SENATE.

TUESDAY, *November 17, 1903.*

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

ANSELM J. MCLAURIN, a Senator from the State of Mississippi; JOSEPH H. MILLARD, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, and JAMES P. TALIAFERRO, a Senator from the State of Florida, appeared in their seats to-day.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Journal will stand approved. The Chair hears none. It is approved.

MIDWAY ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of a letter from Mr. George G. Ward, vice-president and general manager of the Commercial Pacific Cable Company, requesting the enactment of certain legislation for the relief of the conditions in the Midway Islands by providing appropriations for the establishment of a suitable harbor, buoys, and light-house; for the construction of landing facilities, and for the establishment of marines or other guards to maintain order and enforce the laws at that place; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of the Michigan Hay Association, of Owosso, Mich., and a petition of the National Hay Association, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of George F. Dimond, president of the Michigan Hay Dealers' Association, of Mayville, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Epworth League of Henderson, of the Temperance Alliance of Henderson, of sundry citizens of West Bay City, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Henderson, and of sundry citizens of Douglas, all in the State of Michigan, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Bellevue; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Newville; of the congregation of the South Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wilkinsburg; of the congregation of the Christian Church of Bellevue; of the congregation of the Episcopal Church of Bellevue; of the congregation of the Methodist Protestant Church of Bellevue; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Bellevue; of the United Presbyterian Seminary, of Allegheny; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bellevue; of Class E, Organization of the Patterson Memorial Presbyterian Sunday School, of Philadelphia; of sundry citizens of Philadelphia; of the Evangelical Association of Rochester; of sundry citizens of Morris Run; of the congregation of the Evangelical Church of Connellsville; of sundry citizens of Somerton; of the congregation of the First Lutheran Church of Altoona; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Connellsville; of the Prohibition Alliance of Meadville; of the session of the First Presbyterian Church of Shenandoah; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Mahanoy City; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Reedsville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cochranville; of the congregation of the United Evangelical Church of Milton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lake Pleasant; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Oxford, and of sundry citizens of Milesburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Berlin; of the Epworth League of Mount Vernon; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Broadalbin; of the East Wayne Christian Endeavor Union, of Wayne County; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Findley Lake; of sundry citizens of Arkport; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mina; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Westchester; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Williamson; of the Christian Endeavor Society of Syracuse; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Elba; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of North Elba; of sundry citizens of Northfield; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Chazy; of sundry citizens of Islip; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Islip; of the congregation of the Sixth Avenue Baptist Church, of Troy; of the congregation of the Third Avenue Church of Christ, of Troy; of the congregation of the Memorial Baptist Church, of Troy; of the congregation of the Grace Methodist Church, of Troy; of the congregation of the English Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, of Troy; of the Young Men's Christian Association of Troy; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Troy; of the Christian Endeavor Society of Jasper; of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of Seneca Castle; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Arkport; of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal churches and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jasper; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Union Springs; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bay Shore; of the Woman's Branch of the City Missions of Brooklyn; of sundry citizens of Islip; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Smithtown; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Smithtown; of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Bay Shore; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Islip; of the Presbytery of Brooklyn; of sundry citizens of Brooklyn; of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of Brooklyn; of sundry citizens of Northport; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Syracuse; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Montgomery; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Montgomery; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Troy; of sundry citizens of Grumville; of the congregation of the Geddes Congregational Church, of Syracuse; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Syracuse; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lawrence; of the congregation of the University Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Syracuse; of the congregation of the Olivet Baptist Church, of Syracuse; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Stamford; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Auburn; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Stillwater; of the Young Men's Christian Association of Rochester; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Plattekill; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Port Jervis; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Williamson; of the Epworth League of Stamford; of the congregation of the First German Baptist Church of Rochester; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Plain; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cohocton; of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sandy Hill; of sundry citizens of Mount Vernon; of the congregation of the New York Presbyterian Church, of New York City; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Cohocton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Horseheads; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Cohocton; of the Christian Endeavor Society of Atlanta; of sundry citizens of New York City; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Pulaski; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pulaski; of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Pulaski; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Rochester; of the congregation of the Methodist Protestant Church of Gerry; of sundry citizens of Stamford; of the congregation of the Free Baptist Church of Horseheads; of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of Hornellsville; of the congregation of the Brighton Heights Reformed Church, of New Brighton; of the Brighton Heights Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of New York City; of sundry citizens of New Brighton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hopewell; of the Woman's Synodical Society of Hudson; of sundry citizens of Verona; of sundry citizens of Hornellsville; of sundry citizens of Arkport; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Wolcott; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Waterloo; of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Baptist Church of Esperance; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Flycreek; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Sherman; of sundry citizens of New York City; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Seneca; of the Epworth League of New York City; of the congregation of St. James Church, of New York City; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oneida County; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rockland County; of the Ladies' Aid Society of the Lenox Church, of New York City; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hobart; of sundry citizens of Rockland County; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rochester; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Buffalo; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Tyrone; of the Prohibition Alliance of Perry; of the Ries Park Baptist Mission, of Rochester; of sundry citizens of Otsego; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bedford; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Madison County; of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the Mount Kisco Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Bedford; of the E. F. Lord Union Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of New York City; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Buffalo; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Katonah; of sundry citizens of Patterson; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Waterloo; of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Westchester Presbytery; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of North Salem; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Seneca; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Edward; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Canisteo; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Canisteo; of the Independent Order of Good Templars of Orleans; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Perry; of sundry citizens of West Galway; of sundry citizens of Thiells; of sundry citizens of Southeast; of the Presbyterian Church of Yorktown; of the Woman's Missionary Society of Yorktown; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kendall; of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Kanona; of the Epworth League of Fly Creek; of the King's Daughters Circle of the Lenox Presbyterian Church, of New York City; of the congregation of the Lake Avenue Baptist Church, of Rochester; of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Lenox Presbyterian Church, of New York City; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Montgomery; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Mount Vernon; of the Society of Friends of Milton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mount Vernon; of sundry citizens of Mount Vernon; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Stamford; of sundry citizens of Poughkeepsie; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Westfield; of sundry citizens of Redlands; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cohocton; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Walworth; of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Gasport; of the Society of Christian Endeavor of the Baptist Church of Christ, of Poughkeepsie; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Poughkeepsie; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westerleigh; of the Christian Endeavor Society of Clinton; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Carmel; of sundry citizens of Stamford, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Richmond County, all in the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Atlas Lumber and Shingle Company, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 71, Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 71, Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Mount Vernon, Wash., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbia, Wash., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DRYDEN presented petitions of the congregation of the Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church, of Camden; of the Frances Willard Union of Camden; of the congregation of the Calvary Methodist Protestant Church, of Camden, and of the congregation of the Bethel Methodist Episcopal Church, of Camden, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BALL presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Camden and Wyoming; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Newcastle; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wyoming; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Camden; of the congregation of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wilmington; of the Sunday School Association of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wilmington; of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wilmington; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Marshallton; of the Good Templars of Marshallton; of the Knights of Pythias of Marshallton; of the Knights of the Golden Eagle of Marshallton; of the Degree of Honor of Marshallton; of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Dover, and of Capital Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dover, all in the State of Delaware, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FULTON presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, and of the Sunday school of the Friends Church of Salem, Oreg., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BARD presented a petition of General George A. Custer Council, No. 22, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present an address to Congress adopted by the National Convention of Insurance Commissioners, held at Baltimore, desiring to bring to the attention of Congress certain matters, and also a letter addressed to me from the insurance commissioner of the State of Missouri. It is in regard to the get-rich-quick companies—fraudulent companies in the United States, and postal facilities that are afforded them in some instances. I move that the papers be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads for their consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of Local Union No. 399, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Vincennes, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a reduction of 20 per cent on all goods coming from Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 19, International Printing Pressmen's Union, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 19, International Printing Pressmen's Union, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TELLER. I present sundry petitions from citizens of Colorado, praying that there may be an investigation of the right of Senator SMOOT, of Utah, to a seat in the Senate. I wish to say that I have examined these petitions and none of them ask for his expulsion. They simply ask that the Senate will inquire whether he is a polygamist and living in violation of the statutes of the United States, and, if such shall be the fact, that he may be expelled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Milton; of the congregation of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Wilkinson; of the congregation of the St. Paul Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Newville; of the congregation of the Third Presbyterian Church of Washington; of the Young Ladies' Missionary Society of the Third Presbyterian Church of Washington; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Washington; of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Third Presbyterian Church of Washington; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Sheridanville; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Monaca; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Sheridanville; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Sheridanville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sheridanville; of the congregation of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church of Pittsburg; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Vandling, and of the congregation of the Big Spring Presbyterian Church, of Newville; all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of the Ladies' Missionary Society of the First and Second Presbyterian churches of Peekskill, of sundry citizens of Berlin, of sundry citizens of Dobbs Ferry, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Binghamton, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Islip, of the Presbyterian Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Arsport, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West New Brighton, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Shawangunk, of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbytery of Geneva, and of the congregation of the Friends Church of Union Springs, all in the State of New York, praying for an examination of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. McCUMBER presented the memorial of Adam Sprafka

and sundry citizens of Minto, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Economic Club, of Washington, D. C., praying for the reorganization of the Bureau of Labor; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 1238) granting an increase of pension to Sarah V. Rearick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. HAWLEY) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to John Adamson;

A bill (S. 1240) granting a pension to Emma E. Taylor;

A bill (S. 1241) granting an increase of pension to Hamlet F. Roberts;

A bill (S. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Davis; and

A bill (S. 1243) granting a pension to Mary McLean Wyllys.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1244) granting a pension to Sue Stevens Eskridge; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1245) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of David S. Cox; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 1246) granting a pension to John Slayton;

A bill (S. 1247) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hall (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1248) to increase rate of pension paid for gunshot wounds, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1249) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Bay (with an accompanying paper).

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

A bill (S. 1250) granting a pension to William Schall;

A bill (S. 1251) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Harvey;

A bill (S. 1252) granting an increase of pension to William O. Eagle;

A bill (S. 1253) granting a pension to Abigail Campbell;

A bill (S. 1254) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bodkin;

A bill (S. 1255) granting an increase of pension to John N. Rounder; and

A bill (S. 1256) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Crull.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1257) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George F. Harter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1258) to amend the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1259) granting an increase of pension to John M. Stanyan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLACKBURN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1260) to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of army officers in certain cases, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 1261) to amend sections 3894 and 3929 of the Revised Statutes and the first section of the act of Congress of March 2, 1895, chapter 191, entitled "An act for the suppression of lottery traffic through national and interstate commerce and the postal service, subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the United States," so as to apply the provisions of existing laws to letters, postal cards, circulars, pamphlets, and publications concerning any business of and contracts and policies of life, fire, or other insurance transmitted into any State, District, or Territory by concerns or persons not authorized to transact such business in the State, District, or Territory from which the same are transmitted; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. DRYDEN. I ask permission to state that this bill is introduced by request. At the convention of the officials of the several insurance departments of the States recently held at Baltimore a committee was appointed to prepare a bill and a memorial to Congress for the purpose of preventing the use of the mails by fraudulent insurance companies.

I wish to make it distinctly clear that this bill and the memorial were not prepared by or in the interest of any company or set of companies or for any system of insurance, but the committee of that convention, in which were represented twenty-nine States of the Union, and which speaks for the officials of the various insurance departments, prepared the bill and memorial. The committee consisted of the insurance commissioners of the State of Tennessee, the State of Michigan, the State of Indiana, the State of Ohio, the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of Vermont. It is, therefore, an act of public interest.

I move that the bill be referred, with the accompanying memorial, to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads; and I wish to state to the committee that at a later day and at the proper time the committee of the national convention of insurance commissioners will ask to be heard upon the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A bill (S. 1262) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased;

A bill (S. 1263) for the relief of John Zimmerman;

A bill (S. 1264) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Jane Elizabeth Rodes;

A bill (S. 1265) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.;

A bill (S. 1266) for the relief of the heirs of C. C. Moore, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1267) for the relief of Davidson County, in the State of Tennessee.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 1268) for the relief of James Denton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 1269) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Martin (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1270) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hollingsworth (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1271) granting an increase of pension to Lucius S. Bowman (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 1272) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Rollins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 1273) to validate certain certificates of soldiers' additional homestead right; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 1274) to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of army officers in certain cases, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1275) granting an increase of pension to Herbert N. Robinson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 1276) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza E. Hebert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 1277) granting a pension to Reuben F. Canterbury; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1278) to provide for the erection of buildings for an immigrant station at the port of San Francisco, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

A bill (S. 1279) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Barr;

A bill (S. 1280) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilfong;

A bill (S. 1281) granting an increase of pension to John H. Martens; and

A bill (S. 1282) granting an increase of pension to William Stitzer.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1283) for the relief of William H. Crawford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1284) to restore to the active list of the Navy the name of Talleyrand Desaix Myers; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1285) to correct the military record of William Harper; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1286) for the relief of the Old Dominion Granite Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1287) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 1288) granting a pension to John F. Kline;
A bill (S. 1289) granting a pension to Andrew J. McWade;
A bill (S. 1290) granting a pension to Thomas Madden;
A bill (S. 1291) granting a pension to John G. B. Masters;
A bill (S. 1292) granting a pension to Maria L. Meserve;
A bill (S. 1293) granting a pension to Thomas M. Moore;
A bill (S. 1294) granting a pension to Archie Nunnelly;
A bill (S. 1295) granting a pension to Morgan O'Brien;
A bill (S. 1296) granting a pension to John E. Page;
A bill (S. 1297) granting a pension to Luther B. Paxon;
A bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Robert N. Pollock;
A bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to John M. Reimer;
A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Milton Reynolds;
A bill (S. 1301) granting a pension to Thomas B. Roark;
A bill (S. 1302) granting a pension to O. Gustave Roedel;
A bill (S. 1303) granting a pension to Mary P. Scovel;
A bill (S. 1304) granting a pension to Upton T. Smith;
A bill (S. 1305) granting a pension to Henry Stutsman;
A bill (S. 1306) granting a pension to John D. Thomas;
A bill (S. 1307) granting a pension to William C. Thoms;
A bill (S. 1308) granting a pension to Thomas Tobens;
A bill (S. 1309) granting a pension to Daniel L. Tracy;
A bill (S. 1310) granting a pension to Ella C. Tupper;
A bill (S. 1311) granting a pension to Henry Wagner;
A bill (S. 1312) granting a pension to Jacob D. Walter;
A bill (S. 1313) granting a pension to George R. Warner;
A bill (S. 1314) granting a pension to Reuben B. Weiser;
A bill (S. 1315) granting a pension to George W. Williford;
A bill (S. 1316) granting a pension to Aaron Wood; and
A bill (S. 1317) granting a pension to Henry A. F. Worth.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1318) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Frank A. Land; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 1319) authorizing Robert A. Chapman, of Alabama, his associates and assigns, to use the waters of the Coosa River, in Alabama, for the purpose of generating electricity; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1320) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Auburn, in the State of Maine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

TREATIES, LAWS, ETC., RELATING TO INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 452, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Treaties, Laws, Executive Orders, etc., relating to Indian Affairs," as revised, 300 of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 800 for the House of Representatives, 200 for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 50 for the House Committee on Indian Affairs, 50 for the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and the remaining 1,100 shall be sold by the superintendent of documents.

DELAWARE RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. KEAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the Delaware River between Trenton, N. J., and Philadelphia, Pa., with a view to deepening the channel to 17 feet, and to submit an estimate of the cost at the earliest date practicable.

CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS AND PAPERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] proposing an amendment to the rules. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. HOAR, as follows:

An amendment intended to be proposed to Rule XXXVI of the Senate.

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended by adding at the end of Rule XXXVI the following:

"V. Whenever by the request of the Senate, or any committee thereof, any documents or papers shall be communicated to the Senate by the President or the head of any Department relating to any matter pending in the Senate, the proceedings in regard to which are secret or confidential under the rules, said documents and papers shall be considered as confidential and shall not be disclosed without leave of the Senate."

Mr. HOAR. I move that the proposed amendment be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. I simply desired to know what the motion was. I could not hear it. The Chair has stated it. It is all right.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. If there is no further morning business, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. PENROSE. There are a number of nominations which I should like to report to the Senate from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HALE. Then I will change the motion, or the Senator from Pennsylvania can make it.

Mr. PENROSE. Very well. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine withdraw his motion?

Mr. HALE. I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, November 18, 1903, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 17, 1903.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

James C. McReynolds, of Tennessee, to be Assistant Attorney-General.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Daniel Thew Wright, of Ohio, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER.

Alford Warriner Cooley, of New York, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

CHIEF EXAMINER, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Frank M. Kiggins, of Tennessee, to be chief examiner of the Civil Service Commission.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF CORPORATIONS.

Herbert Knox Smith, of Hartford, Conn., to be deputy commissioner of corporations in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

David M. Little, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Salem and Beverly, in the State of Massachusetts.

TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

William H. Pope, of New Mexico, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico.

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

E. Finley Jonnson, of Michigan, to be an associate justice of the supreme court of the Philippine Islands, provided for in the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes."

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

William C. Hook, of Kansas, now serving as United States district judge for the district of Kansas, to be United States circuit judge for the eighth judicial circuit.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

John G. Foster, of Vermont, to be consul-general of the United States at Ottawa, Canada.

CONSULS.

Luther T. Ellsworth, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Cartagena, Colombia.

Christopher H. Payne, of West Virginia, to be consul of the United States at St. Thomas, West Indies.

Alfred L. M. Gottschalk, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Callao, Peru.

Charles N. Daniels, of Connecticut, to be consul of the United States at Sheffield, England.

Pierre Paul Demers, of New Hampshire, to be consul of the United States at Port Limon, Costa Rica.

Edward Higgins, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Berne, Switzerland.

Urbain J. Ledoux, of Maine, to be consul of the United States at Prague, Austria.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Sherman T. McPherson, of Ohio, to be attorney of the United States for the southern district of Ohio.

John P. Nields, of Delaware, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Delaware.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Howard M. Broadbent to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. Francis M. Dunwoody to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. Howard Emery to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. Daniel P. Foley to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. John G. Berry to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Claude S. Cochran to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Colin S. Craig to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Samuel P. Edmonds to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. John Boedeker to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

George L. Collins, of Massachusetts, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Edward Maples Steger, of Texas, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Harvey G. Ebert, of Washington, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

William M. Wightman, of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

MARSHALS.

Henry W. Mayo, of Maine, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Maine.

Horace W. Bailey, of Vermont, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Vermont.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

E. J. Brooks to be postmaster at Juneau, in the Territory of Alaska.

ARIZONA.

Fred E. Cadwell to be postmaster at Douglas, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona.

ARKANSAS.

Arthur Deland to be postmaster at Black Rock, in the county of Lawrence and State of Arkansas.

James A. Maxwell to be postmaster at Lake Village, in the county of Chicot and State of Arkansas.

Mary J. Smith to be postmaster at Lewisville (late New Lewisville), in the county of Lafayette and State of Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA.

Roy R. Giffen to be postmaster at Fowler, in the county of Fresno and State of California.

Samuel W. Metcalf to be postmaster at Sisson, in the county of Siskiyou and State of California.

Catherine T. Ryan to be postmaster at Gilroy, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California.

Nels A. Thompson to be postmaster at Newman, in the county of Stanislaus and State of California.

Daniel R. Trout to be postmaster at Boulder Creek, in the county of Santa Cruz and State of California.

George Watterson to be postmaster at Bishop, in the county of Inyo and State of California.

William F. Wulf to be postmaster at Crescent City, in the county of Del Norte and State of California.

CONNECTICUT.

John A. Ayer to be postmaster at Saybrook, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

Levi O. Chittenden to be postmaster at Guilford, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Billious C. Hall to be postmaster at Union City, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Frank A. Hefflon to be postmaster at Deep River, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

James R. Meigs to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Jacob Widmer to be postmaster at New Hartford, in the county of Litchfield and State of Connecticut.

DELAWARE.

Carroll S. Fisher to be postmaster at Wyoming, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware.

John P. Steward to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware.

GEORGIA.

Cicero C. Alexander to be postmaster at Commerce, late Harmony Grove, in the county of Jackson and State of Georgia.

Sarah J. Anthony to be postmaster at Shellman, in the county of Randolph and State of Georgia.

William O. Bagwell to be postmaster at Lytle, in the county of Walker and State of Georgia.

William O. De Loache to be postmaster at Talbotton, in the county of Talbot and State of Georgia.

Anna P. Grimsley to be postmaster at Cochran, in the county of Pulaski and State of Georgia.

Charles E. Murphy to be postmaster at Waycross, in the county of Ware and State of Georgia.

HAWAII.

Vetle A. Vetlesen to be postmaster at Wailuku, Maui Island, Hawaii.

Mabel R. Woods to be postmaster at Kohala, in the Territory of Hawaii.

ILLINOIS.

Frank M. Cauger to be postmaster at Granite City (late Granite), in the county of Madison and State of Illinois.

William A. Collins to be postmaster at Western Springs, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Albert S. Corl to be postmaster at Nunda, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois.

Charles A. Gregory to be postmaster at Lovington, in the county of Moultrie and State of Illinois.

Herman F. Middendorf to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Randolph and State of Illinois.

Frederick W. Morrison to be postmaster at Berwyn, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Frank Morrell to be postmaster at Pawnee, in the county of Sangamon and State of Illinois.

John S. Nicholson to be postmaster at Beardstown, in the county of Cass and State of Illinois.

Frederick W. Obermiller to be postmaster at Mount Pulaski, in the county of Logan and State of Illinois.

Frank L. Paine to be postmaster at Xenia, in the county of Clay and State of Illinois.

John F. Regan to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, in the county of Brown and State of Illinois.

George E. Swanson to be postmaster at Woodhull, in the county of Henry and State of Illinois.

Allen H. Webster to be postmaster at Cuba, in the county of Fulton and State of Illinois.

George E. Wiedman to be postmaster at Zion City, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.

John Yost to be postmaster at Eldorado, in the county of Saline and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

John Perry to be postmaster at Kramer, in the county of Warren and State of Indiana.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

John E. Bruin to be postmaster at Bristow, in the Cherokee Nation, Ind. T.

Harland J. Butler to be postmaster at Miami, in the Ottawa Nation, Ind. T.

Philip K. Connaway to be postmaster at Minco, in the Chickasaw Nation, Ind. T.

Charles J. Lane to be postmaster at McAlester, in the Choctaw Nation, Ind. T.

Arthur I. Morgan to be postmaster at Bartlesville, in the Cherokee Nation, Ind. T.

Enoch Needham to be postmaster at Hugo, in the Choctaw Nation, Ind. T.

John A. Porter to be postmaster at Tishomingo, in Chickasaw Nation and Indian Territory.

Flavyous J. Sullivan to be postmaster at Pryor Creek, in the Cherokee Nation, Ind. T.

IOWA.

Charles H. Austin to be postmaster at Lineville, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa.

James Beard to be postmaster at Mount Ayr, in the county of Ringgold and State of Iowa.

Alonzo Bryson to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Scott and State of Iowa.

Alice M. Davis to be postmaster at Bonaparte, in the county of Van Buren and State of Iowa.

Walter Gillrup to be postmaster at Northwood, in the county of Worth and State of Iowa.

Henry P. Gow to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Adair and State of Iowa.

Nathan O. Hickenlooper to be postmaster at Blockton, in the county of Taylor and State of Iowa.

J. J. Marsh to be postmaster at Decorah, in the county of Winneshiek and State of Iowa.

Minnie A. Muhs to be postmaster at Akron, in the county of Plymouth and State of Iowa.

Peter S. Narum to be postmaster at Waukon, in the county of Allamakee and State of Iowa.

Robert P. Osier to be postmaster at Clarion, in the county of Wright and State of Iowa.

Jacob E. Palmer to be postmaster at Hawkeye, in the county of Fayette and State of Iowa.

Lambert J. Rogers to be postmaster at Allison, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa.

Frank C. Traverse to be postmaster at Bloomfield, in the county of Davis and State of Iowa.

George W. Wiltse to be postmaster at Montezuma, in the county of Poweshiek and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

George W. Hill to be postmaster at Douglass, in the county of Butler and State of Kansas.

Frank W. Johnson to be postmaster at Larned, in the county of Pawnee and State of Kansas.

Roberta H. McBlain to be postmaster at Fort Riley, in the county of Geary and State of Kansas.

J. Frank Smith to be postmaster at Pleasanton, in the county of Linn and State of Kansas.

Joseph A. Whitehair to be postmaster at Chapman, in the county of Dickinson and State of Kansas.

MAINE.

William W. Brown to be postmaster at Bowdoinham, in the county of Sagadahoc and State of Maine.

Irving W. Case to be postmaster at Lubec, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

Lindley H. Folsom to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine.

Frank E. Monroe to be postmaster at Milo, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine.

Stephen B. Thurlow to be postmaster at Stonington, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Festus G. Amsden to be postmaster at Athol, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Alfred G. Cone to be postmaster at Haydenville, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

George W. Cutting to be postmaster at Weston, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Ralph W. Emerson to be postmaster of Chelmsford, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Frank A. Fales to be postmaster at Norwood, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Fred A. Hanaford to be postmaster at South Lancaster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Herbert M. Howard to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Stephen C. Luce to be postmaster at Vineyard Haven, in the county of Dukes and State of Massachusetts.

