United States courts at Wilkesboro, N. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14777) for the judicial ascertainment of claims against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A resolution (H. Res. 278) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish to the House what salary or other compensation has been paid to Gen. Leonard A. Wood, late governor-general of Cuba—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TONGUE: A resolution (H. Res. 279) granting the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands leave to print—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 14765) granting a pension to Thomas Cory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14766) granting an increase of pension to John B. Ellett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 14767) granting an increase of pension to Boston Dillion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14768) granting a pension to Edgar Woolfolk—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14769) granting a pension to Mary S. Downey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 14770) for the relief of James S. Harber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 14771) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. J. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14772) for the relief of John Hale—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 14773) granting an increase of pension to James W. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 14774) granting a pension to John C. Clarke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 14775) granting an increase of pension to Conrad G. Boehme—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14776) granting an increase of pension to John McVicar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 14778) granting an increase of pension to Marcena C. S. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A resolution (H. Res. 275) to equalize the pay of the conductors of the elevator in the House wing of the old Library space—to the Committee on Accounts.

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. BALL: Sundry petitions of posts of the Grand Army of the Republic of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Minnesota, Montana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and Indian and Oklahoma Territories, urging the passage of House bill 13986, to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: Resolutions of Republican County Committee of Westchester County, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of North American Gymnastic Unions, of Pittsburg, East Pittsburg, and Allentown, Pa., in regard to House bill 12199—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of O. B. Rice Post, No. 71, Department of Wisconsin, favoring House bill 13986, to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of Third Ward Democratic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of Warham Easley, of Loudon County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Martha P. Underwood, to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the record of John Underwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of James S. Gleghorn, vice-president of Pennsylvania Drug Clerks' Association, Allegheny, Pa., favoring the adoption of the metric system as the standard of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Eli Hemphill Post, No. 135, of Tarentum, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring a bill to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of St. Stanislawa Kostka Polish Society, of Carnegie, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of criers and bailiffs of the United States courts in the eastern district of Pennsylvania, asking for the passage of Senate bill 5735, relating to the compensation of certain officers in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of Ernest Stalhuth, of Columbus, Ind., in support of House bill 123, for the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring a reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of James Gordon, of Augusta County, Va., asking that his claim be referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of numerous citizens of the State of Kentucky, in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 14323, granting a pension to A. Hausman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to James W. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Resolution of Sacred Heart of Jesus Society, No. 1, Polish Alliance, Chicago, Ill., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski, at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Evidence in support of House bill 14439, granting a pension to Franklin Peale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUMPLE: Petition of Buffalo (Iowa) Turn Verein, protesting against the passage of House bill 12199 in its present form—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of the State of Kentucky, in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of Westchester County Republican Committee, of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May 29, 1902.*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

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

INAUGURATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticutt) laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of State; which was read, and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, May 28, 1902.*

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE,
President pro tempore United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of an attested copy of the Senate's resolutions of May 21, 1902, reading as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America*, That the Senate views with satisfaction and expresses congratulation at the appearance of the Cuban Republic among the nations of the world.