Harriet M. Mudge to be postmaster at Bedford, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

John F. Phipps to be postmaster at Hopkinton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Edward F. Shaw to be postmaster at Three Rivers, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

Mary C. Smith to be postmaster at Wellesley Hills, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Frank M. Tripp to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Charles H. Webster to be postmaster at Northfield, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

MISSOURI.

Andrew J. Robison to be postmaster at Liberty, in the county of Clay and State of Missouri.

Frank Wyman to be postmaster at St. Louis, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri.

MONTANA.

Lewis Coleman to be postmaster at Deer Lodge, in the county of Powell and State of Montana.

Clarence R. Lane to be postmaster at Forsyth, in the county of Rosebud and State of Montana.

John R. Stout to be postmaster at Glendive, in the county of Dawson and State of Montana.

NEVADA.

Herman C. Sommer to be postmaster at Lovelocks, in the county of Humboldt and State of Nevada.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Andrew J. Hook to be postmaster at Warner, in the county of Merrimac and State of New Hampshire.

Forrest E. Page to be postmaster at Raymond, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire.

NEW MEXICO.

Fred O. Blood to be postmaster at Las Vegas (late East Las Vegas), in the county of San Miguel and Territory of New Mexico.

Albert R. Carter to be postmaster at Tucumcari, in the county of Quay and Territory of New Mexico.

John M. Hawkins to be postmaster at Alamogordo, in the county of Otero and Territory of New Mexico.

OREGON.

Carlton E. Harmon to be postmaster at Grants Pass, in the county of Josephine and State of Oregon.

Hiram F. Murdoch to be postmaster at Klamath Falls, in the county of Klamath and State of Oregon.

Wallace W. Smead to be postmaster at Heppner, in the county of Morrow and State of Oregon.

PORTO RICO.

Augusto Font to be postmaster at Aguadilla, in the county of Aguadilla, P. R.

RHODE ISLAND.

John B. Landers to be postmaster at Jamestown, in the county of Newport and State of Rhode Island.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Bayard T. Boylan to be postmaster at Armour, in the county of Douglas and State of South Dakota.

John J. Mansfield to be postmaster at Hurley, in the county of Turner and State of South Dakota.

Eva M. Young to be postmaster at Faulkton, in the county of Faulk and State of South Dakota.

TEXAS.

James A. Butler to be postmaster at Troup, in the county of Smith and State of Texas.

W. E. Connelly to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hill and State of Texas.

Ellie V. Flanagan to be postmaster at Henderson, in the county of Rusk and State of Texas.

Albert L. Gibson to be postmaster at Guffey, in the county of Jefferson and State of Texas.

UTAH.

Samuel Judd to be postmaster at St. George, in the county of Washington and State of Utah.

WISCONSIN.

William H. Berray to be postmaster at Wautoma, in the county of Waushara and State of Wisconsin.

Thomas W. Claridge to be postmaster at Reedsburg, in the county of Sauk and State of Wisconsin.

Albert E. Edwards to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin.

Gertrude Frazier to be postmaster at Viola, in the county of Richland and State of Wisconsin.

Edith L. Maynard to be postmaster at Sheboygan, in the county of Sheboygan and State of Wisconsin.

Sutcliffe Parkin to be postmaster at Mazomanie, in the county of Dane and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *November 17, 1903.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

CORRECTIONS.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct the Journal. The RECORD is correct, but the Journal, which states, according to the reading by the Clerk, that CHOICE B. RANDELL, of the Tenth district of Texas, was sworn in yesterday, is not correct. I am from the Fourth district of Texas, was not sworn in

yesterday, but was sworn in on the first day of the session. I understand the Hon. JOSEPH E. RANSDELL, of Louisiana, was sworn in yesterday. I wish to correct the Journal in that respect.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Fowler, the Chair is informed, is present and desires to take the oath.

Mr. Fowler came forward to the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. Brundidge, from the Second district of Arkansas, is present and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. Brundidge came forward to the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 8.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of that portion of the Columbia River between Tongue Point and Fort Stevens, Oreg., commonly known and designated as the Astoria Harbor, with a view to widening and deepening the channel and permanently improving said harbor, and to submit a plan and estimate for such improvement.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 9.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of removing Starr Rock, Bellingham Bay, Washington, in accordance with the recommendations heretofore made and filed with the War Department.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 10.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and estimates to be submitted of the cost of dredging and otherwise improving the harbor of South Bend, Willapa Harbor, Washington, so as to meet the demands of commerce.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 11.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Chehalis River, Washington, between Aberdeen and Montesano, to meet the demands of commerce.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 12.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the Delaware River, between Trenton, N. J., and Philadelphia, Pa., with a view of deepening the channel of 17 feet, and to submit an estimate of the cost at the earliest date practicable.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 8:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of that portion of the Columbia River between Tongue Point and Fort Stevens, Oreg., commonly known and designated as the Astoria Harbor, with a view to widening and deepening the channel and permanently improving said harbor, and to submit a plan and estimate for such improvement—

to the Committee on River and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 9:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of removing Starr Rock, Bellingham Bay, Washington, in accordance with the recommendations heretofore made and filed with the War Department—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 10:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and estimates to be submitted of the cost of dredging and otherwise improving the harbor of South Bend, Willapa Harbor, Washington, so as to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 11:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Chehalis River, Washington, between Aberdeen and Montesano, to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 12:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the Delaware River, between Trenton, N. J., and Philadelphia, Pa., with a view of deepening the channel of 17 feet, and to submit an estimate of the cost at the earliest date practicable—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

CUBA.

The SPEAKER. In pursuance of the resolution adopted yesterday the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1921, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1921, the title of which will be announced by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows;

A bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KNAPP].

Mr. KNAPP. Mr. Chairman, the United States during the past five years has had new duties to perform and problems to solve by reason of the war with Spain. The results accomplished in performing those duties and solving those problems have been greater than were ever accomplished for a similar purpose and during an equal period of time by any other nation.

The war with Spain created a new era in history, gave a new rank to the United States, added a new glory to the flag, taught other peoples how to make war for humanity's sake, and awoke the nations of the Old World to the fact that the United States was a world-wide power.

The causes which led to that war are too familiar to need recall except to say that they were such as, in the judgment of the civilized world, justified this Government and nation in an appeal to arms. President McKinley and those associated with him in the administration of the Government, with humane purpose, made every honorable effort to right the wrongs of Cuba and still avert armed conflict. Possibly those efforts might have prevailed had it not been for the crime of the *Maine;* but if ever there had been a possibility of securing justice for Cuba without a resort to arms, that calamity destroyed the possibility and made war, with all its trials and results, a certainty.

War came, victory followed, and the nation stood face to face with new and untried responsibilities. Some were bidden; others were not; all were ours.

But there is no question in the government of peoples that can not be safely intrusted to the American nation. And so all the results growing out of the war with Spain have been accepted and all are being and will continue to be worked out for the advancement of peoples who have never known the blessings of good government and for the credit of the American name and the lasting honor of the American nation.

RESULTS OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN.

As one of the results of that conflict Cuba became a temporary dependency of the United States. We said to the people of that, one of the fairest isles of the seas, "We have given you liberty from the tyranny of Spanish rule; we will add to that the blessings of self-government." As a means of redeeming this promise the United States instituted in the island of Cuba a military government, which began on the 13th day of December, 1898, and ended on the 20th day of May, 1902, when the government of the island was turned over to the duly constituted authorities of the Cuban Republic. During our occupancy of Cuba we pacified her people, stimulated her industries, gave her a splendid school system, and taught her the blessings of education, in which center the hope of any people. We projected railways, improved her harbors, built up her waste places, advanced her trade and commerce, and pointed her the way to industrial prosperity. In short, we rescued her from a tyrant's rule, led her in paths of peace, gave her self-government, and welcomed her to the galaxy of nations.

History bears no record of a promise more unselfish and a fulfillment more generous. All of this commands the gratitude of a people whose dream of liberty has been made a reality and challenges the admiration of every civilized nation of the world.

But all of this did not measure our full responsibility to Cuba and her people. There was then and there is now no rule of right by which we could or can abandon Cuba to her fate. Every dictate of justice and national honor demands "that Cuba shall still be sheltered by the American flag." To give her self-government we gave of our treasure and blood. To make that Government stable and insure her future we must aid, as far as possible, in securing to her industrial prosperity. This we can do by granting her reciprocal trade relations, and that without injuring a single one of our manifold industries. That was one of the purposes of the attempted legislation in the Fifty-seventh Congress, but which failed of enactment; that is one of the purposes of the treaty negotiated by the President, ratified by the Senate, and now before the House for its concurrent action.

That treaty, of which the bill now before the House is the enabling act necessary to make the same operative, provides, in substance, as follows:

Article 1 provides that all articles of merchandise being the product of the soil or industry of the United States and the Republic of Cuba and now imported from one country to the other free of duty shall so continue to be admitted as free of duty.

Articles 2 and 3 provide that all articles of merchandise not included in article 1 being the product of the soil or industry of the United States or the Republic of Cuba and imported from one country into the other shall be admitted at a reduction of 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon as provided by the tariff laws of the respective countries.

Article 4 provides that certain articles of merchandise especially enumerated and described and being the product of the soil or industry of the United States imported into Cuba shall be admitted at the respective reductions of 25 per cent, 30 per cent, and 40 per cent of the rates of duty thereon provided by the tariff of the Republic of Cuba.

Article 8 provides that the rates of duty provided for by the treaty, both on the part of the United States and Cuba, being preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries, and also that while "the rates of duty herein granted by the United States to the Republic of Cuba are and shall continue during the term of this convention preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries in return for said preferential rates of duty granted to the Republic of Cuba by the United States, it is agreed that the concession herein granted on the part of the said Republic of Cuba to the products of the United States shall be likewise, and shall continue during the term of this convention, preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries: *Provided*, That while this convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater that 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, and no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897."

Article 11 provides that the treaty shall continue in force for at least the period of five years.

TREATY ONE OF RECIPROCITY.

This treaty provides for reciprocal trade relations between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on terms and conditions intended to be beneficial to both countries; in other words, it is a treaty of reciprocity.

The criticism made by some who have preceded me that it is inconsistent with the policy of a protective tariff is not well founded. To the principle of a protective tariff the Republican party stands to-day, as it has in the past, irrevocably committed. Through that principle, enacted into tariff laws, it has given this nation an industrial policy which has developed agriculture, dotted hills and valleys with manufacturing industries, employed labor, veined the continent with railways, vexed the waters of the deep with fleets which convey the products of our greatness to every nation and clime, and through it all has led the nation along a pathway of industrial prosperity never equaled by any other nation since time begun. Whenever changed commercial and industrial conditions have or may indicate the wisdom of a thorough revision of the tariff laws, such revision has been and doubtless will be made, and if made by the Republican party will, like its revision of the tariffs in the past, have as basic principle not free trade, not tariff for revenue only, but just protection for American industries, labor, and homes. [Applause.]

The treaty under discussion is in no way inconsistent with this Republican principle of protection, but, on the contrary, is in exact accord and compliance with it.

The present tariff law authorizes the President to enter into reciprocity treaties with other nations which may reduce duties of the present law 20 per cent from those fixed in the original act. It is under the express authority conferred by that provision of the Dingley tariff law that this treaty has been negotiated by the President, concurred in by the Senate, and is now before the House for action.

It is not an attempted revision of the schedules of the tariff law, except for the purpose of trade relations with Cuba. That was clearly set forth in the message of the President on reciprocity with Cuba, transmitted to the Fifty-seventh Congress on June 13, 1902. In that message the President said:

The question as to which, if any, of the different schedules of the tariff ought most properly to be revised does not enter into this matter in any way or shape. We are concerned with getting a friendly reciprocal agreement with Cuba.

That is a clear and explicit statement of the purposes and intent of this proposed legislation, which is to enter into reciprocal trade relations with Cuba by means of a treaty of reciprocity.

But reciprocity, as has been repeatedly stated in this Chamber, is a Republican doctrine. It was advocated and put into effect by some of the greatest of Republican leaders and American statesmen, among them James G. Blaine, Benjamin Harrison, and William McKinley. They never considered the doctrine of reciprocity inconsistent with that of protection. Both the tariff law of 1890, known as the McKinley tariff law, and the present tariff act, known as the Dingley tariff law, were framed with special reference to making applicable to their provisions the doctrine of reciprocity, and it is a significant fact that under both these acts they were so made applicable, and reciprocal trade relations were entered into with other nations.

Further than all this, President McKinley, in his speech at Buffalo, the last, but one of the greatest, of his public utterances, said:

Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our entire industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. * * * Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

Those words were uttered in what proved to be a last message to his countrymen from one whose devotion to the policy of a protective tariff has never been questioned, and whose services to his country and humanity will live through coming years.

But no added words are needed to demonstrate the value of reciprocity—that it is, so to speak, a very handmaiden of protection, and the treaty of reciprocity with Cuba now under consideration is in perfect accord with that Republican policy which has made us the greatest industrial nation in the world.

TREATY WILL NOT INJURE ANY OF OUR INDUSTRIES.

The purposes which underlie this reciprocity treaty are twofold: First, reciprocal trade relations between the United States and Cuba, the resultant effect of which may be beneficial to both countries; second, and equally important, justice to Cuba, for the welfare of which the United States must, to a certain extent, stand sponsor.

While the question as to whether this treaty will work injury to any one of our industries can not be answered with mathematical accuracy, still, reasoning from the experience of the past and the probabilities of the future, the conclusion is reasonable that it will not, but will in the end be beneficial not only to our industries but to our trade with Cuba. The protests that it would work injury to the beet-sugar industries of this country are neither new nor solely characteristic of this treaty, and that such would be the result is by no means conceded.

There are at present in the United States about forty beet-sugar factories. Their production for the year 1902 aggregated about 190,000 tons. That industry should continue to have the fostering care which will protect and develop it, and it is not the intention of those on this side of the House who favor this treaty to deprive it of such care. While, as stated, the exact effect of the treaty upon a single industry can not be foretold with mathematical accuracy, it can be foretold with exact certainty that after the reduction proposed on beet sugar that industry will still remain one of the most highly protected of all our industries, and it is a fair and reasonable assumption that such reduction will neither jeopardize nor injure the industry. As materially bearing upon this subject, I present the following figures, compiled from official statistics, showing the total consumption of sugar in the United States during the calendar year 1902, as well as the production, imports, and exports of sugar during the same period:

	Gross tons of 2,240 pounds.
Quantity of sugar consumed in the United States during the calendar year 1902	2,566,108
Product of the continental United States during the crop year 1902:	
Cane	310,614
Beet	163,126
Total	473,740
Imports from United States Territories and possessions during the calendar year 1902:	
Hawaii	303,470
Porto Rico	91,671
Philippine Islands	2,429
Total	397,570
Imports from foreign countries during the calendar year 1902	1,709,032
Exports of sugar refined in the United States during the calendar year 1902, including shipments to Porto Rico	4,901
Foreign sugar exported from the United States during the calendar year 1902	1,137

RECAPITULATION.

United States product, crop year 1902	473,740
Imports from United States Territories, etc., calender year 1902	397,570
Imports from foreign countries	1,709,032
Total product and imports	2,580,342
Total exports (4,901+1,137)	6,038
Total net imports (397,570+1,709,032−6,038 tons)	2,100,564

From the above figures it will be observed that the balance of sugar on hand unconsumed in this country amounted at the beginning of the calendar year 1903 to 14,234 tons. However, from this total must be taken 6,038 tons exported from the United States during 1902, leaving unconsumed in the United States but 8,196 tons, the material fact, however, being the importation from foreign countries of 1,709,032 tons.

It is a further fact that the average increase in the consumption of sugar in this country during the past fifteen years has been between 7 and 8 per cent annually. Under these conditions and the present importation of about 1,709,032 tons of sugar there should be no fear that the beet-sugar industry will be injured during the life of this treaty, limited as it is to five years.

But it is in this connection a significant fact that sugar is one of the most highly protected articles in the present tariff law. The

sugar schedule of the Dingley tariff law was purposely so framed, having in view the making of that schedule, as expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], "a trading schedule for reciprocity treaties." It was not intended by the framers of the sugar schedule, as is evidenced by section 4 of the Dingley tariff law, to unalterably fix the tariff rate on sugar, but rather to fix the maximum duty, adding a permission, under prescribed conditions, for a 20 per cent reduction, so that this treaty in question is in exact compliance with both the intention and the letter of the Dingley tariff law.

It is further a fact that under the provisions of this very treaty sugar will still have a protection of about 25 per cent above the average and second only to one of our diversified industries, namely, tobacco. It is a fact, which will be conceded by all, that no one of our industries should be permitted to have a monopoly of protection. Reciprocity treaties neither stand nor fall on prophesied results as to one industry, but rather on hoped-for results as to the industries affected taken as a whole. This treaty affects not alone the article of sugar, but other articles in tariff schedules of various industries, and if viewed as a whole, from the standpoint of self-interest, it is beyond a reasonable doubt that its resultant effects will be beneficial to the trade and industries of the United States.

But, further than all this, reciprocity with Cuba is not an untried experiment. We need not be ignorant of a past or obliged to guess at a future. Under the McKinley tariff law we had a reciprocity treaty with Cuba, and during the nearly three years that treaty was in force our exports to Cuba increased to the extent that they nearly doubled, and after it was annulled by the enactment of the so-called Wilson bill our exports decreased.

The fact that in 1900 and 1901, during our occupancy of the island and under military tariff, our exports again largely increased is no argument against the beneficial results of that treaty. That treaty was in force when Cuba was under the despotic rule of Spain, and if its results were beneficial who will doubt that this treaty would be far more beneficial, negotiated as it is, not with a dependency of Spain, but with the Republic of Cuba, the people of which are bound both by ties of gratitude and friendship to this neighboring Republic?

CUBA'S TRADE AND COMMERCE.

But still further Cuba is, as has been said, an "inviting field for American trade and commerce." Her near-by location, the possibilities of her commercial and industrial development, the close relationship which does and should exist between the two countries, all point unerringly to the fact that the United States should of right possess a monopoly of Cuba's foreign trade and commerce. This is not now ours to the extent that it should be. As demonstrating this, I submit for careful consideration a table showing the aggregate of Cuba's trade and commerce for the calendar year of 1902:

Cuba's commerce in 1902 (calendar year).

	Including money.	Excluding money.
Imports	$62,135,464	$60,584,800
Exports	64,948,804	64,329,700
Total	127,084,268	124,914,500
Imports from United States	26,053,395	25,243,200
Imports from other countries	36,082,069	35,341,600
Exports to the United States	49,498,587	49,498,300
Exports to other countries	15,450,217	14,831,400

The above table shows that during the calendar year of 1902 the total commerce of Cuba, excluding money, aggregated in value $124,914,500, and of this $64,329,700 represented exports and $60,584,800 represented imports. Of her exports she sold to the United States in value $49,498,300, and to all other countries $14,831,400, or approaching three times as much to the United States as to all other countries.

Of her imports she purchased of the United States in value $25,243,200, and of all other countries $35,341,600, or nearly $10,000,000 worth more of other countries than the United States. So that at the end of the year the United States owed Cuba as a balance of trade $24,255,100, while Cuba owed other nations as a balance of trade $20,510,200.

As further illustrating the importance of this to certain industries in the United States it may be noted that during the calendar year of 1902 Cuba's total imports of certain industries were as follows:

Total imports of cotton goods	$5,285,511
Imports of same from the United States	401,107
Total imports of vegetables	2,307,279
Imports of same from the United States	789,713
Total imports of animals and products	12,881,681
Imports of same from the United States	6,869,489
Total amount dairy products imported from all countries	1,096,340
Total amount same from the United States	555,554

Why should not these conditions be changed, and the balance of trade be in favor instead of against the United States? While the trade and commerce of Cuba may not be large in the aggregate, still, her natural resources, which will invite the investment of capital, the progressiveness of her people, and her new relationship to the nations of the earth, make it a reasonable certainty of the future that as years go by her trade and commerce will continually and largely increase. Here, then, at our very door are markets present and prospective for the products of the American farmers and manufacturers, and it is our duty, even in self-interest, by reciprocal trade relations, by fostering a spirit of good will, and by every right means to secure those markets to the American producer, and such is among the purposes and doubtless will be among the results of this treaty of reciprocity.

JUSTICE TO CUBA DEMANDS THE TREATY.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are reasons above and beyond all of these which more than justify this treaty. Reasons limited not by the narrow bounds of self-interest but by the broader considerations of right. Justice to Cuba, for the future destiny of which this nation must to a great extent stand sponsor, demands this treaty. In the interest of humanity we gave Cuba liberty, we added self-government, and now if we are to make that liberty and self-government permanent realities and so consummate the great work which challenges the approval and admiration of the world we must, as far as lies in our power, add to Cuba industrial prosperity.

The war with Spain and its results placed upon this nation the duty of securing to Cuba a stable government. That duty is still upon us. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in discussing this subject in the last Congress made use of the following language, to quote:

> I assert as a fundamental proposition that a stable government is possible only to a contented people. The world's history of revolutions and insurrections is the bloody record of discontent. And I assert, furthermore, that to insure peace and tranquillity to any people you must have prosperous industrial conditions; that poverty and bankruptcy are the efficient causes of popular uprisings and of crimes against law and order.

The truth of the above assertion has been inscribed in a world's history. A contented people has always been the first requisite of a stable government. Prosperous industrial conditions have always been the first requisite of a contented people. Without both of these there can be no such thing as a permanent stable government.

The conditions which characterized Cuba, her industries, and her people, and which have led up to and emphasize the necessity for this treaty are too familiar to need recall. For more than half a century Cuba had longed for freedom. Her people had struggled with a heroism which challenged the admiration of mankind to lift the yoke of Spanish oppression. That terrible struggle and the successive wars which characterized it culminated in 1898, when the United States proclaimed to the world that Cuba's wrongs must be righted and that Spanish misrule on this Western Continent must end forever.

For that half a century Cuba's dream, hope, ambition, and effort had been for liberty, and in her struggle for that all but paralyzed were her industries. Her plantations were laid waste, her mills and factories destroyed, her homes pillaged, her labor unemployed, her industries prostrated. Poor, unhappy, desperate was the lot of Cuba. But with liberty and self-government secured to her by the United States, her people turned resolutely to the future. They, with a purpose and energy worthy an ambitious people, began to build upon the ruins of the past—to turn industrial night into industrial day. And while it is true that her industrial conditions are somewhat improved, still the results of half a century of trials, of war, of bloodshed, and neglected industries are still upon her, and to-day to obtain the revenues sufficient to pay the sum due her patriot army and meet necessary requirements she seeks the markets of the world to negotiate a loan aggregating $35,000,000. That is the mortgage which must be placed upon this new-made Republic to aid her to successfully continue in the pathway of national life.

In the face of all this, where could or should Cuba turn for aid but to the United States? As we were morally bound to lend a helping hand to give her civic freedom, so we are morally bound to lend a helping hand to give her industrial prosperity. The declaration of war against Spain, the results of that war, our occupancy of Cuba, and finally our turning the island over to the Government we had aided them to establish, all emphasize the truth of the above assertion.

The United States by every act relative to Cuba, from the declaration of war against Spain to the present time, stands morally committed to establish in that island a stable government. Because it was so committed, this Government insisted and Cuba acquiesced in ingrafting into her constitution the so-called Platt amendment. By the provisions of that amendment Cuba stipulated, among other things, "never to enter into any treaty or other

compact with any foreign power which would impair, or tend to impair, her independence, or to permit any such power for military or naval purposes to gain control over the island or any part of it." That her Government "would never assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest on which" and provide for its ultimate discharge the revenues of the island should be insufficient, aside from defraying the expenses of the Government.

Articles III and VII of such amendments provide, respectively, in full as follows:

III. That the Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the Government of Cuba.

VII. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof as well as for its own defense, the Government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

By inserting this amendment in her constitution Cuba's Government made partial relinquishment of sovereignty to the island, and while it may be maintained that the United States made no direct promise in reciprocation, is there not in the fair construction of that amendment and the fair interpretation of all our acts relative to Cuba an implied promise that we would aid in making stable her Government and secure her future? This we can best do by making contented her people, this best do by making prosperous her industrial conditions, and all can best be accomplished by giving her what she reasonably asks—reciprocal trade relations. Trade and commerce are connecting links between nations. They are factors more potent in shaping the destiny and relationship of nations than all the armies that tread the earth or navies that ride the sea. Reciprocal trade and commerce will give the people of Cuba new hope for the future and be an added link to bind in lasting friendship the two Republics.

But is it said that we owe Cuba nothing more? Then let us remember that there are some things we owe to ourselves. We owe it to ourselves to keep our promise, direct or implied. We owe it to ourselves to deal with Cuba by the rules of right and justice. She does not ask of us alms, but only that we give her that trade reciprocity which will breathe life anew into her industries and make possible to her that industrial prosperity which will invite national progress.

We gave our treasure and blood to give her liberty and self-government, and now to cast her adrift would be a reproach to the American name. She is still our child, and ours is the duty to see to it that she does not fall upon the threshold of national existence; ours the duty to make stable her government and certain her future; ours the duty to lead her by the hand until she can walk alone the pathway of national life.

This nation was humane and great enough to free Cuba from a tyrant's rule and make her a republic; it is humane, great, and just enough to continue Cuba in the galaxy of nations. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to oppose my personal opinion and judgment against that of the great majority of my associates on this side of the House, and especially against that of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. For three terms I have followed his leadership and I have had and now have a sincere respect for his wisdom and his judgment. But some investigation and reflection upon the conditions surrounding this measure have constrained me to differ with him and with the majority on this side of the House, and I ask leave to state briefly the reasons for my position.

I should feel under obligation to have voted for a straight 20 per cent reduction upon Cuban products entering this country, not because I believed there was any obligation, express or implied, on our part, because we have given Cuba all she desired and with no hope or expectation of reward to ourselves; not that I believe any promise had been made, because none was or could have been made by any Executive; not that I believe that Cuba needs such legislation, because she is fairly prosperous now; not that I believe it would be of any benefit to this country, because I think it will be a detriment; but I would vote for it because the great majority of the American people out of their abundance desire to be generous to Cuba, and because such a reduction is pressed and recommended by our Republican National Administration.

CONDITIONS OF RECIPROCITY.

But when the proposition comes before us for official action I find two conditions attached to the reduction. First, that there shall be a continuing preference for five years to the admission of Cuban products into our country as provided by the bill, page 2, lines 12, 13, and 14, as follows:

The rates of duty herein granted by the United States to the Republic of Cuba are and shall continue during the term of said convention preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries.

Second, that the duty on sugar shall not be reduced for five years by either statute, treaty, or convention unless the treaty shall be sooner abrogated as follows, page 2, lines 15 et seq:

Provided, That while said convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, and no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.

BELIEVE IN PROTECTION.

I wish to state in the outset that I am a sincere protectionist. I believe just as squarely in the Republican doctrine of protection as any man on this side of the House. But I believe that the time will be near at hand when a reduction must be made in some of our tariff schedules which are admitted to be excessive, such as those of iron and steel, glass, lumber, pulp, pottery, and the like, and among them must be reduced the tariff schedule on sugar. The chairman of the committee yesterday informed us that this schedule was excessive now. I believe that if it be burdensome to our people a reduction should be made so that our people will get the benefit, and that it ought not go to some foreign producers or to those who dwell in some foreign country. I am unwilling to vote for any measure which pledges to continue for five years a tariff schedule which is admittedly excessive and burdensome and which wrings unjust taxation to that extent from our people.

BELIEVE IN RECIPROCITY.

I believe also in the Republican doctrine of reciprocity. I believe that the practical application of that doctrine is necessary to protect and extend our foreign trade, and I am convinced that the results of this measure will be to restrict our trade rather than to extend it. I believe it will narrow our markets rather than increase them; that it will prevent reciprocity rather than promote it. I believe a liberal policy of trade agreements should be adopted, especially with Canada, Mexico, and our nearest American neighbors. But this measure seems to me to postpone such a consummation indefinitely.

COMMERCIAL NATIONS PRODUCE SUGAR.

Nearly all the commercial nations of the world are producers of sugar. Since the passage of the Dingley bill in 1897 the United States has imported sugar from nearly all the great commercial nations of the world.

The following table shows the total sugar importations into the United States since 1897 and from the nations indicated:

From—	Tons.	Appraised value.	Percentage of total imports
Cuba	1,890,000	$101,025,861	60
Austria	234,000	9,584,648	20
Belgium	136,000	5,552,700	7
France	44,492	1,386,589	⅛ of 1
Germany	1,890,998	74,510,274	14
Netherlands, including colonies	2,487,168	101,237,396	[a]48
United Kingdom, including colonies	1,363,002	57,375,828	[b]5½
Russia	2,346	105,644	⅛ of 1
Mexico	5,449	202,277	⅛ of 1
Central America	15,125	808,685	1¼
South America	741,535	26,717,109	[c]¾ of 1
Santo Domingo and Haiti	339,642	15,234,763	55
Asia and Africa producing sugar, excluding colonies	262,416	12,169,316	16

[a] On 85 per cent of colonial trade. [b] On 16 per cent of colonial trade. [c] On excluding Brazil, 15 per cent.

You will notice that from nearly all the commercial nations of the world we import sugar. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KNAPP], who just preceded me, has made a statement concerning the present condition in the American market, but I do not think he has brought his figures quite up to date. I have been furnished this morning from the Bureau of Statistics a compilation made by Willett & Gray, which shows the probable condition of the American sugar market during the next season.

SUGAR PRODUCTION OF THE WORLD.

It is as follows: The consumption of the United States will be about 2,800,000 tons. The estimated crops are as follows:

Sugar crops of the world.

In the following table we have aimed to include the entire sugar production of all the countries of the world, including those crops which have hereto-

fore been ignored in statistics. These figures include local consumptions of home production wherever known:

[Willett & Gray's estimates of cane-sugar crops, November 5, 1903.]

	1903-4.	1902-3.	1901-2.	1900-1.
United States:	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
Louisiana	240,000	300,000	310,000	270,338
Porto Rico	95,000	85,000	85,000	80,000
Hawaiian Islands	375,000	375,000	317,509	321,461
Cuba, crop	1,130,000	980,000	850,181	635,856
British West Indies:				
Trinidad, exports	49,000	45,000	51,077	52,673
Barbados, exports	35,000	31,000	43,750	55,300
Jamaica, exports	17,000	18,772	15,843	17,059
Antigua and St. Kitts	19,000	18,000	19,000	21,579
French West Indies:				
Martinique, exports	33,000	32,000	34,942	39,750
Guadeloupe	40,000	38,000	41,000	39,000
Danish West Indies—St. Croix	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Haiti and Santo Domingo	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Lesser Antilles, not named above	13,000	12,000	15,000	15,000
Mexico, crop	125,000	115,000	103,110	95,000
Central America:				
Guatemala, crop	10,000	10,000	10,000	9,000
San Salvador, crop	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Nicaragua, crop	4,000	4,500	4,500	3,500
Costa Rica, crop	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
South America:				
British Guiana (Demerara), exports	125,000	122,000	123,967	84,559
Dutch Guiana (Surinam), crop	13,000	13,000	12,750	13,000
Venezuela	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Peru, crop	140,000	140,000	138,000	135,000
Argentine Republic, crop	84,000	130,000	135,000	114,252
Brazil, crop	237,000	187,500	345,000	320,000
Total in America	2,854,000	2,726,772	2,725,629	2,392,387
Asia:				
British India, exports	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Siam, crop	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Java, crop	850,000	842,812	767,130	709,928
Japan (consumption 170,000 tons, mostly imported)				
Philippine Islands, exports	125,000	90,000	78,637	55,400
China (consumption large, mostly imported)				
Total in Asia	997,000	954,812	867,767	787,328
Australia and Polynesia:				
Queensland	93,800	76,627	120,858	92,554
New South Wales	20,000	21,000	18,000	19,000
Fiji Islands, exports	50,000	35,500	31,000	33,000
Total in Australia and Polynesia	163,800	133,126	169,858	144,554
Africa:				
Egypt, crop	90,000	90,000	96,200	94,880
Mauritius	175,000	150,349	147,828	175,267
Réunion	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Total in Africa	300,000	275,349	279,028	305,147
Europe—Spain	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000
Total cane-sugar production (Willett & Gray)	4,342,800	4,118,059	4,070,282	3,657,416
Europe beet sugar production (Licht)	5,850,000	5,521,869	6,760,361	5,990,080
United States beet-sugar production (Willett & Gray)	233,000	195,463	163,126	76,859
Grand total cane and beet sugar	10,425,800	9,835,391	10,993,769	9,724,355
Estimated increase in the world's production	590,409			

Another semiofficial estimate from Cuba is a crop of 1,250,000 tons. So it can safely be calculated as upward of 1,150,000 tons. The Bureau of Statistics reports that there is now on hand and in stock in Cuba 347,941 tons. So that we can estimate that there will be imported into the United States during the next year under the provisionsof this bill between fourteen and fifteen hundred thousand tons.

This same estimate of Willett & Gray also reports that there will be produced in the United States and within its dependencies of cane sugar and beet sugar for our own consumption something over 1,038,000 tons, making in the aggregate over twenty-five hundred thousand tons that will be produced in Cuba and the United States and its possessions and marketed in this country. The result will be that the American market will be almost completely filled next year from these sources, and that the year after, with the great possibilities for increase, the American market will be completely monopolized by Cuba and our own crop.

POSSIBILITIES OF CUBA.

Our consul-general in Cuba has recently reported, this very season, that the possibilities for the growth of sugar in Cuba are almost limitless; that an annual production of 6,000,000 tons is possible. It only requires sufficient capital and additional labor to raise this immense product. Those of you who have read the November monthly report made by the Dun Mercantile Company upon conditions in Cuba will notice that the capital is already there, and that there is even now an agitation to repeal whatever restrictive immigration laws now exist, and to increase immigration of Asiatic, African, and cheap labor so that this vast increase of sugar production shall be made. You will notice further that the junior Senator from Massachusetts already has introduced a bill in the Senate, regardless of the constitutional limitations and restrictions upon origin of revenue legislation, to reduce the duty on Philippine sugars. This will be accomplished in the near future, and there is almost a limitless capacity for sugar production there. Between those two factors there can be no doubt, then, that within one year or two years, and certainly before the expiration of the term provided by this measure, the American market will be completely monopolized from these various sources.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST COMMERCIAL NATIONS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, consider further that we have purchased sugar from the various nations of the world and that we have sold them goods in return. Now, we notify them by the provisions of this very act that we propose to discriminate to the extent of 20 per cent of our tariff rates against their product, and, second, that we shall not reduce our tariff on sugar for at least five years. The result will be that the very article which they produce in abundance and which we desire to buy, the very article of which we purchase and import the most from the markets of the world, is excluded from the competition of the great commercial nations.

We invite retaliation from these various nations whose products are excluded from the American market. Germany, Austria, Russia, the Netherlands, British colonies, West Indies and East Indies, Mexico, and Central and South America are excluded from our sugar markets by a direct policy of our discrimination against them and their products. They would have no right to complain if our domestic product met our own wants. They could not complain if they had entrance to our market on even terms with all other nations and could not compete in prices, quality, and delivery. So long as any nation is treated fairly and equally with every other nation there can be no danger on their part of discrimination against us and our trade. But it is just such action as this which expressly and in terms discriminates against them and excludes any possibility of their competing for our market, the richest and most profitable in the world, which will inevitably drive some, if not many, of them to retaliation and discrimination against us and our products. Such methods are easy to be adopted by the great nations. We have remonstrated against Germany and France in the past for just such procedure, yet here the Congress deliberately adopts a policy of exclusion and discrimination which can but produce results which will constantly return to plague us in nearly every department of our export trade.

RUSSIA DISCRIMINATES.

We remember about two years ago—although Russia has sold us only about 5,000 tons of sugar—yet because we imposed the countervailing duty on sugar provided by the Dingley bill upon the Russian product, that Russia quite excluded many American products from its market. I notice this very week that one of the leading English statesmen, Sir Henry Norman, a free trader, has been urging upon the present Balfour ministry of Great Britain that that ministry prepare measures of retaliation against the United States on account of this very measure. The result will be if this bill passes that we invite retaliation from the great sugar producing and distributing nations of the world.

NATIONS WILL NOT STAND DISCRIMINATION.

Germany, which has an estimated sugar crop and stock of nearly 2,500,000 tons, and purchases annually from us $193,000,000 of our products, will not submit tamely to be excluded from our market for its principal agricultural product. The Netherlands and its colonies, producing annually fully a million tons and purchasing over $80,000,000 annually of us; Austria, producing a million tons and purchasing annually over $6,000,000 of us; Belgium, producing nearly 250,000 tons and purchasing over $45,000,000 of us, will surely resent this action. Russia, producing 1,250,000 tons and purchasing $10,000,000 from us, has already retaliated. Mexico produces 125,000 tons of sugar annually, purchases $42,000,000 of our products, has invested in its domains more than $700,000,000 of American capital—seven times the amount invested in Cuba—possesses opportunities and possibilities for development and a market for our products far greater than Cuba; yet Mexico is subject to this discrimination. The South American nations raise a sugar crop for export nearly as large as Cuba and purchase annually nearly twice as much, yet are ejected from our market. And even the West India Islands, outside of Cuba and Porto Rico, produce two-thirds of the Cuban crop and purchase from us annually more than $17,000,000 of our goods, yet can not enter into equal and fair competition with their near neighbor in our markets.

BENEFITS OF THE BILL.

Now, what do we secure by the passage of this bill? We have a preferential entrance into the Cuban market of from 20 to 40 per cent over other nations. Last year they imported $60,000,000 of foreign products. I have made some compilations, as carefully as I could, as to where these products should naturally come from. I have made three classes. First, the products of which the United States has a practical monopoly in the Cuban market, where other nations can not fairly compete. The second class of products is that where the other nations have a practical monopoly in the Cuban market, and where we can not fairly compete, and the third, the class of competing products. In the first class, of which we have a monopoly, I find last year there was imported into Cuba about $15,000,000 from the United States, consisting of steel and iron manufactures, of provisions and grain stuffs, and things of that sort.

In the class where the other nations had a monopoly and as to which we can not fairly compete, during the term of this treaty, I find about $20,000,000 were imported of jerked beef, of textiles such as silks and linens, some glass and gold and silver wares, and some wines and liquors, which we ourselves import from European markets. There remains, then, the third class of about $25,000,000 of competing products.

SHARE OF UNITED STATES.

If I remember correctly, General Bliss testified before the Senate committee that the United States, under the provisions of this treaty, ought to receive about 80 per cent of the competing trade. Eighty per cent of $25,000,000 would be $20,000,000, which we ought to get under this bill. Mr. Bliss further confirms this by a detailed estimate that the increase would be about $21,000,000 annually. The reciprocity under the McKinley bill, which has been praised so greatly upon this floor, yielded an annual increase of our exports to Cuba of about $12,000,000 over the preceding year, when there was no reciprocity. I believe that would be about the increase which might be fairly expected from this bill—an increase of exports of about $12,000,000 per annum, although it may possibly run up to $20,000,000.

UNSOUND PROPHECIES.

I think that the prophecy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was almost nonsensical yesterday when he stated that there might be an increase of $300,000,000. Why, Mr. Chairman, last year we exported to Great Britain, the greatest consuming nation of the world outside of this country, only about $524,000,000. We exported to Germany, the next greatest consuming nation of the world, one hundred and ninety-three millions of export; to France, less than eighty millions, and to the Netherlands, with their population in the East Indies of 50,000,000 people, about $80,000,000. It seems to me utter nonsense that we can expect any vast increase of our trade with Cuba. Remember, too, that we have had an increase of trade in the last few years above even the high tide of McKinley reciprocity.

Year ending June 30—	United States exports to Cuba, domestic and foreign.
1893	$24,157,698
1894	20,125,321
1895	12,807,661
1896	7,530,880
1897	8,259,776
1898	9,561,656
1899	18,616,377
1900	26,513,400
1901	25,964,801
1902	26,623,500
1903	21,761,638

This shows that our exports in 1900, 1901, and 1902 were in each year larger than our exports during the highest period of McKinley reciprocity, and we can not fairly expect any further phenomenal increase. Now we may possibly get an increase of from twelve to twenty million dollars.

COST OF TRADE INCREASE.

What do we pay for it? In the first place there will be a reduction of our revenues. If I read the testimony rightly, this measure will cause a reduction of revenue of about $7 a ton on sugar. There will be 1,400,000 tons to 1,500,000 tons imported from Cuba next year. Seven dollars a ton would make a reduction of about $10,000,000 on sugar alone. There would be a further reduction of about $2,000,000, as I recall, on other products. The result would be that we anticipate a possible reduction of $12,000,000 in our revenue for the sake of selling possibly from twelve to twenty million dollars of our products.

This reduction of $12,000,000 per annum comes at rather an inopportune time, when our custom revenues are falling off, and since the beginning of the fiscal year the expenditures have been larger than the receipts, yet here we propose to further reduce our receipts more than a million dollars a month. To consider it practically it would be good business policy for us to appropriate that money out of our Treasury, buy these additional products, and cast them into the sea, rather than let a bill like this pass which imperils the vast foreign trade of our country with other sugar-producing nations.

FOREIGN TRADE.

What did that trade amount to last year? We sold Cuba $21,764,000 of products. We sold the other West India islands which export sugar to this country during the same time $17,133,000. We sold the East Indies $6,221,000. We sold to the South American nations which export sugar to us $41,114,000. We sold Germany $193,000,000. We sold Austria $8,000,000. We sold to the African territories which export sugar to us $38,000,000. We sold the Netherlands $80,000,000. We sold the British colonies which export sugar to us $36,000,000. This does not include Great Britain, which purchased more than $524,000,000 last year, and whose capital is interested in sugar production in every country and colony under the sun. We must fairly and fully realize the situation that for the sake of getting a possible increase of from twelve to twenty million dollars in the Cuban market we imperil and will invite retaliation on one thousand million dollars of our foreign trade.

It would take but a very small percentage of discrimination against our products to swallow up many times over all the possible increase of our trade with Cuba. This is why I believe this measure will not promote reciprocity, but prevent it; will not increase our foreign trade, but restrict it. It will not sell more of our farmers' products at higher prices, as is so glibly promised, but will tend to decrease the demand, to depress prices, because it will subject our export trade to added burdens.

BURDEN ON FREIGHTS.

But that is not all. Where we have been importing 1,000,000 tons of sugar from other countries, that has enabled other products to be exported by cheaper freights with better facilities and to better advantage. Sugar has been one of the staple articles, of great bulk and weight, that has furnished inward cargoes to this country. We cut off these sugar cargoes coming into this country, and the ships which go out loaded with our products must come in empty and in ballast. The result would be that freights would be greatly increased the very next year, and must continue to increase so long as there is a cargo only one way. The export cargo must pay for the double voyage. There is no escape from that fact when we exclude other sugars from our markets. We may find that the freights on our exports to those nations who formerly sent sugar to us may be increased from three to six million dollars, and we can safely count that before the expiration of this treaty our annual freight charge on our products going to the same countries may possibly be increased more than $6,000,000, thus levying an annual tribute upon our foreign trade on account of this help toward Cuba.

PREVENTS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Another factor, and I speak as a Republican now. I believe the measure in the last Congress was and I believe this measure in this Congress is a cruel blow to one of the most promising agricultural industries of this country; that is, the establishment of beet-sugar production wherever practicable and profitable. I make no plea for factories already in existence. This bill is a bonanza to them, because it insures a high price for their product for five years and prevents at the same time the establishment of new enterprises which might compete and reduce their profits. I am not interested in continuing the profits of existing factories. But I am greatly interested in the development of new enterprises wherever it can be profitably done in this country.

PREVENTS GROWTH OF SUGAR INDUSTRY.

It is very easy to assert that this measure injures no industry and will not interfere with any legitimate interests. Let facts and not assertions determine. The chairman of the committee admitted yesterday that no beet-sugar factory had been established since this agitation had commenced. I believe no beet-sugar factory will be established during the term of this measure, unless it may be in an exceptional place and under exceptional conditions. I believe it for this reason, that these conditions which I have just outlined, these obnoxious reasons that I have just stated, which will imperil and restrict and burden our foreign trade, will become so hateful to the people of this country that there will be started a movement to abolish them, especially the continuance of the present tariff for five years. The agitation will be begun at once, and will increase in intensity as the burden and injustice become known and felt. We know well that as long as such an agitation continues capital will not embark in the development of the sugar business. I believe as a Republican

and a protectionist that we should reduce this tariff on sugar to the proper protective point that is admitted to be fair, just, and reasonable, and keep it there. Then under its provisions and under its beneficent influence we could develop the beet-sugar industry, as can and should be done in this country. And do we realize what that might mean?

BENEFITS SUGAR INDUSTRY.

The Agricultural Department reports there are twenty-two States in this Union which can cultivate beet sugar. There would be needed many millions of capital and there would be employed many thousands of men, and not only the direct results but the indirect results of beet-sugar cultivation would be even more beneficial. The result in France and Germany has shown that under the proper scientific system of beet-sugar cultivation in those countries, under the scientific and practical rotation of crops, the proportionate increase of yield of other crops, such as grain, grasses, and root crops, has been from 25 to 33 per cent over the same land not so cultivated. The average yield of grain in France in the beet-sugar districts under this system increased from 17 to 28 bushels per acre on the average.

BY-PRODUCTS.

There is further needed, when beet sugar is cultivated scientifically, a larger number of cattle to be used in connection with the land cultivated. In Germany is used about 1 head to every 6 acres; in France, about 1 head to every 7 acres. I conferred with one of the instructors in our school of agriculture in Minnesota, one of the most eminent in his line in the United States, if not in the world, and he informed me that in the Northwest it would be a safe estimate that 1 head of cattle would be needed for every 5 acres. Another instructor connected with the school of agriculture, who has made a specialty of this very branch, informed me that 1 head of cattle would be needed for every 4 acres. One of my constituents, a gentleman of culture and much experience, who has experimented in this line, stated that in his experiments he has found that 1 head to every 2 acres could be utilized.

There is now in the North Central States, according to the last census, about 1 head to every 20 acres of cultivated land. The result would be that under this calculation the number of cattle would be increased from four to five fold, adding many millions of dollars of wealth to our country and greatly increasing the fertility of our farms. In our great dairy States, too, there is needed use for the pulp that remains in the factories after the juice has been expressed. In our section this pulp is sold to the dairymen, and the result of experiments that have been made show that its use increases from 7 to 15 per cent the value of the cream and milk over the same expenditure of labor and money used without it.

HEAT, LIGHT, AND POWER FURNISHED.

From the residue of molasses in Germany a large amount of alcohol is distilled, and it is actually shown by the report of Consul-General Mason, one of our most reliable officials, that this alcohol produces 10 per cent more heat and power units than is found in refined petroleum. If we could have appropriate legislation by Congress so that alcohol could be utilized as it is in Germany, the troublesome propositions of heat, light, and power could be solved for many of our Western States. The German Government has used this product to advantage and with economy in its public work. Stoves, lamps, and engines have been constructed for its use, and there is no reason why there should not be a similar development in this country.

DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS.

If these things could be brought to pass, the increase of crop yield would be millions of dollars annually, the increase of cattle and cattle products would be a source of immense wealth. The increase of your dairying is and has been a solicitude to Congress, and the development of new heat, light, and power possibilities in every locality in the West could be of untold benefit to our people. Thousands of people would be profitably employed, and the industries of our country could be wonderfully diversified and increased. For my part, instead of having one of our principal food products produced on baronial estates, owned by nonresident landlords, in tropical climes, by semislave labor consuming little of our products, and always a menace to our institutions, I prefer to have our sugar grown in our own land by the small farmer in the midst of civilization, which he and his family do so much to support, and who consume the bulk and the best of our native products. I prefer to see the manufacturing done in our smaller communities scattered all over the land, owned by thousands of small investors, rather than to have it all done by a grasping monopoly in a few of the larger cities of the country and distributed under the rigid régime of the sugar trust. Yet the last is the inevitable effect of this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I greatly regret to see such magnificent possibilities destroyed by Republican legislation. I regret that this great opportunity for the development of the agricultural sections of this country, which have stood so nobly by the Republican party, and propose to so stand in the future, destroyed by legislation like this. Because it takes money out of our Treasury and distributes it to foreigners at a time of possible national extremity, because it imperils or injures untold millions of our foreign trade, because it restricts our commerce and prevents genuine reciprocity, because it injures, if not destroys, one of our most promising agricultural industries, I am compelled by my convictions to vote against this bill. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for forty minutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, in making any remarks upon this bill the first duty of a Democrat is to congratulate the Republicans that "light" is breaking on their intellects at last. [Laughter.] It is not "a great awakening light," such as Abou Ben Adhem saw on a celebrated occasion, but it is a light nevertheless, and an earnest of what may happen in the days to come, because it is written in a very old book that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

Before I say anything in particular about the bill I want to return my heartfelt thanks to my distinguished friend from Pittsburg [Mr. DALZELL] for delivering for the thirty-seventh time in this House yesterday his famous speech about what happened when the Wilson bill was finally passed in this House. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

It is said that practice makes perfect, and if that is true, then that speech of Brother DALZELL ought to be the most perfect piece of eloquence that ever fell from human lips. [Laughter.] Now, I have a fair proposition to make, and every Democrat will indorse it, and most of the Republicans, that if he will agree never to deliver that speech in the House again we will all agree to commit it to memory. [Laughter.] So that when he feels moved to deliver it all he will have to say is, "Dig up out of your memories that speech I have delivered so frequently." [Laughter.] He said he might not have delivered it if there were not a lot of new Members in the House.

Well, it must be assumed that new Members can read, and one of the most valuable daily papers published in America is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In my judgment our Republican friends in this House are riding to a fall and pickling a rod for their own backs. If there is anything that is probable at this time, it is that the Democrats will control the next House of Representatives and elect the President of the United States [applause on the Democratic side], and it becomes more probable every day. In the November election Kentucky finally and for all time set the seal of her condemnation on assassination as a political method in this country. [Applause.] Maryland once more took her place securely in the political household to which she legitimately belongs.

My friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], venerable and vitriolic, said here last winter, when he and I delivered some remarks at cross purposes, that Rhode Island went Democratic last year by a fluke. It went Democratic this year, and two victories in succession for the Democrats of Rhode Island show that there was no fluke about it, and that it is the settled purpose of the voters of that State to return to the Democratic column where it used to belong. Greater New York has freed herself from the domination of that great aggregation of political Pecksniffs that has controlled her destinies for the last two years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if cool judgment could control and human passion did not enter into the equation, then when we get possession of this House we would do away, undoubtedly, with these gag rules. But Mark Twain says that human nature is very strong, and we all have a heap of it in us. [Laughter.] Lord Byron, after enumerating everything that was sweet in nature that he could think of, wound up by declaring that "sweet is revenge;" and he ought to know, because he practiced it as much as any man who ever lived. Now, the tighter you bind us down, the more of these ironclad rules you ram down our throats, the more you will get rammed down your throats when we come into possession of this House. [Great laughter.] Consequently, you will do well to go a little slow and to "bring forth fruits meet for repentance."

I want to read you an excerpt or two from the RECORD which my friend from Pittsburg [Mr. DALZELL] helped to make. He tells with great gusto what we did in passing the Wilson and Gorman bill, which my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] terms an enormity. So far as I am individually concerned, I voted for it holding my nose. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pittsburg [Mr. DALZELL] says that we made them swallow 600 amendments to the Wilson-Gorman bill without debate! Well, that is

practically true. Now, that is a startling proposition if nothing else goes with it. I will tell the rest of that interesting story, which the gentleman was too modest to relate.

The new Members for whose benefit he was delivering his remarkable speech for the thirty-seventh time will be pleased to learn that when the Republicans got into possession of the House, when my friend was helping run the machine, they concocted in this House after nine days' debate the Dingley tariff bill and sent it over to the Senate, and they sent it back, not with 600 amendments, but with 872 amendments! [Laughter.] Let us see what they did. How much debate did they allow us? Here is what happened. The first thing that occurred on the 8th day of July, 1897, in this House was this message from the Senate:

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Cox, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the said bill and amendments, and had ordered that Mr. ALLISON, Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, Mr. BURROWS, Mr. Jones of Nevada, Mr. Vest, Mr. Jones of Arkansas, and Mr. White be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

After disposing of a point of order that was raised by the brilliant and picturesque statesman from the new State of Washington, Col. James Hamilton Lewis, to the effect that Congress was not in session at all [laughter], my friend from Pittsburg [Mr. DALZELL] introduced the following rule:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred House resolution No. 64, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report the following substitute therefor:

"*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move to nonconcur in gross in the Senate amendments to House bill No. 379, and agree to a committee of conference, asked for by the Senate, on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and the House shall, without further delay, proceed to vote upon said motion; and if the said motion prevail, a committee of conference shall be appointed, without instructions; and said committee shall have authority to join with the Senate committee in renumbering the paragraphs and sections of said bill when finally agreed upon."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, as the RECORD shows, on that occasion really desired to take away from the Democrats in this House the poor privilege of debating that rule for forty minutes—twenty minutes on a side—but JOSEPH WELDON BAILEY, of Texas, at that time leader of the minority of the House, and among the leaders of the Senate now, the greatest debater on the American Continent, bar none, would not have it. He secured the twenty minutes, and during that time he delivered these sentences, which I commend to the careful and prayerful consideration of the gentlemen on the other side of the House:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has suggested a weak point, which it was the purpose of the committee to guard. They do not desire to be embarrassed with a proposition to eliminate the gratuity to the sugar trust.

That applies to-day as well as it did when Mr. BAILEY was standing up here making that speech.

Here are some more of his remarks:

If they are willing to take that responsibility, certainly we on this side will not complain. If they are willing to go to the country, having given the sugar trust all that it asked for and more than it expected, and having denied the House an opportunity for a separate vote upon that question, we are content to have the record made up in that manner.

That is exactly what we ask for in this connection, the privilege of voting on an amendment to this bill to strike out the differential on refined sugar, which amounts, in round numbers, to 12½ cents per 100 pounds of refined sugar, and the leaders of the Republican party on the other side of the House were so afraid that the Minnesota and California and Michigan and other beet-sugar producing statesmen on their side of the Chamber would kick out and vote with us again, as they did in the last Congress, that they would not give them the opportunity to do so, and there you are. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can not get away from that proposition.

But that is not all of this rule business. I want to stir up your minds just a little more about it. Here is a rule that I say has never been paralleled in any legislative body in any civilized country on the face of the earth. It was brought in here on February 27, the day they were stealing a seat from a Democrat which they had no earthly use for, a Democrat who was as lawfully elected to Congress as any man that sits in this House to-day. Here is the rule they brought in, and I want the younger Members, to whom the gentleman was addressing his speech, to listen to it:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolutions of the House numbered 468 and 470, have had the same under consideration, and report the following in lieu thereof, with the recommendation that it do pass:

"*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this rule, and at any time thereafter during the remainder of this session, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table any general appropriation bill returned with Senate amendments, and such amendments having been read, the question shall be at once taken without debate or intervening motion on the following question: 'Will the House disagree to said amendments en bloc and ask a conference with the Senate?' And if this motion shall be decided in the affirmative, the Speaker shall at once appoint the conferees, without the intervention of any motion. If the House shall decide said motion in the negative, the effect of said vote shall be to agree to the said amendments."

Now, gentlemen, that rule amounts to this: That if you vote on one proposition you shall be counted as voting on another proposition. It has never been equaled, and I say that it does not lie in the mouth of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] or any other gentleman on the other side of the House to be eternally and everlastingly lecturing us about what a Democratic House did in the Fifty-third Congress.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I would not have done it if I thought it would hurt so much. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. I want to clear that thing up for all time to come and be through with it. I am tired of hearing that speech! [Laughter.]

There is another little matter I wish to attend to before I come to this bill. I always listen to my distinguished friend, the chairman of this committee [Mr. PAYNE], with pleasure, sometimes with amazement, and frequently with awe. There was one paragraph in his speech yesterday which constitutes what Horace Greeley would have denominated "mighty rich reading." I will read it to you:

Under the Wilson bill we had fallen behind in the revenue, and the object of a Republican bill always is to produce revenue as well as protection. A Democratic bill, as, for instance, the Wilson-Gorman enormity, was neither protective nor did it supply sufficient revenue to support the Government. It was wrong at both ends. They profess the principle of tariff for revenue only, with incidental protection. They did not get the protection incidental, nor did they get the revenue under their bill; and so it is that we put the rate of duty higher on sugar than was absolutely necessary because we could get this splendid revenue from the sugar duty, a revenue that came from the people of the United States who use sugar in their households.

Now, to begin at the last end of it. Every Republican in the United States that I ever heard make a speech, every Republican newspaper that I ever read in all my life has been asserting ever since the tariff question in this country became acute that "the foreigner pays the tariff tax" and the American citizen does not. It is said an open confession is good for the soul. I congratulate my friend the chairman of the committee on making it, for he says:

And so it is that we put the rate of duty higher on sugar than was absolutely necessary, because we could get this splendid revenue from the sugar duty, a revenue that came from the people of the United States who used sugar in their households!

That sentence answers every Republican speech that has been made on the tariff in the last twenty years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It comes right down to the Democratic position, and I thank God that the Republicans have gone even this little step toward Democracy. Thomas Jefferson said in his first inaugural address, which has become a classic, "We are all Federalists; we are all Republicans." If he were delivering that oration to-day, in the changed nomenclature of the times, he would say, "We are all Republicans, we are all Democrats, and it really looks from this performance here that we are going to be all Democrats." [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] That is not all of that wonderful paragraph. He continues:

Under the Wilson bill we had fallen behind in the revenue, and the object of a Republican bill always is to produce revenue as well as protection.

It is a work of supererogation, but I am going into that thing once more. I was really surprised to hear a man of the eminence of the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, make any such declaration as that.

I will tell you what produced the deficiency in the revenue. The McKinley tariff bill produced it; and the Wilson tariff bill, while it did not suit me, would have produced enough revenue to run the Government if the income-tax section had not been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, when it reversed the precedents of an entire century to render that decision. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from New York speaks of the Wilson-Gorman bill as a "tariff for revenue only" measure, when, as a matter of fact, it carried an average tariff of thirty-nine and a fraction per cent on about 4,000 articles of everyday consumption.

What I am going to read to you is not original at all. I owe it to the industry and courage of the Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES, of Tennessee. He thrashed out that question very thoroughly once, and at the risk of boring some of the old Members, and for the purpose of carrying on that school of instruction which my friend from Pittsburg [Mr. DALZELL] started yesterday, I will read you a little correspondence. Brother GAINES took it into his head one day that he was going to find out the truth about this business of how that deficit came. He went over to the Bureau of Engraving and wanted to get Secretary Foster's letter. He could not get the letter until he went to the Secretary of the Treasury and got an order from Mr. Gage to give him a copy of that letter.

Here is the whole of the Gaines-Gage correspondence, which is a valuable thing to have in the Democratic family and which proves beyond a peradventure that the McKinley tariff bill created a deficit in the revenues some eighteen months before the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill was enacted into law:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1897.

SIR: I desire to procure the original letter, or certified copy thereof, written by Mr. Secretary Foster February 20, 1893, addressed to the Chief of the

Bureau of Engraving and Printing, of which the following purports to be a copy:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.

SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are 100s and 1,000s coupon bonds and 100s, 1,000s, and 10,000s of the registered bonds. This authority is given in advance of the enactment in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner. I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bond.

Respectfully, yours,

CHARLES FOSTER, *Secretary.*

The CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

The original is now in the hands of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which I called for and read this morning. I desire to use the original letter or certified copy thereof this evening, and will be especially obliged if my request can be complied with at once.

Yours, very respectfully, JNO. W. GAINES.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
Secretary of the Treasury.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1897.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, requesting the original letter, or a certified copy thereof, written by Mr. Secretary Foster, February 20, 1893, addressed to the Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, authorizing the preparation of certain plates. In compliance with said request, I submit below a correct copy of the letter in question, also a copy of the text of the proposed bond.

[Copy of letter.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.

SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are 100s and 1,000s of the coupon bonds and 100s, 1,000s, and 10,000s of the registered bonds. The authority is given in advance of the enactment, in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner. I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script of the body of the bond.

Respectfully, yours,

CHARLES FOSTER, *Secretary.*

The CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF PRINTING AND ENGRAVING.

Respectfully, yours,

LYMAN J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I really believe there is such a thing as fairness in politics, in Congress, or anywhere else. I believe that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], considering the high standing that he occupies in this House, owes it to himself and the country to get right up and state the fact about it, that the McKinley bill produced the deficiency; that Secretary Foster was preparing to print the bonds before he went out of office, but that in some way they managed to scrape together enough money to run until Cleveland was sworn in on the 4th of March, 1893. The bond issue for which Secretary Foster ordered the plates amounted to $50,000,000.

Mr. DINSMORE. If the gentleman will allow me, I will suggest to him that the McKinley bill was entitled "A bill to reduce the revenue."

Mr. CLARK. Yes; and it did reduce it, too. In that regard it was a great success. I thank my friend for that suggestion. That is the truth about this whole business, and it never ought to be repeated on this floor or in a respectable newspaper or in any stump speech made by any Republican having any reputation to lose in this country that the fact is otherwise. So much for that.

I have a few words to say about this bill. It is not really necessary to say anything about it, but our Republican friends are split up all over the country about it. They will undoubtedly go to the country and say, "We did it!" You could not pass this bill to save your souls, and you know it, if you did not know that a large number of Democrats on this side of the House were going to vote for it. All of the "kickers" that appeared in the last Congress would be here kicking now if there was a chance to defeat it.

The truth is that down in their hearts the Republican majority in this House are not in favor of this bill, and my guess is, if you could go to the bottom of it, that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] came nearer to stating their exact position than do those gentlemen who advocate it. What is the situation? A year or so ago Senator HANNA, who is supposed to be authorized to speak for the party, whose friends are grooming him now to run against Colonel Roosevelt for the Republican nomination, gave out this slogan for the Republicans: "Let well enough alone!" Then afterwards he changed it to "Stand pat." That is a phrase that I do not really understand the meaning of. [Laughter.] After a while the spirit moved my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to give out a battle cry. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee infringed on your Uncle MARK HANNA's patent by giving out his slogan as "Keep on letting well enough alone!"

There is not an unindicted malefactor in the land who will not agree to that proposition. [Laughter.] This last summer, when Col. Theodore Roosevelt and Senator JOSEPH BENSON FORAKER were punching Uncle MARK over the ropes in the Ohio convention, just as he went into a comatose state he exclaimed, "For God's sake, let well enough alone." [Renewed laughter.] And there you are.

I will read to you a sentence or two. Some of you will recognize it and some will not; some of the old Members will want to forget it, but I want to read it to some of my brothers over there who are in a sort of kindergarten, 128 of you. Here it is:

A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Gentlemen, who said that? William McKinley, President of the United States, in that great speech which he delivered at Buffalo just before he was assassinated; and it is the essence of the Democratic position on the tariff question as stated here yesterday so ably by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Do you people over there believe that? Who is the organ of your crowd? [Laughter.] If you have any especial organ it is the American Tariff League, and the organ of the American Tariff League is the American Economist, published at Philadelphia. It is an exceedingly able paper. I read it constantly to find out what the enemy is up to. Now, listen to an editorial from the Washington Post, including an excerpt from an editorial of this paper, the American Economist.

The editor of the Washington Post is an out-and-out protectionist—not a stand-patter, but a high protectionist—nevertheless that paper is independent in its politics; it says it is, and I believe it is. But it has an incorrigible leaning for everything that comes from Ohio. What it says it says well; none better. It is authorized to speak for a certain wing of the protectionists.

I just read you President McKinley's farewell statement. Now, listen to this Philadelphia organ of the protectionists, the American Economist, and it will make the cold chills run up and down the spinal columns of the Republican Members composing the majority, especially the Republicans from Pennsylvania. It threatens to land Pennsylvania in the Democratic column. [Laughter.] Good heavens! If Pennsylvania goes, all the rest will go. When Pennsylvania goes Democratic, the thing will be unanimous.

Here is the Post editorial, containing and commenting on an extract from the American Economist editorial:

VENOMOUS AND SIGNIFICANT.

The passage of the Cuban reciprocity measure having become a moral certainty, one would naturally have supposed that even the American Economist, organ of the American Protective Tariff League, would deem it inexpedient to continue its bitter war on that scheme. But that is not what has happened. The organ of the men who have been the chief reliance of fat fryers for lo, those many years, greets President Roosevelt's Cuban message in a tone that bodes trouble. Although this reciprocity proposition is President Roosevelt's only by inheritance from his murdered predecessor, the league's organ treats him and it as if it were his original conception. When, upon his accession to the Presidency, Mr. Roosevelt dispelled doubt and braced up confidence by giving his pledge to carry out the policy of McKinley, he bound himself to do just what he has done in this matter. It is the McKinley policy—the policy of a statesman whose devotion to protection made him President—against which the league's organ inveighs. Here are samples of the blasts it delivers to the Executive who is to be the Republican Presidential candidate in the coming campaign:

"Already the President has been informed that if the Cuban reciprocity treaty shall be consummated the electoral vote of a great Republican State may at once be placed in the Democratic column for 1904. Other Republican States may prove to be in a similar frame of mind regarding the damage thus wantonly inflicted upon their industries.

"To be positive and peremptory in matters of profound conviction is a most excellent quality in a Chief Executive. To be mistaken as the result of rejecting truthful and reliable information is to court trouble and discomfiture.

"'First be sure you are right, and then go ahead,' is a maxim which might as well serve for the guidance of Presidents as of ordinary people."

In order to appreciate the venom of that it is only necessary to remember that in the opinion of the late President, as well as of his successor, and in the opinion of a large majority of Republicans in Congress, the honor of this Republic is involved—that the faith of this nation is pledged to its Caribbean ward.

So much for the venom in these stings. As to their significance, that can be guessed at by keeping in mind the source from which they come—the American Protective Tariff League, composed of the men who finance Republican campaigns.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I had time, I could take this one issue of the Economist and so fill up the RECORD with extracts of that sort that would extend my speech for an hour. Every man that has denounced this reciprocity scheme this summer in a public speech can get his speech into that paper under the running head of a "Great Republican speech." If any of you who favored reciprocity made a speech, you did not find it under the head of a "Great Republican speech." My friend from Iowa, Colonel HEPBURN, delivered a "stand-pat" speech, and it was so published. My friend Mr. LACEY delivered a speech of that sort, and it was so published. My other friend from Iowa, ROBERT G. COUSINS,

delivered a speech in the last convention, and it was so published. The time has come for the dissolution of the Republican party, and the process has already set in, thank God. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] This bill places it in the process of ultimate extinction.

Now, it is very rare that we ordinary mortals get a chance to read an editorial in a great paper in the United States three or four days before it is printed.

That is a blessing very rarely vouchsafed to us poor mortals here below. This is the 17th day of November. For the last three or four days I have had possession of this paper, which is an editorial from the American Economist for November 20, 1903. That is some time in the future. If the elder Disraeli—not brilliant Benjamin, but his father, Isaac—could come back to life again, he would seize hold of this editorial and place it with his curiosities of literature. One-half of it is taken up with the strange proposition that has been stated here, that we have already done more than we were under any obligations to do for Cuba, and therefore that we ought not to do any more for her to the injury of our own people. It gives four reasons to prove that we have done more than we had any business or were under any obligations to do.

Either this editorial was written by two men or it was written by a man who forgot while he was writing the last half what he had written in the first half of it, for the last half is devoted to the other proposition, that this bill, instead of being of benefit to the poor, downtrodden Cubans, is absolutely a monstrous outrage upon them. Here is the editorial in full:

[From the American Economist of November 20, 1903.]

ARE WE UNDER ANY MORAL OBLIGATION TO CUBA?

To demonstrate that there is not the slightest "moral obligation" on our part to Cuba that we are called upon to discharge, it is only necessary to contrast Cuba's condition under the rule of Spain with her condition now because of our intervention.

1. We gave Cuba her independence, something on which it is almost impossible to set a value. The cost of lives lost in her several wars, the tyranny of Spain, the burden of oppressive taxation, go, however, to make up the value of that independence, to which must be added the right of Cuba to govern herself, an inestimable privilege, not to be measured in dollars and cents. In doing this Cuba must be charged with the sacrifice of American lives and the expenditure of several hundreds of millions of the money of our taxpayers and a new pension list. To these must be added:

2. Our obligation under the Platt amendment to guard and protect Cuba from internal dissensions and from foreign foe for all time, under which Cuba may dispense with an army and a navy that would cost her six to ten millions per annum.

3. We have wiped out the $400,000,000 of debt that Cuba was carrying, equal to $283.50 per capita of her population, the annual interest on which $400,000,000 was $10,500,000, or nearly $10 per capita per annum.

4. We have relieved Cuba of the $12,000,000 of annual tax that was laid in Madrid to support the Spanish-Cuban army and navy and support the infamous rule of Spain in the island.

5. We relieved Cuba of the oppressive Spanish tariff of 1897, under which Cuba was forced, in buying from nations other than Spain, to pay duties averaging 125 per cent, or from one and a half to three times more than Spanish goods paid. It is now proposed to readopt that policy of "discrimination" in favor of the United States, only on a smaller scale. The theory seems to be that the curse of it will be removed if it is done under the cloak of "reciprocity." In other words, Cuba would be forced to pay from 20 to 40 per cent more than at present if she buys "treaty" goods from any nation except the United States. That is what has come to be known as affording Cuba "relief."

The result would be that the Cuban masses would be forced to pay the same duties they now pay on certain articles if taken from us, the quality of which, taken of foreign nations, is better, the cost of which is lower, and the time credit on which is longer than if purchased of the United States. We propose to force on the whole Cuban people disadvantages in order that a few sugar and tobacco planters in Cuba and the sugar trust and the tobacco and cigar trust may profit.

That is the whole case in a nutshell. Is it fair, is it decent, is it moral to thus take advantage of this new Republic that we have just set upon its feet?

It is said that Cuba will be unable to make her $35,000,000 loan unless she pledges her customs receipts. These receipts will either be reduced by the legislation proposed or else her people must pay the higher 20 to 40 per cent rates that reciprocity contemplates and calls on Cuba to enact in order to give us a discriminating or lower duty compared with other foreign nations. In other words, Cuba, under reciprocity, must either reduce her rates on her imports from us 20 to 40 per cent, which would cost her about $2,500,000 annually, and which she can not afford to do, or she must, in order to discriminate in our favor, increase her rates on goods from other foreign nations 20 to 40 per cent, the burden falling on her consumers. Is that right, no matter how much better and lower they may be, and regardless of the advantage of a longer credit that foreign nations now extend compared with that given by our exporters? That is in the very teeth of Mr. McKinley's policy.

The scheme has not a leg to stand upon that will commend itself to the investigator. It is unjust and oppressive from a Cuban standpoint, perhaps dangerous to her revenues and to the continued maintenance of a stable government, because it invites internal-revenue taxation, that Cubans are even now vigorously opposing. They object to the old Spanish "consumption taxes," and our policy will do more to create discontent than any other thing that could be devised. Can that be the ulterior object of the interested American trusts, syndicates, and exploiters who want annexation and free sugar and tobacco? As we have shown, there certainly is no moral obligation on our part to impose any such scheme on Cuba, and it would be in the very teeth of Mr. McKinley's policy of "commercial freedom" for the island.

In addition to that, the San Francisco Chronicle, another Republican organ, recently contained the following editorial:

KILL THE TREATY—THE BEST THING THE REPUBLICAN PARTY COULD DO AT THE EXTRA SESSION.

The extra session of Congress is called to meet on November 9. The only object stated in the proclamation is the passage of a law to validate the treaty of fake "reciprocity" negotiated with Cuba, and thereby stop the growth of our domestic sugar industry, throw both this country and Cuba into commercial war with half the nations of the earth, and utterly destroy public confidence in the pledges of the Republican party in its national convention and all faith in the words of Republican statesmen. We do not know whether the Republican Congress will commit party suicide or not. We do not believe that it will.

The validation of the Cuban treaty would stop the growth of the domestic sugar industry, because, with the present beet-sugar factories in the hands of the sugar trust, it would be more profitable to their owners to close them than to run them, and it would not pay new capital to go into the business and fight the trust. California land yields more beet sugar per acre than any other State in the Union, and, as per Willett & Gray's last statement, almost exactly double the yield of Michigan land, and there has not been a new sugar factory built or even projected here since the Cuban agitation began. The treaty would start commercial wars because it expressly provides that during its life no country except Cuba shall obtain any reduction whatever from our tariff rates on sugar.

What Germany will at once do is shown by what she did in the case of Canada, and by the plain notice that she has given that she will claim every advantage which Cuba and the United States grant to each other. What Russia will do is shown by what she did do when we applied to her sugar the countervailing duties. What the other countries will do may be readily imagined. They will retaliate in the most convenient way. The validation of the treaty would destroy confidence in Republican statesmen, because they were elected on a platform which, when dealing with reciprocity, explicitly declared against reciprocity in competing products. If the Republican party, responsible for legislation, deliberately and in the face of protest legislates precisely as it declared that it would not legislate, how can it expect its pledges to be ever again believed?

It will be best to kill the Cuban treaty.

I will tell you in brief why I am in favor of the bill. I am in favor of it, in the first place, because it is a small slice of the Democratic loaf. It is the beginning of the end. Thomas Jefferson is the father of reciprocity. I am in favor of it because, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] demonstrated yesterday beyond all controversy—and it was a great speech he delivered—and as President McKinley indicates in the extract that I have read, we have got to do something to broaden our market in the commerce of the world. I am in favor of it because I am selfish for my own people, because while the Cubans under this bill get their stuff in here 20 per cent under the Dingley tariff rates, we get our stuff into Cuba 20 per cent off of their rate; that is a preferential tariff of 20 per cent in our favor. On some things we are favored to the extent of 25 per cent and even as high as 40 per cent. The duty of a Representative is double; to represent the entire country in a certain sense, and more especially to represent those who sent him hither. This bill enables the farmers of the Mississippi Valley to get their butter, flour, wheat, corn meal, and everything of that kind into Cuba 30 per cent lower than anybody else on the face of the earth can get those articles in there. If that does not give us control of the Cuban market, then there is no sense in tariff schedules at all.

I have a reason back of these that I have always advocated and always will advocate as long as I live, provided it does not happen before I die. I am in favor of this bill because there are two pieces of ground on the North American continent that I want to see annexed to the United States. One is Cuba, and the other is every foot of the British North American possessions, no matter how far north they extend. [Applause.]

I am not in favor of conquering them. There is no reason why they should be conquered, and if we act with any sense they will come to us peaceably, and this bill is a step in the right direction. If we want the friendship of Cuba, as we are in duty bound to do and in good sense bound to do, she will come to us in time without the expenditure of a dollar, without the shedding of a single tear.

It is a strange historical fact that the accident of one man doing one thing kept us from securing the North American British possessions at the time of the Revolutionary war. I am going to dig into history and find out his name. When Gen. Richard Montgomery and Benedict Arnold with the American expedition assaulted Quebec all of the British soldiers took to their heels and they ran off without firing a gun. For some unaccountable reason one went back and touched fire to one of the cannon, that killed Montgomery, broke Arnold's leg, and cut down the head of the column, and the rest retreated, and it has been a British territory ever since.

Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, one of the greatest Democrats that ever lived, always contended that we had an indefeasible title to the line 54-40, on which the campaign of 1844 was fought and won. We ought to have had it then, and there never would have been any Alaskan boundary question. I am for it for those reasons. I believe that it is among the certainties of the future that Canada and the British possessions will be ours. We will welcome them with open arms. They are our kind of people; they understand our system of government; they speak our language, and they are fit for American citizenship.

Before I close I want to make one other remark. As far as this effort to tie the hands of the American Congress for five years is concerned, we utterly repudiate it and hold it for naught. You might as well understand that at this time as later, and that whenever we get possession of Congress we will do as we please. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] We vote for this

bill with that provison in it under duress, and every lawyer in the land knows that what you do under duress is not binding at any future time; and when we get possession of Congress we will abolish that provision with as little ceremony and as little hesitancy as Samson broke the withes that bound him. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask leave to round out my remarks and dress them up a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to "round out" his remarks. [Laughter.] Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for forty minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from New York begins I would ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] if he has anyone on his side of the House who cares to speak now.

Mr. PAYNE. If I knew of anyone on this side who wanted to talk at this time I would be glad to give them the opportunity, but the gentlemen on this side of the House seem to be inclined to talk to-morrow or the next day.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, in the interests of fairness of debate I do not think the gentleman ought to load up the wagon too much at the rear.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I do not think there will be any trouble about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. We should try as near as possible to have a streak of lean and a streak of fat.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, because of the rule which was adopted yesterday it will be impossible to amend or change any of the provisions of the bill before the House. Gentlemen must therefore accept it entire or reject it entire. Had the minority been permitted to do so, we should have offered an amendment striking out the provisos of the first section of the bill and substituting a provision removing the differential.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he will explain what he means by "the differential."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do. I am glad that my colleague asked the question, because I know there are some gentlemen among us who do not know its exact meaning.

Sugar is either refined or unrefined. All sugar that is purified by the use of animal charcoal, or, as it is sometimes called, "boneblack" or "char," is called "refined sugar." All sugar that is purified without the use of boneblack is called "unrefined sugar." It is possible to purify unrefined sugar to almost the same degree of purity as refined sugar. The process is, however, so expensive and difficult that for high grades of sugar boneblack is always employed.

The Dingley duty on sugar is levied according to its color and saccharine strength. The color is determined by the so-called Dutch standard. The first sixteen numbers of the Dutch standard are unrefined sugars; those above, refined. The saccharine strength is determined by the polariscopic test. The duty on unrefined sugars—that is, the sugars including No. 16 Dutch standard which have not been purified by the use of boneblack—is ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent per pound, provided the sugar does not test above 75° by the polariscope; for every additional degree, thirty-five one-thousandths of a cent is added per pound. This makes the duty on 96° sugar, which is the usual Cuban sugar of commerce, 1.685 cents per pound.

The duty on refined sugar—that is, the sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard which have been refined—is 1.95 cents per pound.

The differential is this difference in rate of duty between the refined and unrefined sugars. Thus the differential between a pound of refined sugar and a pound of 96° No. 16 Dutch standard sugar is 0.265 cent per pound.

This differential is the protection given the sugar refiners of this country.

The reasons which actuated us in desiring to so amend the bill so as to remove the differential have been stated at length in the exceedingly able views of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means, prepared by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi.

In the few minutes at my disposal I propose to very briefly answer some of the objections which have been urged against the bill, especially by the distinguished leader of the opposition, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COOPER]. [Laughter.]

It is claimed, first, that the enactment of this bill will inure exclusively to the benefit of the so-called sugar trust; secondly, that the United States will derive no benefit whatsoever from the proposed legislation; thirdly, if any benefit accrues to Cuba she does not need the benefit proposed, and fourthly, that the proposed legislation is un-Democratic.

Two years ago when the Cuban reciprocity bill was before the House I discussed at some length the argument that the sugar trust would be the sole beneficiary from any reduction of the Dingley rate upon sugar imported from Cuba. At that time the gentlemen who advanced this argument labored under the impression that there might be several world prices for sugar at the same time. Since then a great light has dawned upon them and they have discovered that there can be only one world price, and that the price fixed at Hamburg, Germany. As Germany is the largest producer of sugar in the world, the world price of sugar is fixed at her principal port of export, Hamburg. The price of sugar in New York at any time will, therefore, be the Hamburg price, plus freight and shipping charges, duty, and countervailing duty.

The following statement will explain my meaning:

Parity of 88° analysis beet sugar and 96° polarization cane sugar per 100 pounds.

Beet sugar, at 6/9 f. o. b. Hamburg, per 112 pounds	$1.47
Freight, 7/6 per ton	.083
Insurance, bank commission, loss of weight, one-half per cent	.022
Duty (88° analysis outturns 94° polarization)	1.615
Countervailing duty (German sugar)	.26
Lighterage at New York	.03
Difference in value to refiners between 88° analysis and 96° polarization	.19
Parity of 96° polarization cane centrifugal	3.67

The price of sugar at Habana, free on board ship, at any time, will be the price at New York, less duty, freight, and shipping charges.

According to the custom in Cuba, the planter sells directly to the agent of the refiner. There is nothing to prevent him selling upon the New York market. Sugar is sold upon the New York market as sugar, according to its saccharine strength. There is no particular brand of sugar as there is of cigars. Sugar is sold as sugar, and it is impossible to distinguish the origin of the different kinds of cane sugar, provided they are of the same polarization and color.

If it is possible for the American Sugar Refining Company to derive the full benefit of this reduction of rates, or any benefit whatsoever, by fixing the price of Cuban sugar, it must necessarily follow that there can be two prices for the same article at the same place and at the same time, and if the price of sugar is fixed at Hamburg, as it is, this is impossible.

Now, two years ago gentlemen who opposed this bill, or the similar bill then before the House, cited, in proof of their argument, that Porto Rican sugar, after a reduction of 15 per cent of the Dingley rate, had failed to reach the price of Cuban sugar by 0.13 of a cent; and although this argument has been exploded, although it was shown that they used an inferior grade of Porto Rican sugar and a superior grade of Cuban sugar, and that when the two grades were brought to a parity the price was the same, this same exploded argument is again brought forward to do service in opposition to this bill. Now, gentlemen who advance this argument either do not know that it has been exploded or they do know that it has been exploded. If they do not know that it has been exploded, then they have no business in their ignorance to set up as authorities upon the subject. If they do know that it has been exploded, then they have no business to try to deceive the country and to try to deceive the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman explain to the House how it is that three days ago prime yellow clarified (unrefined) sugar was quoted at $3\frac{29}{32}$, while last year on the same day it was $3\frac{23}{32}$, or a difference of $3\frac{1}{2}$ points against the American producer, while refined sugar on the same day last year was quoted at 4.21 and this year at 4.50? In other words, why is it that refined sugar has gained 29 points since Congress has met and prime yellow clarified, the best grade of unrefined sugar, has lost $3\frac{1}{2}$ points, a difference of just $32\frac{1}{2}$ points, the exact amount fixed by the pending reciprocity bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think I can answer that a little later in my speech, when I come to another point. If I do not, the gentleman can interrupt me.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I would like very much to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Now, some gentlemen urge that there is no reason why we should pass this bill, because it confers no direct benefit upon us. In view of the moral obligation which we are under to Cuba this objection is sordid and selfish enough, but even so, it can be met. Ever since the Cuban war the imports into Cuba have been steadily declining, and the share of the United States in those imports has been declining in even greater proportion.

I should like to say that my figures are taken from the report of Mr. O. P. Austin, and of course I assume they are correct, as he is a Government official.

In 1899 the total imports into Cuba were $66,783,100, of which the share of the United States amounted to 43.7 per cent.

In 1900 the total imports had fallen to $66,658,600, while the share of the United States rose slightly to 43.8 per cent.

In 1901 the total imports had fallen to $66,584,000, while the share of the United States had fallen to 42.2 per cent.

In 1902 the imports had still further decreased to $62,135,464, and this including specie, while the share of the United States had fallen to 42 per cent. During the same period of the exports from Cuba to other countries the share of the United States fell from 83 per cent to 76.2 per cent.

In return for our trifling concession of 20 per cent, Cuba concedes us reductions in the rates of duties now levied upon products of the United States ranging from 20 to 40 per cent.

These liberal concessions should certainly permit the United States to obtain a virtual monopoly of the Cuban market.

I know that gentlemen from Louisiana, in common with representatives of the beet-sugar industry, are afraid that this 20 per cent reduction will so stimulate the production of sugar in Cuba as to result in driving the American industry out of business. They should console themselves with the thought that the per capita of consumption in this country has kept pace with the increased production throughout the world and that there is still a safe margin of some one and a half million tons which must be purchased by the people of the United States elsewhere than in Cuba.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. But the gentleman from New York will admit, I think, that the increased production of raw sugar in Cuba has been very remarkable. In the last three years it has jumped from 630,000 tons to 1,130,000 tons this year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The gentleman is not altogether exact. The exports of sugar from Cuba have increased to that extent, but the production has not. Last year they drew very largely from the reserve.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. They increased from 680,000 tons to 1,130,000 this year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The production estimated for 1903? I have got the figures, and I think the gentleman will find that those are the exports from Cuba and not the production.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, while the per capita consumption of sugar in Great Britain in 1901-2, according to Licht's sugar circular, was 98.03 pounds, the per capita in the United States was 70.59 pounds, and there is no reason why our per capita should not eventually be as great as that of Great Britain.

It is claimed by some gentlemen that a decrease of the Dingley duty on sugar will not lower the price to the American consumer, although these same gentlemen insist that a tariff tax is always borne by the consumer.

Now, eliminating the question of the incidence of a tariff tax, let us for a moment examine the probable effect of the reduction of the sugar duty on the cost to the consumer.

On the 1st of September of this year the Brussels sugar convention went into effect, having been ratified by France, Germany, Austria, Great Britain, Holland, Sweden, and, tentatively, by Italy.

Without going into detail as to the provisions of this convention, it is enough for present purposes that the effect of the convention is the destruction of the power of the kartels to artificially increase the price of sugar within the boundaries of the countries where they are powerful and to decrease it abroad. In other words, as the result of the Brussels convention, the world price of sugar, heretofore artificially fixed by the arbitrary action of the sugar kartels, will henceforth be regulated by the natural law of supply and demand.

Now, if it is true, as some of the opponents of this bill claim, that the reduction of the Dingley rate on sugar will enormously stimulate production in Cuba, it must necessarily follow that the supply will outrun the demand so as to lower the price until the demand meets the supply, and, as a consequence, the consumer will derive the benefit of the lower price.

While we are steadily losing our trade with Cuba, Cuba is steadily losing her ability to trade. Unless something is done to secure the Cuban market and to relieve economic conditions in Cuba, it can only be a question of time when what little commerce she can afford to have will be deflected from our ports and when her respectable poverty will be changed into absolute bankruptcy.

It is claimed that Cuba has become so prosperous that she does not need any commercial help from us.

Cuba does not come to us as a beggar. She is not an object of charity. She is not bankrupt, but she is, none the less, very poor.

Our responsibility did not cease with the transfer of her government to Cuban hands, and it is our duty to allow her to become prosperous. She comes to us asking for a trade arrangement which will permit her to better her condition, and in return she offers us concessions of priceless value.

For the two years 1894 and 1895, before the war, the total exports from Cuba amounted to $215,107,742, and the total imports amounted to $162,244,893, showing a balance in favor of Cuba of $52,862,849.

For the four years 1899 to 1902, inclusive, the total exports amounted to $232,494,081, and the total imports to $275,261,323, showing a balance against Cuba of $42,769,242. Or, if we compare the exports and the imports of the last two years with those of the years 1894 and 1895, we find a shrinkage of nearly $85,000,000.

In other words, during the two years immediately before the war Cuba sold $53,000,000 more than she bought, and yet during the last four years, the greater part of which time she was under American control, she sold nearly $43,000,000 less than she bought. This certainly does not show increasing prosperity.

Two years ago Cuba was on the verge of bankruptcy, and that she has escaped ruin is not due to any effort on our part.

That she has been able to exist at all during the last two years is because of two reasons:

First, the change in her government; second, the marketing of an increased amount of tobacco and sugar.

In 1902 the spectacular and extravagant rule of General Wood, having saddled upon Habana for ten years the infamous gambling monopoly of the Sociedad Anonima Jai Alai, gave place to the conservative, economical, sensible, and business-like administration of President Estrada Palma, who has proved himself an executive of the very highest order.

The fiscal year 1899-1900 produced a revenue of $17,385,898, during which time there was expended $15,661,093. General Wood was in office about six months of this time.

During the fiscal year 1900-1901 the revenues amounted to $17,165,080 and the expenditures to $17,645,427. General Wood was in office during the entire year, and the budget showed a deficit of about half a million dollars.

From July 1, 1901, to May 19, 1902, or less than eleven months, the revenues amounted to $14,708,302 and the expenditures to $16,401,480. General Wood was still in office and the budget showed a deficit for the eleven months of nearly two million dollars.

From May 20, 1902, the date of the commencement of the Cuban Republic, to December 31, 1902, the revenues amounted to $9,729,448 and the expenditures to $8,102,587, a surplus of over a million and a half dollars, while for the six months from January 1, 1903, to June 30, 1903, the revenues amounted to $8,197,940 and the expenditures to $5,229,250, a surplus for six months of nearly three million dollars.

In other words, under President Estrada Palma the cost of government is over $7,000,000 per annum, or nearly 40 per cent less than it was under General Wood.

This has alone greatly relieved the economic condition of Cuba. The second factor which has kept Cuba from bankruptcy has been the marketing of an increased quantity of tobacco and of sugar.

While the total value of tobacco exported from Cuba to the United States in 1902 was $10,899,924, the total value for 1903 is approximately $13,141,646, or an increase of nearly $2,250,000.

During the past year a very large quantity of sugar, including a considerable amount of the reserve stock, was imported from Cuba to the United States.

I do not wish to be unfair to the gentleman from Michigan. The crop for 1903 amounted to 975,000 tons, as against 850,181 tons for 1902.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. And for 1903 and 1904 it is estimated at 1,130,000 tons.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a matter of estimate, and we have had experience in that before. Two years ago it was estimated all sorts of ways.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. It is Willett & Gray's estimate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; but they were 100,000 tons out of the way in the crop of 1902.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That would still make it over a million tons.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

The crop for 1903 amounted to 975,000 tons, as against 850,181 tons for 1902. But of the 1902 crop, only 439,382 tons were exported, while in 1903 the reserve was drawn upon, so that the total amount exported to the United States was 1,069,610 tons.

This increased exportation was not due to increased prosperity, nor did it result in profit to the planters.

It is generally conceded that the cost of a pound of 96° centrifugal sugar, free on board ship at Habana, is 2 cents. The shipping charges, freight, insurance, etc., from Habana to New York range from 0.25 to 0.265 cent per pound, according to the market price of sugar. The bond price of sugar in New York—that is, the market price of sugar less the duty—must therefore be 2.25 cents per pound in order to permit the Cuban planter to sell his product without loss; or, if the duty, which amounts to 1.685 cents per pound, be added, the market price must be about 3¾ cents.

When the last reciprocity bill was before the House the market price was about 3⅝ cents, representing a loss to the Cuban planter of 0.56 cent per pound.

Shortly after that time the Brussels convention was signed by the delegates taking part, and in anticipation of its ratification there was an immediate shrinkage in continental sugar production. The effect of this was an increase in the price of sugar, so that the last Cuban sugar crop was sold at between 3¾ and 3⅞ cents per pound, representing a loss of approximately over a million dollars to the sugar planters of Cuba.

The planters prefer to get rid of their sugar and pocket their loss rather than pay the insurance and storage charges for an indefinite period, with the hope of ultimately obtaining a reduction of the Dingley tariff rate.

Should a 20 per cent reduction of the Dingley rate be conceded to Cuban sugar, the duty will be reduced to 1.348 cents per pound, which at a market price in New York of 3¾ cents would mean a profit of about 0.144 cent per pound to the Cuban planter, or, on a crop of 850,000 tons, a profit of nearly $3,000,000 to Cuba.

In short, Cuba has existed because the cost of her Government has been reduced over $7,000,000 per annum; because the sugar planter has been able to market his crop and a part of his reserve at a loss, and the tobacco planter has been able to sell about $2,225,000 more of his product.

The objection to the bill that it is undemocratic is scarcely valid. I grant that it does not of itself shatter the Dingley law and give us in place a tariff for revenue and revenue only, but it certainly does lower the excessive and iniquitous Dingley duties in one direction, and it certainly does decrease taxation to the people of the United States.

Let me call the attention of those Democrats who are opposed to reciprocity to the fact that the first treaty of reciprocity was negotiated by Franklin Pierce, a Democratic President; that the Hawaiian treaty of reciprocity was renewed by a Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, and that the platform of 1892 proclaimed the doctrine as sound Democracy.

And let me especially ask them, if they are in doubt, to read the "Report on the privileges and restrictions on the commerce of the United States in foreign countries," sent to the House of Representatives on December 16, 1793, by the then Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, in which he says:

> Such being the restrictions on the commerce and navigation of the United States, the question is, In what way may they best be removed, modified, or counteracted?
>
> As to commerce, two methods occur: First, by friendly arrangements with the several nations with whom these restrictions exist, or, second, by the separate act of our own legislatures for countervailing their effects.
>
> There can be no doubt but that of these two, friendly arrangements is the most eligible.
>
> Would even a single nation begin with the United States this system of free commerce it would be advisable to begin it with that nation, since it is one by one only that it can be extended to all. Where the circumstances of either party render it expedient to levy a revenue by way of impost on commerce its freedom might be modified in that particular by mutual and equialenvt measures, preserving it entire in all others.
>
> Some nations, not yet ripe for free commerce in all its extent, might still be willing to mollify its restrictions and regulations for us in proportion to the advantages which an intercourse with us might offer. Particularly they may concur with us in reciprocating the duties to be levied on each side, or in compensating any excess of duty by equivalent advantages of another nature.

Certainly the objection of Republicans who are conscientious protectionists is much more valid, for this bill is unquestionably a breach in the wall of protection and a step in the direction of a tariff for revenue and revenue only.

Whether the sugar trust will or will not increase its dividends under the terms of this bill, whether the United States will receive direct benefit or not, whether Cuba is bankrupt or only on the verge of bankruptcy, whether this bill is undemocratic or unrepublican, there is an argument in favor of its enactment which, to my mind, rises above all other arguments, and that is what some gentlemen sneeringly call the sentimental argument, but which really involves that greatest of all sentiments—the good faith and the honor of the United States.

Let me very briefly run over the history of the question which is before the House.

In 1898 the United States recognized the independence of Cuba, but in 1901, by the terms of the so-called Platt amendment, we limited that independence and took Cuba within the sphere of influence of what some of our statesmen are pleased to call "the American system."

It is true that a republic has been established in Cuba and that we have withdrawn from direct participation in her government, but, none the less, the effect of the Platt amendment has been to make Cuba a dependency under the protection of the United States.

I do not propose to criticise the wisdom or the folly, the justice or the injustice, of our action in 1901. The Platt amendment imposed upon us an obligation of our own seeking, the obligation to preserve Cuban independence and to maintain a government "adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty."

Whether our action there was wise or foolish, right or wrong, we must bear the consequences.

We are as much bound in honor as a nation to foster the material prosperity of Cuba, so that an adequate government can be maintained, as we were bound in honor to withdraw from the island the moment an adequate government was established.

We have denied to Cuba the right to enter into intimate relations with any other power. It is true that she may negotiate treaties of commerce with other countries, but were she to negotiate such treaties and to repudiate any of the obligations she might incur, as Latin-American republics have sometimes been known to do, the cocontracting power would be unable, either directly or indirectly, to even request her to live up to the terms of the treaty without having to answer to the United States.

It is scarcely probable that any of the nations of Europe would care to enter into intimate commercial relations with a power that has been made irresponsible through our action.

As we have made it impossible for Cuba to seek alliances elsewhere, it is a duty which we can not shirk to permit her to enter into the closest political and commercial relations with us.

Cuba complied with the terms of the Platt amendment willingly and in good faith, trusting to the honor of the United States that our part of the bargain would be carried out.

It is a stain on the national good faith which can never be removed, that the petty interests of a second-rate trust should have been considered of greater moment than the fulfillment of the word of honor of our great country

Now, at last, after years of waiting, after the spectacle of an insolent lobby practically dominating the Congress, we propose to partially fulfill our pledge to Cuba by giving her this twopenny measure of relief which is warranted not to offend the susceptibilities of even the most sensitive trust in existence.

Many believe that as the years go by a common destiny will draw the United States and Cuba closer and closer together until, in God's good time, the Republic of Cuba will become an integral part of the greatest nation on earth.

If Cuba is ever to throw in her lot with ours, she must do so voluntarily, having first been united to us in interests, in sentiment, and in aspirations before she is united politically.

The shortest road to union is by tearing down the barriers of the prohibitive tariff which divides the two nations. The strongest plea that can be made to Cuban hearts is to excite their gratitude.

We have made a solemn promise to Cuba. If a Republican majority in its might is only willing to partially keep that promise, the blame and the shame rest with the Republican party.

This bill is but a partial fulfillment of our obligation; but as we are confronted with the alternative of either not fulfilling that obligation at all or of only fulfilling it in part, there should be no difference of opinion upon this side of the Chamber as to the necessity of enacting the bill.

It is not a question which should be considered in the light of personal preferences, of sectional feeling, or of private interests. It is a question which should be considered in the light of the duty and of the honor of the United States. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the bill under consideration for ethical and political, rather than economical reasons. When the Republic of Cuba was born into the family of nations its freedom was somewhat hampered by conditions and limitations imposed upon its sovereignty by this Government which are embodied in what is commonly known as the "Platt amendment." The status of Cuba is not that of a dependency, but its relationship with the United States is similar to that of a qualified suzerainty, and in view of the limitations imposed upon the power of the new Republic affecting substantially its functions of international sovereignty, it is the solemn duty of this Government to render adequate compensatory benefits to the infant State. It is a matter of common everyday justice, and Congress ought not to hesitate to give validity to the pending treaty upon this ground alone. If this country had permitted the Republic of Cuba to take a position among the powers of the earth without a single limitation upon its freedom of action, it might be justly said that upon ethical grounds the United States owes no further duty to the island, but since the power of the new Republic to conduct international affairs is so seriously limited by conditions imposed upon its sovereignty by this country, our responsibility is such that we are under obligation to see that it does not suffer on account of our restrictions.

The establishment of the independence of Cuba and the hauling down of the American flag, to be replaced by a new emblem

representing a new government of the people, by the people, and for the people, constitutes one of the proudest pages in American history, and we can not afford to mar or in any manner becloud that splendid act of justice and magnanimity by following it up with a narrow, selfish, and unjust commercial policy. This Government stands sponsor for the new Republic, and the question of cost is a secondary consideration. We should either grant the reasonable requests of the Republic of Cuba respecting commercial and all other relations, or unqualifiedly abrogate the conditions that we imposed upon its sovereignty. In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, the location of Cuba, occupying as it does a commanding position over the Gulf of Mexico and the Isthmus of Panama, makes it imperatively necessary from a political standpoint that in a large sense American influence shall control the policy of the island. It is truly within the sphere of our political influence, and conditions upon the island—political, social, and commercial—are and must forever be so intimately connected with our own affairs that prudence demands that our relations with the new Government shall be of the most intimate and cordial character possible. The close proximity of Cuba to the United States, and its intimate connection with our own peace and welfare, justified our interposition in the first instance and our conduct in securing its independence. It would be a policy of inexcusable stupidity for this country to now turn the island adrift and allow foreign influences to get a foothold in its commercial and political policy. It would be a practical abandonment of the principles that we professed in intervening to wrest the island from further domination by the Kingdom of Spain.

Furthermore, it is the belief of many of our people that the ultimate destiny of Cuba will be annexation to the United States. That eventuality can be justified only when the people of the island willingly consent to it. We owe the new Government our sincere good will and encouragement in its independent national life, but if the time shall come when it is the judgement of the people of Cuba and of this country that annexation is the wiser policy for both, conditions ought to exist in the island that will make its assimilation more easily accomplished. But whether annexation shall ever be brought about or not the clear policy of the United States is to Americanize the new Republic as far as possible. Its political institutions are largely patterned after ours. Its national and social life ought to be brought into fuller harmony with our civilization, in order that peace and good will between this country and that shall be permanently assured; and no policy tends more to knit peoples together into closer friendship than intimate commercial intercourse. Therefore, for political reasons alone, there is abundant justification for the enactment of the pending measure and the vitalizing the treaty that has been negotiated.

The pending treaty provides that products from the island of Cuba shall be admitted into our ports at a rate of duty 20 per cent below those fixed by the Dingley law, and, as a matter of compensation, products of the United States exported to Cuba are to be admitted at preferential rates of from 20 to 40 per cent over other countries. Cuba, like all tropical and subtropical countries at all developed, is a greater producer than consumer. Judged from a pure money basis, it is not likely that the United States will receive any material benefits from the treaty. I do not mean to say that our trade with Cuba will not be increased, because it will, but what I mean is that we will probably yield more benefits from a commercial standpoint than we will receive. Sugar is the chief product of Cuba, and a reduction of 20 per cent of the tariff rate will amount to $7 a ton on the entire product of the island. The quantity of sugar consumed in the United States last year was something over 2,500,000 tons. The quantity imported from foreign countries was about 1,600,000 tons, and of this seven or eight hundred thousand tons were imported from Cuba.

As long as the product of Cuba is not sufficient to satisfy our foreign demand, the rebate of $7 a ton on sugar will wholly go into the pockets of the Cuban sugar grower, since there can not be two prices in the markets for the same commodity, and Cuba will have an advantage over all competitors of $7 a ton. It is not to be supposed that Cuban sugar will be sold any cheaper than sugar from Germany or Austria, so it is quite clear that the Cuban sugar producer will be the beneficiary of the rebate of $7 a ton until the Cuban product more than satisfies our demand for foreign sugar. This is the object of the treaty. It is designed to give the Cuban sugar grower the benefit of the substantial concession in order to promote development and to contribute to the general prosperity of the island. Whenever Cuba produces more than sugar enough to satisfy the American demand, then the concession made in the tariff will be divided between the Cuban sugar producer and the American sugar consumer. This is in accordance with economic law. The largest sugar product in the island of Cuba was in 1894 and amounted to something over a million tons.

The development of the island, however, is in its infancy. It has an area of about 44,000 square miles and a population of about a million six hundred thousand. When properly developed, as it will be if conditions are sufficiently encouraging, it has the ultimate capacity to produce sugar enough to supply the entire world, and in my judgment, under the influence of the pending treaty, inside of five years Cuba will produce and send to this country every pound of sugar that will be necessary for us to bring from abroad. The island is exceedingly fertile and prolific. Its resources are large and its products are numerous. The only thing that seriously hampers rapid development in the island to-day is lack of a market for its sugar product and the want of an adequate labor supply. The island of Java is but little larger than Cuba, and its natural fertility and resources are no greater, but it has been developed and is to-day supporting a population of 28,000,000 people. Cuba has the capacity to creditably and comfortably maintain a population of from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 souls. This condition perhaps will not come about for a considerable period of time, but it is a condition that will ultimately come, and the power and influence of a country so fertile and resourceful with so large a population will be a considerable factor in the politics and commerce of this country.

In the development of Cuba there will be a large demand for iron products, for agricultural implements, machinery, and many things that the people of this country are able to supply, and, under the advantages we obtain by the provisions of the pending treaty, we ought in a large measure to supply all the things that may be required along the lines I have suggested in the development of the island. We will be benefited in a large measure by the terms of the treaty from the standpoint of trade.

Our trade with foreign countries may be greatly increased under the influence of reciprocity treaties. If we are receiving certain kinds of products from several competing nations and should negotiate with one, giving it material advantages in our ports, as a matter of course our trade with that country would be greatly increased, but an increase of trade brought about by such conditions is not always a benefit, viewed from a purely commercial standpoint. An increase of trade is always a blessing to the country if it comes about by operation of natural law. In determining the question as to the advantages derived from an increase of trade, the question of concession and sacrifice is always an important factor.

I confess I am not enamored of the policy of reciprocity as a means of promoting foreign trade. It is unscientific, and arrests and often destroys the operation of natural economic law. If our tariff policy were made up altogether of reciprocity agreements with commercial countries containing various and varied rates of duty upon similar commodities brought to our ports, competing countries for our trade would not occupy an equal footing, and the whole system of commerce would be artificialized and chaos and factitious forces would reign supreme. It seems to me that the wisest commercial policy for any country is to receive the products of foreign countries in its ports upon equal terms where impartial treatment is accorded it by those countries. I believe in the open-door policy, and by that I mean that we should treat all of the commercial countries impartially that deal with us according to the same principle. The open-door policy, as I conceive it to be, means simply equal commercial treatment of foreign nations that do not discriminate against us. It is perfectly consistent with the policy of protection, and it encourages a better feeling among foreign nations and at the same time puts producing countries seeking our markets upon an equal footing and allows those that can produce to the best advantage to have the full benefit of their superiority.

I am discussing this question now from a purely commercial standpoint, and, as I said at the outset, I am in favor of the pending treaty with Cuba upon other grounds. It is often the case that political considerations outweigh commercial considerations, and where this is true a country is perfectly justifiable in granting trade concessions for the purpose of obtaining political advantages. Again, it is sometimes necessary for a country to enter into special trade relations with another country for the purpose of protecting itself against unjust treatment in the commercial world. The policy of retaliation is a most important weapon in the commercial armory, and it should always be used where it is necessary to secure fair and just treatment.

Reciprocity, as a permanent commercial policy, in my judgment, can not be reconciled with the policy of protection as exemplified in the last two Republican tariff laws. Those laws were framed along the line of imposing a tariff upon products the like of which can be produced in this country, for the double purpose of raising revenue and encouraging the home industry. This is the essence of protection, as expressed in the McKinley law enacted in 1890 and the Dingley law enacted in 1897. Those laws admitted into this country free of duty all commodities, not classified as luxuries, the like of which can not be produced here. In negotiating reciprocity treaties it is necessary, of course, to make

trade concessions in favor of foreign countries, and where the tariff laws are framed for the double purpose of revenue and protection, and customs are collected exclusively upon competitive products, no concessions can be made except upon competitive articles. The result must be that domestic manufacturers, seeking markets abroad under special trade arrangements, will urge the reduction of customs duties upon other products in order to secure better markets for their own. This policy creates discord, friction, and warring among our own industries and leaves the whole industrial situation in a condition of uncertainty and anxiety.

If reciprocity is to be the permanent commercial policy of this country, we should revise our tariff laws and impose duties upon articles the like of which we can not produce in order to have a basis for the negotiation of trade treaties. If we had a tariff upon coffee, we could say to the Republic of Brazil, "We are prepared to make substantial reductions in favor of your coffee products if you will give us equivalent concessions for certain lines of our wares." This could be done without sacrificing the interests of any American industries and without breeding commercial and sectional wars among our own producers. The McKinley bill in 1890 greatly enlarged the free list, and Mr. Blaine criticised that historic measure on the ground that it gave away substantial customs duties without receiving a single concession in the way of preferential advantages in foreign markets in return. This I conceive to be the reciprocity policy advocated by Mr. Blaine, one of the most intelligent and consistent of a long line of able champions of the policy of protection. He believed that the tariff should not be abrogated upon noncompetitive articles, except upon receiving equivalent concessions in the markets of the countries producing and importing that class of commodities.

That is the only kind of reciprocity that can be reconciled with a policy of protection. It is along the same line that Hon. Joseph Chamberlain is advocating the reconstruction of tariff duties in the British ports. He favors larger customs schedules, not for the purpose of protecting industries of the United Kingdom, but for the purpose of enabling the Imperial Government to accord preferential rates to the English colonies and other countries that care to enter into trade treaties with Great Britain. The principle is identical with the Blaine idea and, in my judgment, in view of the fact that all the great powers of the earth are hedging themselves about with protective laws, it is only a question of a few years when Great Britain will enact a general tariff law sufficient to enable her to grant preferences to her own colonies and to other countries where she may find it to her interest to do so. The limit upon my time only allows a brief reference to this great question, and I have only attempted to state a few general conclusions. I have endeavored to discriminate the pending treaty from what is commonly termed the "general reciprocity policy."

There is much sentiment in this country in favor of more liberal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and there is much to justify that sentiment in the way of political argument. That is a question solely for the future. If a trade treaty should ever be negotiated with Canada, in my judgment it will be justified mainly upon political grounds, and it does seem that the people of the United States and the people of Canada ought to be bound together by stronger ties of political and commercial unity than they are to-day.

The Cuban treaty has my unqualified approval. If Cuba was geographically situated so as to be without the proper sphere of American influence and we had no sponsorship for her national life, I probably would entertain different views upon the subject. Two years ago I opposed in a Republican caucus a bill authorizing reductions of tariff revenues in favor of Cuban products. My position was based in the main upon the conditions contained in that bill. It provided that Cuba should not only make equivalent trade concessions, but that she should at the same time in the same connection ingraft upon her system of government our naturalization policy and our labor-exclusion laws. It occurred to me then, and I believe that my position was right, that Cuba could not afford to comply with our demands. The labor situation there is such that her policy may be to encourage laborers from foreign countries. This was our policy in the early days of the Republic, and it greatly promoted development and enhanced our prestige.

We have arrived at a time in our national life when it is altogether proper and expedient for us to impose rigid restrictions upon immigration and to prevent laborers coming here under contract altogether. This condition has not arrived yet in the history of the Republic of Cuba, and it occurred to me that it was unjust and unwise for us to impose any such conditions upon Cuba as a consideration for our making commercial concessions which ought to have been made without hesitation or reluctance. I have no doubt that the pending treaty will soon become operative, and I look forward to a revival of activity in the island of Cuba and a condition of prosperity which it has never enjoyed before in all its history. The American name and memory will be cherished by that grateful people more fully as the years go by, and it certainly will be a matter of pride to every American that this country has been the means of raising the ill-fated island from a position of destitution and dependence to that of prosperity and independence. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, after nearly two years of uncomplaining expectancy—quiet waiting, but nevertheless hope deferred, our sister Republic of the south, whose birth as a nation we were so largely instrumental in bringing about, is still waiting for us to carry out those anticipations she had a right to expect, which practically amounted to an absolute promise on our part that we would grant her, through the lowering of our tariff, the opportunity to market her products, chiefly sugar and tobacco, at a remunerative basis, she having lost her previous outlet by reason of the Spanish-American war, and it is hardly to the honor of our nation, the wish of our people, or the justification of her hopes that she is still knocking at our door and pleading for a relief which practically all admit is necessary for her commercial salvation. Let us therefore no longer delay or stay our hands, but at once redeem our pledge, if only to the degree we propose by the passage of this bill, and allow the 20 per cent reduction, so that Cuba may go her way with renewed hope in the building up of her own destiny.

We need her sugar, we can use to advantage her tobacco, and should never have forced her to pay full duty on the crops of 1902 and 1903 to the extent of about $10,000,000 when she could little afford the burden, after being devastated and impoverished by a cruel war. She is by adoption almost as close to us, and in actual distance closer, than our own newly born daughters of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands, yet we allow the two former absolute freedom of entry to our home ports and rebate on sugar and tobacco from the Philippines 25 per cent, which is likely before long to be made 50 per cent, from our present tariff, as I note Senator LODGE has lately introduced a bill to that end, and from debates that took place in this House at the last session I judge such extra allowance would be favorably considered by this Congress.

I believe now, as I did at the time of the former debate, in 1902, that 25 per cent to 30 per cent rebate should be given, and that it will do no serious harm to our American sugar-beet industry even if for a time capital might hesitate and the building of new factories would not be inaugurated, and I had then and have now slight sympathy with those who made so fierce a fight to retain the full duty on the theory it was necessary protection to any American industry (as most evidence appeared to the contrary), or that it would in any way imperil the general plan of protection, which has been so potent a factor in the grand upbuilding of the greatest manufacturing industries in the world. We should remain loyal to our successfully tried system of protection, but not subservient to it, or make ourselves its abject slave, which some do on my side of the House, as it is our personal duty to approach all such subjects on the broad lines of national honor and expediency, and not sectional interest.

With the greatly improved methods of manufacture, and the gradual cheaper supply of beets through their culture on a large scale, and the use of the by-products, we should be able to turn out the refined sugar to meet competition, unless conditions greatly change and rapidly, Cuba also increasing her output and cheapening it beyond any present calculations of the experts on the subject to-day.

Those who should be well posted claim that if the present duty has to be paid no money can be made, even if the plantations were equipped with the best up-to-date machinery, and railroad connections built to bring the cane more cheaply to the centrales, but that 20 per cent reduction will enable the larger planters to realize a fair margin on the capital invested, but is hardly sufficient to warrant the smaller landowners to go to the expense of fertilizing and erecting new works, and they will most likely have to sell out to the capitalist.

There is one feature of this bargain I can not believe in so strongly as many seem to do, perhaps unthinkingly, and I say this in all good faith, as I am among the strongest advocates for an increased exportation of our manufactured goods, and we should lose no fair opportunity to aid our exporters, as I believe exportation to be the salvation of our industries, and the only way in which we shall be able to maintain our rapid growth and uphold even to a reasonable degree the present wage scale, which is so desirable.

I question, however, the wisdom of the demand we have forced upon Cuba for trade concessions for our goods under the guise of fair reciprocal reciprocity. The term reciprocity means merely the same thing as the swapping of horses among men or jackknives

between boys, and it might be much better for the entire world if all granted uniform tariff laws to all others on goods crossing the ocean or border, which would avoid jealousy and discrimination, and I am glad to know the last speaker [Mr. CRUMPACKER] agrees with me in these views. In any reciprocity treaty one party must get the better of the other.

All countries have a perfect right to adopt a tariff to suit their special needs, and no one can complain; but so soon as they give privileges to one nation and not another, this is clear discrimination and invites retaliation. I will frankly admit, by reason of the circumstances surrounding our relations with Cuba, it is more reasonable and allowable we should proceed on the lines we propose than would apply generally, and the same thing can be said about Canada; but that does not change the principles involved. Circumstances will at times make reciprocity desirable, even necessary, and the lesser of two evils; but it will most always be dangerous.

We can give Cuba 20 per cent reduction in duty for products, including raw sugar, and few can object, although it shuts out the sugar of the English West Indies, which now goes to Canada as its market, receiving a lower duty, as coming from an English colony; but when we ask similar allowances for ourselves, ranging from 20 per cent to 40 per cent on American goods sent to that island, is it true we do her no harm, or, rather, is it not true we really injure her and also the feelings of outside powerful nations who may remember it, and to our own detriment?

It is admitted and well known that Cuba raises her revenue to run the country practically entirely from her customs, and if we to-day do 30 per cent or more of the trade this must mean cutting down her revenue accordingly, and, as it is stated frankly on this floor that our further desire and object is to drive out other nations' goods, so as to secure a larger share of her business for ourselves—in fact, practically all of it if we can—does it not follow if we are successful that we force on her a still larger heavy shrinkage of her revenue, which may be serious to her finances? Is it not again true, although I have not heard it mentioned, that already Cuba has in contemplation this result, and that she admits she may be forced to raise her tariff all around to offset the loss she is likely to sustain?

I fail to see how, under such conditions, we will cheapen the cost of our goods for her benefit, which has been put to us so strongly, but rather that we will increase the cost of all importations to her people and largely those she must have from other nations, as I doubt if the greatest optimist among us will not admit there are some articles she will by inclination and preference or necessity desire to obtain from others. Let us hope this eventuality may not be necessary for her to face, as she can little afford at present to pay high prices for her necessities, and as a non-manufacturing nation she is dependent on the outside for most all the general requirements of her people. We naturally should have pride, as our esteemed leader on this side has said, in doing the larger share of Cuban trade; but with that island almost at our doors it can hardly be either satisfactory or a source of glorification on our part to think or admit that our manufacturers, who boast of world conquest, must have a bounty in their favor of 20 per cent to 40 per cent against all others to enable them to hold what they now have and secure a larger foothold in said island.

One of the speakers referred to various items in which we should largely increase our trade, as whisky, soap, shoes, etc.; but there are other reasons besides reduction of duty which enter into such matters. In the case of whisky, for instance, the Cubans have for years used Scotch whisky, and it will be necessary for our distillers to educate them up to the taste of Bourbon and rye before we can expect to do much in this line. The soap chiefly used, except the common variety, is highly perfumed, costly, and not such at present as we can supply to advantage. Shoes, also, they mostly take from France and Spain, and the same are specially manufactured for their market, and our people will have to study their requirements carefully before they can capture the trade.

I doubt if but a few of our industries need the advantage, and question whether our manufacturers themselves ask for this discrimination in their favor, and some to whom I have spoken state frankly they do not, or that it is wise to give it. If on equal bases the business is not possible it might well pass us. This leads us up to consider the grave and important question of the ultimate benefit of obtaining output for our goods by this hot-house process misnamed "reciprocity." I sincerely hope it will turn out to our benefit and that we shall have no day of reckoning or later lose more in other markets than we gain in Cuba; but let us consider if we can count on this. It is doubtful, and when speaking on this subject in April, 1902, I called the attention of the House to such risk and the dangerous position we were forcing, as few of the speakers either thought of this contingency or mentioned it in their remarks, although some have done so in this debate, and now again I take the present opportunity to once more strongly urge it to be given consideration, as during the past twelve months it has been made plain to us that powerful interests with whom we are already or may shortly be at war commercially do not like and will not quickly accept or tolerate our going ahead continually, as opportunity offers, taking away ther inherent supposed rights and privileges to trade in markets heretofore open to them on equal bases with ourselves. We seem willing to feather our own business nests by plucking the plumage from the commercial body of England, Germany, France, and other nations, and blindly shut our eyes to trade retaliation that may swiftly follow.

Our friend from Virginia who spoke so well and gave us many new ideas to consider tries to put all our loss of business abroad on the grand Republican Dingley tariff act, but fails to see that while other nations may not like our high tariff at home, they can not justly complain, if we will bear the burden, so long as we do not discriminate, but so soon as we do, by reciprocal deals and shutting-out processes, they then find justification in deciding to put up a barrier against us in markets they control at home or abroad.

We are rather boastful to-day, and appear to fancy ourselves greatly, but must not forget that there are several other nations on this earth who have more markets subject to their pleasure than ourselves (leaving out our home market in this statement), and said ports of entry for our goods on equal tariff bases with all others is of the utmost necessity to us, as we may be shipping many millions in value to said countries. As likely the best illustration, we will take England, and all of us are aware of the serious thought she is now giving to this issue, and how Mr. Chamberlain is endeavoring to secure from that country an acceptance of his views, which are certainly not likely to help the United States, which country he states he looks upon as his most powerful trade adversary.

He at present wishes to bring about by his personal propaganda reciprocal relations, not so much with foreign countries—that will come later—but with their own colonies, which is more easy of arrangement. Canada has granted it. Australia and New Zealand are about granting a 10 per cent (at least) reduction on English goods. South Africa, it is said, will shortly follow with 5 to 10 per cent, and India, Ceylon, and the West Indies, and such places in China, etc., also the Crown colonies, or those under control by what is termed "spheres of influence," can readily be brought into line. May we not easily lose many millions more in these markets alone than we will gain in those where we have seen fit to close the door in favor of ourselves? Time alone will tell; but we shall be forced to act on the defensive, and that is always objectionable. Mr. Chamberlain has already assailed us bitterly for shutting them out of our newly acquired colonies, where England has traded for centuries, and in several of his recent speeches he has not been sparing in his remarks regarding the likely action we will take in Cuba. We must remember England's colonies are intensely loyal to the mother country; they look to her for protection from foreign enemies; their moneyed relations to her are as close as those of blood, and these causes alone are worth to her 10 per cent in the way of preference in placing business, and if a reduction is then made of 10 per cent actual benefit we can wisely count it as 20 per cent in her favor.

Germany also is agitating and agitated over this position of ours, and her newspaper articles have lately been very bitter. And who can blame her if she retaliates at home and abroad, as she is to-day the most aggressive nation in Europe searching for new markets? We can not ride several hobbies or horses at the same time, and it is rather foolish to show such indignation and dismay if we are differentiated against, when we play the same game if the chance offers.

The open door for American goods has become the platform cry for our statesmen and speakers, but they seemingly forget the closed doors in the United States, Porto Rico, Hawaiian and Philippine islands, and, lastly, Cuba.

I sympathize with the speakers on the Democratic side who say they are willing to take tariff reduction for ourselves through reciprocity whenever and wherever they can get it; but it will probably be found unwise to mix up the questions too frequently in this way, as we will by so doing finally have so many different rates of duty on the same article, even if with different nations, that it will be difficult to recognize the Dingley Act in due course.

I accept as correct and agree with those on both sides of the House who feel that it is time to revise and cut down a large number of our present duties, some drastic cuts being necessary, as we are fostering combinations and manufacturing interests beyond what is necessary and to the detriment of the people and our ultimate welfare, but this work should be done as a measure by itself and by the Republican side of the House to avoid extreme action and unwise legislation.

No amendments are possible under this bill, while several seem desirable, and so only for the sake of record it is necessary to say I should have advocated a special duty concession beyond the 20

per cent if products of Cuba come to our shores in an American vessel. We have but few deep-water vessels, and any encouragement we can give to them is our clear duty.

Reference was made to a fleet of American ships trading with Cuba and then sailing farther on down the coast to South America, invading and securing for American industries that splendid market which should become so valuable to us in the future; but it is with sincere regret, we must admit, that said fleet is but a phantom one, and likely to remain so, unless the Republican party moves more quickly than they have in the past to redeem their pledges and do something to again restore the Stars and Stripes on the ocean. Every American who loves his country can not but hope for action. I doubt, however, if we will be able to obtain 20 per cent to 40 per cent special concession on our goods from the southern republics unless we do more than we are at present doing to obtain their good will and confidence. [Applause.]

We must all admit that the dignified and successful manner in which Cuba has so far administered her affairs is vastly to her credit, and shows her people are seemingly more capable of self-constraint, control, and good government than was predicted or anticipated by many in this House. This legislation, I believe, is only a beginning, however, and that her ultimate destiny will be closer relationship with us, if not finally an absolute merger of her affairs in our national life. It is perhaps well she had adversity at the start, as likely the real time of trial and risk for her will come when she attains prosperity. Hard times brings individuals and the people of a nation together. Affluence leads to temptations and dissensions.

Heartily glad, however, should we be—even if many of us on both sides desire absolute union—that it now appears likely to come slowly and gradually, as it will prove beyond a doubt the honesty of our position as her protector and redeemer from Spain, and that we had no selfish motive so far as her freedom was in question; and this will oblige the civilized world to give us credit for disinterestedness, which was questioned by some at the close of the late war. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORRELL.]

Mr. MORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am rejoiced that we are so soon to determine what was a vexed question—what our duties are and are not in relation to Cuba. Since the question was first agitated our duties have been so well defined by the sentiment of the country at large, as first portrayed by the press and later by the sentiment which we find existing among the Members of Congress assembled in this extraordinary session, not merely on the Republican side of the Chamber but equally by our colleagues on the Democratic side, that there is practically nothing left but for us to all join hands and vote for the bill.

There is, however, a principle involved, and a principle to my mind as interesting to the Democratic side of the House as it is to this. The distinguished conservative body of gentlemen who conduct their deliberations at the other end of the Capitol have certain prerogatives sacred in their eyes, and, as far as I know, never interfered with or encroached upon by this body at this end of the Capitol. We have, as they have, certain prerogatives which I had always understood were sacred to us—prerogatives as dear to us as those which they enjoy and as sacred to us as their prerogatives are to them. Among the prerogatives which they have is the treaty-making power, the power of confirmation or rejection of appointments, and others, all jealously guarded. Two of the greatest prerogatives which we have are, first, one which we guard and make operative by our own action in adopting the rules which govern the procedure in this body—namely, the power to enact legislation, a power which we, under this rule, propose to put into force at 4 o'clock on next Thursday afternoon. Another of these prerogatives, equally dear to us, and in fact I may say practically mandatory under the Constitution, is the prerogative that all measures affecting the revenue must emanate in the House of Representatives, they being the only body directly chosen by the people. This question, to my mind, as I said before, is equally as dear to the Democratic side of the House as it is to the Republican.

The report of the Committee on Ways and Means does not entirely satisfy me. That report admits that this is legislation respecting taxation. And it matters not, in my opinion, whether such legislation may be referred to the second section or to the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution; it is still limited by the seventh section, which provides that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." In my opinion a literal compliance with the language of that section is a conditional precedent and one which must be performed in its entirety before any revenue bill can rightfully become a law. And while section 7 has never been brought directly and squarely before the Supreme Court for interpretation with reference to acts of Congress, yet I have found analogous cases which fully sustain my contention—cases in which that court has interpreted clauses of State constitutions limiting the taxing power of the legislature.

The last of these cases was decided last March, and is reported in the one hundred and ninetieth volume of United States Supreme Court Reports, at page 107. Another is reported in 180 United States Reports, at page 506. Both of these cases completely sustain my view. Besides these, there are two others reported in 94 United States and 105 United States. The essence of all these decisions is that the manner of enactment of a statute is of its substance; and hence, that when the Constitution plainly directs that bills of a certain kind shall originate in a certain manner or body and receive certain prescribed sanctions, those directions are a condition precedent to the validity of the act. (180 U. S., 315, 322.)

Mr. Chairman, let us consider this bill in the light of the principle thus judicially established. The committee report says:

> That power of taxation is expressly lodged in the Congress. (Sec. 8, Article I of the Constitution.) Section 7 of the same article provides that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. It is not intended here to cite authorities or advance reasons on this proposition. The records of Congress abound with unrefuted arguments on the affirmative of this contention, and the practice of Congress has been uniformly in the same direction.

There is no dispute, then, as to what the constitutional requirement is. The question arises, however, as to what it means; and that I shall endeavor to show by its history.

I think I can show that it does not mean the mere acquiescence of the House in the action of the Senate on measures raising revenue or fixing conditions upon which the House may originate bills for raising revenue; that the Constitution gives that right to the House unconditionally and indefeasibly, and that the reason for its so doing is to be found in the principle that taxation and representation under our governmental system must always go together. I admit that every treaty "requiring the payment of money," from the first of them to the last, has been referred to Congress to make the necessary appropriations of money. That is because no money can be drawn from the Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law and not by treaty. It could not have been otherwise under the Constitution. But this is not an appropriation bill. To show how far it differs from such a bill let me read another paragraph from the report of the committee, in which it is admitted that the true function of the bill is not to appropriate money to carry into effect a valid treaty, but to make an invalid convention with Cuba valid. The report says:

> To render the convention valid it is necessary to enact into law the language of the proviso of Article VIII, "and no sugar, the product of any other foreign country, shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897." To enact these words into law would be to admit by implication that duties could be lowered by treaty or convention. Your committee can not consent to this proposition, nor is it believed that such an admission would be sanctioned by any Member of the House. The bill, therefore, adds the following saving clause at the conclusion of this proviso: "*And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that customs duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress, originating in said House." This proviso, in the judgment of your committee, preserves the contention of the House as to its rights and prerogatives under the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, if the proviso of Article VIII of the convention can not be accepted by the House directly, it can not be accepted by it indirectly, by adding a new proviso to it, as is done in this bill. This last proviso is a mere declaration, like those recently inserted in the District of Columbia and Indian appropriation bills, respecting the policy of Congress, which the courts have declared nugatory. It amounts to nothing. It is a mere pretext for doing per obliquum what can not be done per directum. But if it were otherwise, this House has no right to tie its hands by passing any law respecting taxation which the people of the United States may not honorably, and of their own free will and mere motion, repeal, amend, or alter, without reference to the consent of any other people. I say this House has no right, or power, or pretense of right to tie its own hands in this way. Neither has it the power to tie the hands of the American people in this way. And if it is true, as the report says, that "foreign countries, in making treaties with us, are bound to take notice of the requirements of our Constitution," is it not equally true, and far more reasonable, that we are ourselves charged here with notice of these requirements? Are we not charged with knowledge of the history and meaning of the provision that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. Chairman, the exclusive right of this House to originate bills for raising revenue, according to the authority conferred by the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution, can not be surrendered or compromised without inflicting a fatal wound upon our entire system of government. The great principle on which the English monarchy was established by the revolution of 1688 was that there should be no taxation without representation—that the people, who were to pay the taxes, must decide, through

their immediate representatives in Parliament, what amount and what kind of taxes they were willing to pay, and should have the right of withholding from the Government the very means of existence, if necessary, in order to procure redress of grievances. This right of the people to act through delegates responsible to themselves alone was claimed as the only sure remedy for violations of the right of petition. The petitions of the people had been despised by irresponsible kings, who had been able to collect money from them without their consent, and had used it to hire standing armies for the enslavement of the people. This great principle was the citadel of English liberty, and, as Madison says, it was the germ of American independence.

After this bill passes it can not be repealed or amended without the consent of the Senate, in which the States are represented equally without regard to population or wealth. Its passage will therefore be a clear infraction of the spirit of the Constitution. "Nothing is clearer," said Chief Justice Fuller in the income-tax cases, "than that what the Constitution intended to guard against was the exercise by the General Government of the power of directly taxing persons and property within any State through a majority (in Congress) made up from other States." (157 U. S., 582.) The idea was that the people, according to their numbers, should participate, through their representatives here, in all matters of taxation, and without any limitation as to time except that which provided for biennial elections. And in this the Chief Justice merely expressed in another form the views of Franklin in his letter to Governor Shirley in 1754. In that famous letter, "concerning the voice of the people in choosing rulers by whom taxes are imposed," Franklin said:

> I apprehend that excluding the people of the colonies from all share in the choice of the grand council will give extreme dissatisfaction as well as the taxing them by act of Parliament where they have no representation. It is very possible that the General Government might be as well and faithfully administered without the people as with them; but where heavy burdens are to be laid upon them it has been found useful to make it as much as possible their own act, for they bear better when they have, or think they have, some share in the direction. (2 Franklin's Works, 376, 377.)

But here it is proposed to deprive the people of any share in levying or repealing taxes so long as the President and the Senate see fit to continue in force this convention with Cuba. "It may be for years, and it may be forever." It arms the Government with perennial resources, and forms a precedent for making such resources sufficient, to maintain a standing army of any size, whereas the constitutional provisions for biennial elections and for limiting appropriations for armies to two years show that the framers of the Constitution intended to prohibit all such legislation.

The whole history of the Constitution and the Revolutionary period shows that the principle embodied in section 7 of the first article was deemed essential to the security of the liberties of the people, and that unless it had been incorporated into the Constitution that instrument would never have been adopted. The Journals of Congress, the Madison Papers, The Federalist, Elliott's Debates, and all the books of that period teem with discussions of this "first grand right of the people," showing how deeply the men of those days took this matter to heart. Judge Story, in his great work on the Constitution, emphasizes the importance of the seventh section of the first article, and Judge Cooley, in his notes on Story's work, refers with approval to the Dawes resolution, passed by this House in 1872, and to the action of the Senate with regard to that resolution. (Story on Constitution, sec. 880, note.)

I have not the time necessary for reading these authorities, but I refer to them as sustaining my contention throughout, and as showing why I feel justified in offering a mild protest against this bill in its present form, in spite of the fact that so many able lawyers and eminent statesmen seem satisfied with it. I shall vote for it out of deference to the opinion of the majority of my colleagues and the general sentiment throughout the country among Democrats and Republicans alike that we owe a still further duty to Cuba.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, unless there is some one on this side who desires to take the floor at this time, I will yield thirty minutes of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], to be used at this time by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] is recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does not seem to be present at this moment. I yield this time, Mr. Chairman, only on condition that it is to be used this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] for fifteen minutes.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure of listening yesterday to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who in the course of his remarks indicated that he was talking for the benefit of the new Members of the present House, which portion of the address of the gentleman was alluded to this morning in a very clever manner, indeed, by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I have not had the pleasure of meeting the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I hope to do so during the session of this Congress, and hope that our relations throughout its sitting will be of the most amicable character. If he intended his remarks for our information only, I thank him for the part that was intended for me. But if it was for the purpose of attempting to discredit the Democratic party in the course taken at the time mentioned by him, I respectfully decline to give it heed and will now dismiss it from my thoughts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will address myself to the measure that is pending before the House. I favor it, because it has upon it the brand of Democratic reciprocity. As I understand reciprocity, when it is boiled down to its final analysis it means "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," or give and take. I understand from the provisions of this measure that we are to receive from the Cuban Government the benefit of from 20 to 45 per cent reduction of the Cuban duty on the products of the soil and of the factories and furnaces of the United States that find their way to the Cuban ports, and that we are to extend to that Republic a fair and amicable tariff rate or toll upon the products of the toil of the laborers of that island of the sea that they see fit to export to our shores.

I believe in reciprocity to the core. I believe it ought to be taught in every valley and upon every hill. I believe it ought to be practiced in all communities, as well as between all nations. I believe in a reciprocity that says to those who advocate the great canal upon the South and asks the assistance of those in the North to dig it, that they ought to be willing to accord to those of the North the privilege of cutting their canal from the Hudson River to the Great Lakes and assist them in doing it, thereby opening up those great waterways to the great waterway of the earth—the Atlantic Ocean. I believe in a reciprocity that says to the people of the West, in the arid region, "If you will help us to take the water off of our lands in the South, lying along the banks and in the basins adjacent to the great Father of Waters, we are in favor of helping you to put water upon your arid lands." I believe in a reciprocity that says to England, nay, to all the other governments of the world, that if they will allow us to introduce our products into their empires and provinces at a fair and equitable reciprocal basis we are willing to allow them to introduce theirs into our great nation upon the same terms. Such a course seems to be just, and I believe the conditions are ripe for it.

It has virtually been said upon the floor of this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the leader upon the other side, that the time was ripe for it, and I was surprised at one or two admissions that he made in his speech on yesterday. He must have made it believing in the absolute security and certainty of his reelection from his own Congressional district, and because of a feeling of great confidence in the position his party has taken upon this bill, believing that it has adopted a reciprocal policy that will continue it in power in spite of his suicidal admissions. He said that—

> It seemed to us [the Republican party] that it was incumbent upon us as a great nation out of our wealth, out of our surplus in the Treasury, out of our overflowing taxation, which greatly exceeds our expenditures, to do something for the Republic of Cuba, and hence this bill was brought into the House.

The only conclusion that I can draw from his language just quoted is that there is an exorbitant, unjust, and unnecessary taxation resting upon the toiling masses of this country that is actually overflowing its Treasury, and that out of the overflowing Treasury we can well spare $6,000,000 of our excess revenues at this time by way of reciprocity with Cuba. I agree with the gentleman that we can spare the six millions of our revenue that will be cut off in that way, and I go further and say that if the Treasury is overflowing, if taxation is greater than the needs of our Government demand or require, why can we not cut off more of this excessive revenue and let it remain in the hands of the people, where it rightfully belongs and where it will circulate through the channels of trade until all our people will have felt its beneficial presence?

It has been argued upon this floor that this is a Republican measure. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] went so far as to say that he wanted it to retain its Republican features to the extent that Democrats would not try to swear the parentage of it over to this side of the House. Sir, we deny that the reciprocity feature of the bill is in any wise related to any defined Republican policy. There are two features of the measure, however, that I will guarantee no Democrat will ever try to swear over this way. One is that which attempts to bind us—though it can not under the law do such a thing—for the period of five years against the further reduction of the tariff upon sugar imported from any other country, because of the reciprocal relation that will exist between us and Cuba under the provisions of the bill. We claim that to be a Republican feature, and we do

not want it to mar the beauty of our Democratic child, reciprocity.

Another Republican feature expressed in the bill is that which fails and refuses to extend the provisions of the measure so that it will take in the refined article as well as the crude. We understand, however, that to extend the provisions of the bill to refined sugar would be a blessing to the people and a check upon the abnormal gains of the sugar trust, is why it is left free from its provisions. We know that it is not the policy of the Republican party to help the people where their interests are in conflict with the interests of the trusts. Therefore we are glad to say to the gentleman from Ohio, "You are welcome to the last-named features of the bill. Nurse them, cherish them as you will. No Democrat will ever recognize them as being the features of the Democratic child of reciprocity." But as to the reciprocity feature of it that says to Cuba, "If you will allow our products to enter your ports at from 20 to 40 per cent reduction we will allow yours to enter ours at a reduction of 20 per cent of our present tariff," we say that it is a Democratic feature, and no Republican can claim it as his offspring or disguise it so it will not be known to its own. It is true that Democracy finds her child of reciprocity in bad company in this instance, but a loving parent never fails or refuses to recognize its own because it happens to fall into bad company for a time. Reciprocity has been preached, taught, and practiced by Democrats since the formation of our Government, and we are not going to be frightened out of voting for this bill by the cry of "Republican measure."

Sir, there are not Republicans and sugar planters enough between Nantucket on the east and Yuba Dam on the west to keep us from voting for the bill. I understand, sir, that individual Republicans have from time to time favored the great principle of reciprocity between nations. It was recognized as a living, burning question by the greatest Republican statesman that ever sat in the chair that you now occupy, in my judgment—the Hon. James G. Blaine—but, notwithstanding all his brilliancy, ability, and statesmanship, he could not bring his party to accept his views and practice what he attempted to teach. The much-lamented and illustrious McKinley also embraced the doctrine of reciprocity a short time before the close of his life. He realized that the time had come when we could no longer narrow our transactions to the confines of our own country, and that it was necessary for us to reach out for broader fields in which to market our rapidly increasing commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I have great faith in the possibilities of this grand Union of ours when she has surely launched her reciprocal bark upon the great ocean of commerce. I believe it is strong enough in its matchless resources and superior citizenship to carry its trade, in peace, to the vast expanses of civilization. And, sir, I believe we are too great to desire trade upon other than peaceful terms with any country. I do not believe it necessary, wise, or just to attempt to gain markets or trade by the sword. Coercion will never make a contented or profitable customer. Nations have no more right to obtain trade by the bayonet than a merchant has with a gun. I do not believe in that class of trade that requires hundreds of millions of dollars to be spent in an attempt to pacify a batch of crude islanders in an effort to open up a market in which we might sell a few bales of cotton, bushels of corn and wheat, barrels of flour, or pounds of meat. It would be infinitely better from every conceivable view to take the money that has been expended upon our island possessions and spend it upon the rivers and harbors of this great country. With it we could have leveed the Mississippi River on both sides from its source to its mouth. It would have channeled out all of the smaller navigable rivers, giving to them all of the necessary locks and dams, and in leveeing and channeling out our own streams we would have opened up the most fertile valleys of the earth, in which billions of dollars' worth of produce could have annually been added to the commerce of the world and thousands and thousands of happy and prosperous homes filled with intelligent Caucasian inhabitants would have been erected, that would have been a great addition and mighty help to this Commonwealth.

Is there any hope that the Philippines will produce such a happy condition or add such greatness to our nation? Mr. Chairman, reciprocity is one of the greatest thoughts of this or any other age. Its free adoption will put a stop to our "overflowing taxation," it will remove burdens of labor from the bended backs of the toiling people, it will tear down the high tariff wall that is a menace to our own people as well as to all the nations of the earth. It will stop the great Chamberlain in his mad rush to close the doors of the English markets against us. It will open up a free and mutually beneficial commerce between us and Canada, South America, Germany, France, Russia; nay, sir, I may truthfully say, between all the nations of the earth and us, all of which can be done without the tooting of a horn or the firing of a gun. It seems to me, sir, that the admission of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that "we believed at the time of the adoption of the Dingley tariff act that a lower rate of duty was ample protection to encourage and foster the beet-sugar industry, we believed that a lower rate of duty was sufficient to take care of the sugar industries of the States of Louisiana and Texas," and then in the face of that belief adopted the high-tariff provision of the Dingley law upon the subject of sugar, is enough to discredit him and his party before the American people and before the world. By his declaration he virtually admits that his party has taken 20 per cent too much money out of the pockets of the consumers of this country upon the sugar schedule alone. Then, in the name of reason and good conscience, I ask, how much has his party extorted from them upon other schedules of the bill? Can the people stand such extortion? Will they longer stand it is the question of the hour. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to debate the pending bill, but I feel constrained to do so to-day in the limited time allotted to me because I believe that this bill is a step in the direction of tariff reform and the breaking down of the high rates of the Dingley tariff law of July 24, 1897, and because I hope it may prove also a step in the direction of freer trade relations with other countries, including the Dominion of Canada, thereby benefiting the people and constituency whom I have the honor to represent.

As a Democrat and in common with the Democratic Members of the House, I would like to see the bill amended and put upon it the amendment proposed by the Democratic minority, which was known in the last Congress as the Morris amendment, adopted in the Fifty-seventh Congress as an amendment to the reciprocity bill with Cuba then pending, and which was passed by the united action of the Democratic minority and the Republicans interested in the manufacture of beet sugar. This amendment provided that—

> There shall be levied, collected, and paid, in lieu of the duties thereon now provided by law, on all sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard in color, and on all sugar which has gone through a process of refining, imported into the United States 1.825 cents per pound.

The effect of this amendment would be to strike from the tariff laws the differential duty upon refined sugar, thereby benefiting the consumers of refined sugar in this country.

The bill should also be amended, in my opinion, as proposed by the Democratic minority, by striking out that clause which provides that during the life of the treaty with Cuba, for five years, there shall be no further reduction of the duty upon Cuban sugar imported into the United States and that no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted during said period into the United States at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the Dingley tariff law.

In other words, the United States shall grant no other country any reduction of duty upon sugar during the life of the treaty and no further reduction than 20 per cent shall be granted to Cuba during said time. I do not think such provision legally binding upon a future Congress.

But under the rule adopted by the Republican majority the Democratic Members of the House are unable to secure the adoption of these two amendments. Under these circumstances, and in accordance with the caucus resolution of the Democratic party, I am in favor of this bill, while I opposed the rule which seeks to pass it without the Democratic amendments I have mentioned. I am for the bill, first, because I believe, with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN], that it is a step in the direction of tariff reform and is a breach in the excessively high tariff wall erected around the country by the Dingley tariff law. I believe that a revision of the high protective rates of this law is necessary to the American people and demanded by the American consumer.

These rates are not only unjust and oppressive to the people, but, as was well said on yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the effect of these high rates is to induce many of the nations of the world at this time to so modify their policy with respect to the tariff as to resort to retaliatory measures. Great Britain, which has been heretofore a free-trade country, is now proposing through one of its eminent statesmen, Joseph Chamberlain, free trade between the colonies and the mother country and a protective tariff against the United States and the rest of the world.

I was especially impressed by the statement that Canada still maintains a high tariff against the United States and threatens to increase it, and the preferential tariff in favor of Great Britain is 33⅓ per cent of the Canadian customs tariff. Now, Canada, by

blood and by kinship, by her position north of us upon the American continent, and by every tie, should be a part of this country if we are determined upon a policy of expansion and annexation. She should buy much more largely than heretofore from the United States, and I am fully of the opinion that if we are to have freer trade relations with Cuba by means of reciprocity treaties or otherwise, we should have freer trade relations by means of reciprocity or otherwise with the Dominion of Canada.

And, Mr. Chairman, I shall support the bill for the further reason that I hope and trust it is a movement in the direction of future reciprocity treaties with other countries, especially those upon the American Continent, including the Dominion of Canada. I hope it is the harbinger of Canadian reciprocity as well as a breach in the tariff wall erected by the Republican party. The Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means, in their report filed on yesterday, declared:

> We regret that the party in power has not seen its way to confer still further benefits upon citizens of both nations by providing for even freer and yet more untrammeled and unrestricted commerce between them. As long as the present party is in power we can perhaps hope for tariff reductions and revision only from reciprocity treaties. It is a piecemeal process, but it is better than no process at all. We hail it as a harbinger of future reciprocity treaties with other countries, especially those upon the American Continent, and notably our neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada.

A reciprocity treaty, under the provisions of the Dingley law, authorizing the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into commercial agreements or treaties with other countries, and to concede thereunder for equivalent commercial advantages a reduction of not exceeding 20 per cent upon the duties prescribed by the Dingley tariff law, and similar to the treaties negotiated with France, the Argentine Republic, and other countries, might also be negotiated with Great Britain as to the Dominion of Canada, which would be of great benefit to all sections of the country, and especially to the State and district I have the honor to represent.

At the opening of this session of Congress I introduced the bill which I hold in my hand, and which provides for the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty with Great Britain as to the Dominion of Canada, especially with the view to the abolition or modification of the seventy-fifth item of the customs tariff of Canada of 1897, which imposes a prohibitory tax of 2 cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included, as duty upon American strawberries and other berries imported into Canada.

I shall incorporate my bill in my remarks, and I trust in the future it may be the policy of both the majority and minority, Republicans and Democrats, to advocate the negotiation of such a reciprocity treaty with Canada, framed wisely as to its schedules. Such a treaty would be of incalculable benefit to my own constituency as well as to the whole of the American people. If we are to have wider markets in Cuba for our cotton manufactures, lumber, rice, cattle, and other articles by means of a treaty or commercial agreement, I insist that no greater benefit could be conferred than to open up new markets to the American people in the Dominion of Canada by means of another treaty with Great Britain.

Especially would such a treaty benefit the people of eastern North Carolina and the district I represent, as well as other sections of the country.

Upon the one item of strawberries alone, to which I have referred, the abolition of the Canadian customs tariff would mean a saving of thousands of dollars to my constituency and the opening up of new markets in Canada to North Carolina, the South, and the whole country. Whatever differences of opinion exist in both parties as to tariff rates and schedules, there is no question but that the high rates of the Dingley tariff law need wise revision, and that commercial agreements with Cuba, Canada, and other countries are in line with Democratic ideas and steps in the direction of tariff reform and wider and freer trade relations with the world.

Upon this issue of tariff reform the Democratic party has won success in two Presidential campaigns, and in the next campaign, inscribing upon its platform "honesty in the administration of the Government and opposition to monopoly under the protective system," I trust and believe it will again win; and if, Mr. Chairman, we are to have this piecemeal process of revision of the tariff the movement should extend not only to Cuba, and open up to us her market south of us, but the still wider market for American manufactures of cotton goods and agricultural products north of us in the Dominion of Canada. One of the first reciprocity treaties ever negotiated was negotiated with Canada under the Democratic Administration of Franklin Pierce.

Reciprocity—wise and not sham reciprocity, and which means freer trade relations and just and equitable tariff revision—is good Democratic doctrine; and while we are moving in this direction let us open up the markets north of us in Canada as well as the Cuban market south of us, for the benefit not only of my own people but of the whole country. [Applause.]

A bill authorizing the President to enter into a commercial treaty with the Government of His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with the view to reciprocity between the United States of America and Canada, with reference to a modification of the customs tariff of Canada imposing a duty upon American strawberries.

Whereas by section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved by the Congress of the United States of America July 24, 1897, the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to enter into commercial treaties with other countries and to concede thereunder, for equivalent commercial advantages from such other countries, a reduction of the duties prescribed in the aforesaid act; and

Whereas under the customs tariff of Canada strawberries and other berries enumerated in tariff item 75 of said customs tariff of Canada are required to pay a duty of 2 cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty; and

Whereas the abolition or reduction of said duty would be of great advantage to American farmers cultivating strawberries for market, and said duty is practically valueless to the Canadian government, while the abolition thereof would open up the Canadian market to American farmers cultivating strawberries and other berries enumerated in said customs tariff of Canada: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States of America be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into a commercial treaty of reciprocity under the provisions of the act of Congress of July 24, 1897, with a view to the abolition or reduction of the duty imposed by the customs tariff of Canada upon strawberries and other berries enumerated in the seventy-fifth or other tariff item thereof.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, there are many things that can be said both for and against this bill, but inasmuch as the gentlemen on the other side of the House and those on this side of the House are all going to vote for the bill in any event, it does not seem to me that anything I can say to-day will materially affect the result. Many Democrats are opposed to this bill on various grounds. Some oppose it for the reason that it is a Republican measure and that it will benefit the trusts. It seems to me that if we are ever to vote for a Republican measure, we are necessarily going to vote for a measure that will benefit the trusts. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said this morning, I, with the other Members on this side of the House, rejoice that light at last is breaking in upon the Republican party in this matter. Perhaps we are all, Republicans and Democrats, going to get a little closer together than we have been. It may be that in a little while we shall see that spectacle that Tom Johnson some years ago predicted would be seen on the floor of this House—that of the Republican and Democratic leaders racing to the Speaker's desk to be the first to introduce a bill for tariff revision.

Coming from the district that I do, and representing as I do many varied interests, I feel that there is much to be said on both sides of this question; but we are agreed in my part of the country—and it seems to me that before long we will be agreed in every part of this great country—that the tariff must be reformed until it will be impossible for any man or combination of men to monopolize any of the necessaries of life or to be enabled to favor the foreign consumer because of the high price extorted from our own people.

The only question, as I look at it, is whether the tariff shall be reformed by the Republican party or by the Democratic party. It seems to me there can be no question but that that tariff must be reformed by the party which is now in the minority.

It is an old maxim, an old and true statement, that the minority is always in the right. This may sound strange, but there is reason for it. The minority in its desire, perhaps a sordid desire, to get into power, will search for and adopt principles which attract those who are good and true men to its standard. This has been the course of the Democratic party for years, and it is, I believe, beginning to bear good results.

If the Republican party is sincere in its oft-asserted desire to protect the American laborer against competition with the product of the foreign pauper laborer, let it protect him against the direct competition of the pauper laborers themselves, who are crowding into this country by the thousand. It matters little that the goods are shut out if our ports are thrown open to those who make the goods.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCDERMOTT] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

[Mr. MCDERMOTT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to recognize any of the gentlemen furnished in the list given the Chair by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]—Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the gentleman from Tennessee

[Mr. PIERCE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER]. None of them claims the floor.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, 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. 1921, and had reached no resolution thereon.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR A COMMITTEE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask also for the consideration of the other resolution with it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill (H. R. 1947) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof, was changed from the Committee on Claims to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

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. 422) to correct the military record of W. J. Whitson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 572) for the relief of Arulus C. Parkhurst—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 578) for the relief of Abel Patrick—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 622) granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 699) granting a pension to M. Yell—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 700) granting a pension to Felix Linsay—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1045) granting a pension of $12 per month to Matilda Witt, widow of J. Burgess Witt—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1273) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Hunter—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1347) for the relief of the estate of J. L. Walker, deceased—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1631) granting a pension to John R. Costen—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1842) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Cullen—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1847) to correct the military record of Alexander Nugent—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 3544) to prevent the desecration of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 3545) to refund the cotton tax—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 3546) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newton, in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 3547) for the protection of Balls Bluff battlefield, in Loudoun County, Va., and the cemetery thereon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 3548) granting land warrants to soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 3549) providing for the erection of a public building at Louisiana, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3550) providing for a naval officer in the district of Chicago—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 3551) declaring a certain portion of the Maramec River to be an unnavigable stream—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) making an appropriation to improve the harbor of Hermann, on the Missouri River, in Gasconade County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) for the improvement of the Missouri River at and near the mouth of Smiths Creek, near Bernheimer, Warren County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) removing the import duty from salt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) to place binding twine and all materials used in making or manufacturing the same upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) to place wood pulp, printing paper, and so forth, on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) placing agricultural implements on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHULL: A bill (H. R. 3558) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Easton, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 3559) for the construction and completion of the Harlem River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3560) for the construction and completion of Westchester Creek—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) for the construction and completion of the Bronx River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3562) for the construction and completion of the Harlem (Bronx) Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 3563) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of the Tombigbee River from Demopolis, Ala., to Columbus, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Tombigbee River, in the State of Mississippi and in the State of Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3565) directing the Secretary of War to expend $125,000 heretofore appropriated for the deep-water channel through Sabine Lake, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3566) to provide for the selection of a site for the establishment of a navy-yard and dry dock on or near Sabine Pass, or the Neches or Sabine River, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) providing for a coastwise canal in Texas—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3568) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Murfreesboro, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stone River—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) to place all articles and commodities manufactured and controlled or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts on the free list, and to reduce the rate of duty on any article or commodity manufactured in the United States and sold in a foreign country more cheaply than in the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) to fix the salary of the Public Printer—to the Committee on Printing

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 3572) for the erection of a memorial structure at Fort Recovery, Ohio—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 3573) for the establishment of a board for the protection of children and animals—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of the farmers and tobacco growers of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 3575) to increase the pension of widows of deceased soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3576) for the erection of a public building at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 3577) to acquire certain ground for a Government reservation—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 3578) to authorize the Mercantile Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, from a point in the borough of North Charleroi, Washington County, to a point in Rostraver Township, Westmoreland County—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) to provide for the erection of a public building at Charleroi, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 3580) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Eureka, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) providing the means of acquiring title to two groves of Sequoia gigantea in the State of California, with a view to making national parks thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3582) to extend and regulate the liability of certain classes of employers to make compensation for personal injuries suffered by employees in their service—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3584) to authorize the resubdivision of lots or blocks in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3585) to amend sections 3894 and 3929 of the Revived Statutes, and the first section of the act of Congress of March 2, 1895, chapter 191, entitled "An act for the suppression of lottery traffic through national and interstate commerce and the postal service, subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the United States," so as to apply the provisions of existing laws to letters, postal cards, circulars, pamphlets, and publications concerning any business of and contracts and policies of life, fire, or other insurance transmitted into any State, District, or Territory by concerns or persons not authorized to transact such business in the State, District, or Territory from which the same are transmitted—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 3586) to provide for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) to promote the efficiency of the clerical service in the Navy of the United States, to organize a clerical corps of the Navy of the United States, to define its duties, and to regulate its pay—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 3588) to complete the execution of the ninth article of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 3589) to increase pay of mail carriers on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 3590) in relation to cigarettes, and to limit the effect of the regulation of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) to prohibit the charging by monopolies and combinations of unreasonable prices for certain merchandise and products which enter into interstate commerce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) to define the duties of the Attorney-General concerning combinations and monopolies, and to appropriate such money as may be necessary to pay the expense incident to the discharge of such duties—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) to amend an act entitled "An act providing the terms and places of holding the courts of the United States in the district of Minnesota, and for other purposes, approved April 26, 1890,"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 3594) to provide for the erection of a monument to Gen. Francis Marion—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3595) to regulate the manufacture of cigarettes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 3645) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reclassify the public lands of Alabama—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3816) to extend Nineteenth street northwest, from Cincinnati street to the Adams Mill road, and to acquire the triangle abutting on the east side thereof included within Cincinnati street and the Adams Mill road—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4057) for the erection of a public building at Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4058) providing for the manner of payment of postage on books, catalogues, and other printed matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RIXEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) asking for estimates for the improvement of Upper Machodoc Creek, in King George County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) proposing an amendment to Article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) to appoint Robert S. Talbot a passed assistant engineer on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Virginia, relating to the three hundredth anniversary of the first English settlement at Jamestown, Va.—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Virginia, relating to the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the first English settlement at Jamestown, Va.—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

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. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 3596) granting a pension to Marie Bosslet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3597) to correct the military record of John Herbst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) to correct the military record of Julius H. Rogge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3599) for the benefit of William H. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 3600) for the relief of Ann Kinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3601) for correction of record of Henry S. Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3602) granting an honorable discharge to Levi Mott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3603) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah McCanse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) granting a pension to Laura M. Swan Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) granting a pension to William McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) granting a pension to Timothy Lawhead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3607) granting a pension to Susan H. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) granting an honorable discharge to William Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3609) granting an increase of pension to William W. Thornton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3610) granting an increase of pension to Lucius R. Simons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3611) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 3612) to correct the military record of Demon S. Decker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3613) to reimburse John Waller, late postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for moneys expended in carrying the mails—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) granting a pension to George M. Sayre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3615) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Evens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) granting a pension to James W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) for the relief of Charles M. Everett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) for the relief of Nancy Rose—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) for the relief of David V. Howell—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 3620) granting an increase of pension to Victor Vifquain—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 3621) for the relief of the trustees of Gaylesville Academy and Methodist Episcopal Church, of Gaylesville, Cherokee County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) for the relief of Mrs. Martha Stiff—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) for the relief of Amos L. Griffith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) for the relief of John B. Hardman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) for the relief of William D. Clay and others—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) for the relief of James Pitts—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3627) for the relief of S. V. Biggers, administrator of R. P. Biggers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) for the relief of Claude B. Alverson—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3629) for the relief of Joseph M. Witt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3630) for the relief of E. A. Gilliland—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) for the relief of the estate of J. C. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) for the relief of the estate of James L. Romine, deceased, Winston County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3633) for the relief of the estate of D. M. Sparks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) for the relief of Joseph Blakemore, administrator of Elizabeth Blakemore, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3635) for the relief of the Oak Bowery Church, of Cherokee County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) for the relief of J. B. Roberson, administrator of the estate of J. P. Roberson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3637) for the relief of David W. Hollis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) for the relief of the Bank of Attalla—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph A. Choate—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James W. Gutherie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Robert A. Godsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to James H. Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) granting pensions to certain companies of scouts and guides who served in the Federal Army during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) granting a pension to Thomas Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 3646) granting an increase of pension to Minerva McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 3647) for the relief of the Christian Church of Corinth, Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3648) for the relief of the Masonic lodge at Bexar, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) for the relief of J. M. Cumby, heir of M. G. Cumby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3651) for the relief of the trustees of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) for the relief of J. W. Walker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 3653) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Sollenberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 3654) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William E. Talbert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3655) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3656) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Ziegler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) appropriating money for the protection of property in Lincoln County, Mo.—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) to enable Fredrich Burckhardt to make application to the Commissioner of Patents for the extension of letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) placing upon a pensionable status Fagg's Fifth Regiment of Pike County (Missouri) Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) granting an increase of pension to John Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) granting an increase of pension to George Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) granting an increase of pension to Uriah H. Owings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) granting an increase of pension to John E. Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) granting an increase of pension to James M. Shippee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) granting an increase of pension to Albertus Leovisin Paine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) granting an increase of pension to Garland Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) granting an increase of pension to John Snay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3670) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Barrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) for the relief of Elanor W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3672) for the relief of Capt. Henry L. Heckmann—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) for the relief of the heirs of the late William H. Finch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie Donnelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3675) for the relief of W. D. McLean, alias Donald McLean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) for the relief of the estate of the late B. F. Richardson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) for the relief of Ralls Lodge, No. 33, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Bedell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) for the relief of George W. Payne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3680) for the relief of F. H. Hunicke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) for the relief of the trustees of the Regular Baptist Church, at Mexico, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3682) for the relief of John Harper, Alexander Hammontree, and others, trustees of the Methodist Church at Warrenton, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Church at Warrenton, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3684) for the relief of Edwin F. Mathews—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) granting a pension to William Callaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) granting a pension to Jeremiah Romans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) granting a pension to Maj. Louis Dieckgraefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) granting a pension to George N. Warfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) granting a pension to Charles B. Stough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to William Toedtmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) granting a pension to Cyrus Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3692) granting a pension to Green H. Honeycutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) granting a pension to Prudence E. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) granting a pension to Edward W. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3695) granting a pension to Henry Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3696) granting a pension to Spotwel E. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3697) granting a pension to Johnson W. Eubanks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) granting a pension to Samuel S. Grimmett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) granting a pension to James A. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) granting a pension to Absalom Howell Eggers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3701) granting a pension to Susan L. Brimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3702) granting a pension to Jeremiah Milroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3703) granting a pension to Mary Followill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3704) granting a pension to William Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3705) granting a pension to John T. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to William W. Batterton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) granting a pension to Joseph Turnbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) granting a pension to Elizabeth Seifert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) granting a pension to Mary F. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) granting a pension to Thomas C. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) granting a pension to John McCann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) granting a pension to Frederick W. Tappmeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) granting a pension to Lydia Lollar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) granting a pension to Silas A. Elkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) granting a pension to Freidrich Schmied—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) granting a pension to Samuel Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3717) granting a pension to John J. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) granting a pension to Louvina Mays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3719) granting a pension to Benjamin Haggard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3720) granting a pension to John D. Reeds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3721) granting a pension to Martha A. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) granting a pension to James G. Head—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) granting a pension to James W. Conaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3724) granting a pension to S. M. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3725) granting a pension to George H. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3726) granting a pension to Jeptha D. Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3727) granting a pension to Orison Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3728) granting a pension to James Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) granting a pension to John H. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3730) granting a pension to Lewis K. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3731) granting a pension to Alice Harrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3732) granting a pension to Robert L. Davis, sr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3733) granting a pension to Harrison N. Gourley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3734) granting a pension to James R. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3735) granting a pension to James W. McCune—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3736) granting a pension to John A. Blackwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3737) granting a pension to Ignatz Bohnert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3738) granting a pension to Almond T. Vaughn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3739) granting a pension to Cicero Cluster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3740) granting a pension to George W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) granting a pension to James T. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3742) granting a pension to Peter Berg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3743) granting a pension to Charles E. Foley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) granting a pension to William Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3745) granting a pension to Emma A. Baxter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) granting a pension to Josephine B. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3747) granting a pension to Frank M. Hassler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3748) granting a pension to John W. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3749) granting a pension to Conrad Klinge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3750) granting a pension to Thomas A. Burks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3751) granting a pension to William H. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3752) granting a pension to William H. Boulden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3753) granting a pension to James J. W. Clifton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3754) granting a pension to David Copenhaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3755) granting a pension to William A. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3756) granting a pension to John Rohy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3757) granting a pension to Charles B. Stough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to James M. Cartmill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3759) granting a pension to Annie A. Gallagher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) for the relief of the heirs of the late Joseph M. Carrico—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 3761) ceding certain land appertaining to the custom-house at St. Joseph, Mo., for use as a street—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 3762) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Winans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) granting an increase of pension to Wyatt Botts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam E. Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3765) granting an increase of pension to Titus K. Cone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3766) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3767) granting an increase of pension to William Neely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3768) granting an increase of pension to Joel D. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3769) granting an increase of pension to Clinton M. Casey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3770) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) granting an increase of pension to John Terrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Leith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3773) granting a pension to Theocaneus C. Dodd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) granting a pension to Emma E. Upton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3775) granting a pension to Sarah J. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3776) granting an increase of pension to Alfred I. Judy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3777) granting a pension to William A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 3778) granting an increase of pension to Juliaetta Rowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3779) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 3780) granting an increase of pension to H. M. Wight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 3781) for the relief of William R. Tretheway—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3782) for the relief of George Serrell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3783) for the relief of Frederick Merck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) for the relief of William A. Forbes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3785) to correct the military record of John Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3786) removing the charge of desertion and granting an honorable discharge to John D. Long—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3787) removing the charge of desertion from the record of James Conover—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3788) removing the charges of desertion and granting an honorable discharge to Caleb Aber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3789) granting an honorable discharge to William M. Culbertson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3790) granting an honorable discharge to John Fagan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3791) granting a pension to Gottlieb Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3792) granting a pension to Alexander Sandford Utter, alias Alexander M. Sandford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) granting a pension to Oscar W. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3794) granting a pension to Malinda Van Pelt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3795) granting a pension to Sarah E. Gillette—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3796) granting a pension to Drucilla Beckman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3797) granting a pension to Sarah E. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) granting a pension to Humphrey Sales—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3799) granting a pension to Emma Cortright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3800) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Franklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) granting an increase of pension to John J. Willis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) granting an increase of pension to Israel D. Lum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3803) granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3804) granting an increase of pension to Christine B. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Dishon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3806) granting an increase of pension to George H. Sweet—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3807) granting an increase of pension to William Van Riper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3808) granting an increase of pension to William L. Shipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Sparling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Susie G. Seabury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) granting an increase of pension to Katharina Becker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Marie B. Flannery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 3813) for the relief of James P. Barney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3814) granting an increase of pension to Eben S. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 3815) granting an increase of pension to Hester E. Mooney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 3817) for the relief of Edward S. Brown—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 3818) granting an increase of pension to Peter B. Beidenbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3819) granting an increase of pension to Ira Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3820) granting an increase of pension to William M. Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) granting a pension to Eliza J. Mahurin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3823) granting a pension to John W. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3824) granting an increase of pension to Albert B. Harryman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3825) granting an increase of pension to Fleetwood H. Sale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3826) to correct the military record of Alonzo Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3827) granting a medal to Mortimer S. Longwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3828) to increase the pension of L. L. Tothacer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3829) to increase the pension of Eben Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3830) for the relief of Peter Holt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3831) to increase the pension of John W. Hartley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3832) granting an increase of pension to Eli T. Hoyt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3833) granting an increase of pension to Elias McQuay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3834) granting an increase of pension to Seth R. Henton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3835) granting an increase of pension to Caroline N. Lovejoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3836) granting an increase of pension to David H. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3837) granting an increase of pension to William H. Southwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3838) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Daskam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3839) granting an increase of pension to H. D. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3840) granting an increase of pension to Lucy F. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3841) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3842) granting a pension to Horace Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3843) granting a pension to Belinda Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3844) granting a pension to Adoniram J. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3845) granting a pension to Horace Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3846) granting a pension to John C. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3847) granting a pension to Abigail Etherington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) granting a pension to Sally Ann Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3849) granting a pension to Martha A. Hamlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3850) granting a pension to Charles H. Brisbin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3851) granting a pension to Catherine M. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3852) to correct the military record of Joel N. Sanford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3853) to correct the military record of Hiram Eideneir—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3854) to correct the military record of Jabez Lumbart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) to correct the military record of Henry Myers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3856) to correct the military record of Henry S. Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3857) to correct the military record of George S. Groesbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) to correct the military record of C. W. Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3859) for the relief of Edmund Stanfield—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 3860) for the relief of M. E. Hall and the estate of James B. Hall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3861) for the relief of Joseph Alstott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3862) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Jefferson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3863) for the relief of James T. Blair, executor of Hugh Blair, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3864) for the relief of John C. Buckner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3865) for the relief of John T. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3866) for the relief of Joseph A. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of Mrs. Isabella R. Boyd—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3868) for the relief of the personal representatives of Horace L. Bradley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) for the relief of Campbell County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3870) for the relief of Calvin L. Childress—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3871) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) for the relief of H. T. Cox—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3873) for the relief of the estate of Lemuel Cox, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) for the relief of Sarah E. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Thomas J. Coward, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) for the relief of the estate of George W. and Richard B. Cooper—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3877) for the relief of Andrew A. Colter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3878) for the relief of the personal representatives of Mitchell J. Childress—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3879) for the relief of D. Froneberger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3880) for the relief of William M. Goforth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3881) for the relief of Bartley Giffin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) for the relief of the estste of Isaac Hull, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) for the relief of Mary Jane Hubbard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3884) for the relief of James W. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3885) for the relief of Susan J. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3886) for the relief of the estate of William Lenoir & Bros.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3887) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wiley Line, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3888) for the relief of Anthony L. Maxwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3889) for the relief of Robert McCampbell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3890) for the relief of S. M. McGuire—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3891) for the relief of Wesley C. Owens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) for the relief of the estate of David Pangle, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3893) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church, of Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3894) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of London, Loudon County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3895) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Straw Plains, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3896) for the relief of Eli Sharp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3897) for the relief of William E. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) for the relief of William C. Tindell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) for the relief of Thomas J. Wear—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 3900) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Donham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3901) granting a pension to Mary A. Gurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) granting a pension to Martha J. Derrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3903) granting an increase of pension to George C. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 3904) for the relief of the heirs of Nathan Spitler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 3905) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 3906) for the relief of Samuel S. Weaver—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 3907) granting an honorable discharge and pension to W. Scott King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3908) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Troutman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3909) granting an increase of pension to George Hayden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3910) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3911) granting a pension to Jacob Lybarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3912) granting a pension to Thomas B. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3913) granting a pension to J. H. Pershing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3914) granting a pension to James M. Redick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 3915) for the relief of James McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3916) for the relief of James S. Harber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3917) to correct the military record of Palmer G. Percy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3918) granting a pension to Miller C. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3919) removing charge of desertion from George J. Dennis, Company C, Thirty-third New Jersey Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3920) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Long—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3921) granting an increase of pension to M. C. Staves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3922) granting an increase of pension to Simon N. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3923) granting an increase of pension to John W. Worley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3924) granting an increase of pension to Ira Waldo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3925) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Littleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3926) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval records now standing against John Glass—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3927) correcting the record of Elisha C. Bierce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) to extend the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885, relative to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3929) granting a pension to John Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3930) granting a pension to William Leaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3931) to place the name of Jonathan Ulum on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3932) for the relief of Thomas Burns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3933) for the relief of David K. Reynolds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3934) for the relief of heirs of Daniel Reichard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3935) for the relief of James McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3936) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3937) granting an increase of pension to Roswell Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3938) granting an increase of pension to David Sharp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3939) granting an increase of pension to George E. Dee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3940) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Beltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3941) granting an increase of pension to William Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3942) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) granting an increase of pension to Soren V. Kalsem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3944) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3945) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 3946) to correct the military record of Anthony W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 3947) for the relief of holders and owners of certain District of Columbia special-tax scrip—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 3948) for the relief of Otho Adams—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3949) for the benefit of George W. Taylor's administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of W. R. Akers, of Alliance, Nebr.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANNING: A bill (H. R. 3951) granting a pension to Patrick Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 3952) for the relief of Moses Winstock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 3953) for the relief of Col. David S. Gordon, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 3954) granting a pension to Cecilia H. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3955) for the relief of Robert H. Holland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3956) for the relief of James F. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of the trustees of the Oakgrove Methodist Episcopal Church, of Norfolk County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3958) for the relief of Mary Cornick—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3959) granting a pension to Mary Friary—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3960) for the relief of Felix Weeden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3961) for the relief of Mrs. H. H. Cribbs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3962) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Foster—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3963) for the relief of William B. Olive—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of John C. Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3965) for the relief of W. C. Tipton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3966) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Trousdale—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3967) for the relief of Margret L. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3968) for the relief of Mrs. Nancy M. Weaver—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3969) for the relief of the estate of John Wesson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3970) for the relief of William M. Underwood, of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3971) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3972) for the relief of John Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3973) for the relief of the heirs of Rebecca Haley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of Robert D. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3975) for the relief of John T. Lehman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3976) for the relief of John Thomas Owen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3977) for the relief of the estate of Reuben Street, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3978) for the relief of Thomas H. Streeter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3979) for the relief of Joseph Logan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3980) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3981) for the relief of the heirs of John Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3982) for the relief of the heirs of Moses Wright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3983) for the relief of the heirs of Stewart Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3984) for the relief of the estate of James L. Holland deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3985) for the relief of the estate of John Black, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3986) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Bynum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3987) for the relief of Mattie H. Ligon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3988) for the relief of R. D. Andrews—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3989) for the relief of the estate of W. R. Hanserd, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3990) for the relief of the heirs of John Walston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3991) for the relief of the heirs of Eliah Matheny—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3992) to grant a pension to Mary E. Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3993) to place the name of Sandy Crawford on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3994) to correct the military record of E. D. Judkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3995) to correct the military record of Dobson Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3996) authorizing the heirs of Fannie P. Murfree, of Tennessee, to present their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3997) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jordon H. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3998) granting a pension to John F. Yeargin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3999) granting a pension to Nora Stokes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4000) granting a pension to Tempier Goodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4001) granting a pension to William H. Huggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4002) granting a pension to Mrs. Martha A. E. O'Neal—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4003) granting a pension to James M. O'Neal, soldier of Indian war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4004) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Waller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4005) to increase the pension of N. R. Cooper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4006) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Bonds—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4007) for the relief of the heirs at law of Barclay M. Tillman, deceased, of Bedford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4008) for the relief of J. M. Carney, of Franklin County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4009) for the relief of James C. Hoover, of Rutherford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4010) for the relief of Joseph H. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4011) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dennis Mahoney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) for the relief of Dr. J. J. Crunk, of Marshall County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) for the relief of estate and heirs at law of John Leiper, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) for the relief of William F. Cowan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4015) for the relief of Thomas M. Emerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4016) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary C. Turner, deceased, late of Tullahoma, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4017) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Fayetteville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) for the relief of W. T. Smotherman & Co., of Tennessee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4019) for the relief of Bettie Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4020) for the relief of the estate of C. L. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4021) for the relief of the Baptist Church at Tullahoma, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4022) for the relief of William Henley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4023) for the relief of W. J. Winsett, of Bedford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4024) for the relief of Joseph B. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) for the relief of C. C. Lowe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4026) for the relief of the estate of Laodocia Bivens, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4027) for the relief of L. D. Sugg, of Lincoln County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) to pay the heirs of Fannie P. Murfree, of Tennessee, for property lost, destroyed, taken, and used by the United States forces during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4029) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Tullahoma, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Oliver N. McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4031) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Wasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SKILES: A bill (H. R. 4032) granting a pension to John P. Kosht—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) granting a pension to C. B. Hinnehoright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) granting an increase of pension to Henry Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Coe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) granting an increase of pension to Anna Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) granting an increase of pension to Henry K. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) granting an increase of pension to N. C. Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) granting an increase of pension to William A. Ritchey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4042) granting an increase of pension to William B. Sturges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4043) granting an increase of pension to John Worley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 4044) granting a pension to William H. Slough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4045) granting a pension to Minnie Gusler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) granting an increase of pension to George N. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Lybold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 4048) for the relief of the heirs of Eneas Munson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4049) granting a pension to Sidney F. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 4050) granting a pension to Louise H. Watson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) granting a pension to William E. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4052) granting an increase of pension to Francis X. Soleau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) granting an increase of pension to William R. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) to grant an honorable discharge and pension to Phillip Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wyrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 4056) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BADGER: Address of committee named by the National Convention of Insurance Commissioners, requesting legislation denying the use of the mails to fraudulent insurance companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Daniel Bushman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of Metal Trades Council of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Pattern Makers' Association of St. Louis, Mo., and vicinity, favoring passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Typographia No. 3, of St. Louis, Mo., branch of the American Federation of Labor, favoring the passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of Electrotypers' Union No. 36, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CANNON: Memorial of G. W. Perkins, president of the International Cigar Makers' Union, relative to the so-called Cuban reciprocity measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the National Cigar Leaf Tobacco Association, protesting against the so-called Cuban reciprocity measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Economic O. M. Club, praying for a reorganization of the Bureau of Labor—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAPRON: Letter from the New England Shoe and Leather Association, advocating the retention of the present system of tariff on boots, shoes, and leather between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Letter from Mayaguez section of Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, indorsing petition of Ponce section of Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, praying that a duty of 1½ cents per pound be levied on all coffee entering the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUSINS: Resolution of the National Grain Dealers' Association, favoring the passage of legislation to prevent discrimination of traffic rates between localities and sections—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany bill to pension Alfred I. Judy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: Resolution of Gordon Granger Post, No. 138, Grand Army of the Republic, Orange, Department of California and Nevada, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Resolution of Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of restoring merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of M. G. Everson, of St. Peter, Minn., in favor of the passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers of St. Paul, Minn., favoring passage of an eight-hour law and anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DOVENER: Papers to accompany bill to pension William A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of the heirs of Josiah Pugh, deceased, late of Blount County, Tenn., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Papers to accompany bill to pension Samuel N. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Resolution of Sewickley Presbyterian Church, of West Newton, Pa., urging the passage of the Hepburn interstate liquor act—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to George Hayden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension James M. Redick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Rev. J. H. Pershing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an honorable discharge and a pension to W. Scott King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill to pension Jacob Lybarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Thomas B. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: Papers to accompany bill to pension Betsy Chapman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Papers to accompany bill to pension Mrs. G. H. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Bolivar Sheild, of York County, Va., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. METCALF: Resolution of General George A. Custis Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Oakland, Cal., asking the enactment of a stringent immigration law—to the Committee on Immigration.

Also, resolution of the Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees of America, Division No. 92, Oakland, Cal., in favor of an eight-hour bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of the Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees of America, Division No. 92, of Oakland, Cal., in favor of the passage of anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolution of Benjamin Harrison Post, No. 166, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SKILES: Protest of Cigar Makers' Union No. 416, of Norwalk, Ohio, against passage of the Cuban reciprocity treaty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of C. B. Gambee Post, No. 33, Bellevue, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Papers to accompany bill to pension Wilson Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: Memorial of civil-war locomotive engineers of the United States Government of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of a bill to pension civil-war engineers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of select and common council of Philadelphia, relative to a 35-foot channel for the Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *November 18, 1903.*

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. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wellsburg, W. Va., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Gowanda; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gowanda; of sundry citizens of Clinton and Syracuse; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Bethlehem; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of New Scotland; of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Baiting Hollow; of sundry citizens of Boonville and Oneida; of the Independent Order of Good Templars of Albion; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rochester; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Esperance; of sundry citizens of Mount Vernon and Cayuga; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Huntington; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oswego; of the Young Woman's Missionary Society of Albany; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chazy; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Albion; of the Mothers' Christian Association of New York City; of the congregation of Olivet Methodist Episcopal Church, of Syracuse, and of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Manlius, all in the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of the congregation of the Forty-sixth Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bayonne; of the congregation of the First Reformed Church of Long Branch; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Long Branch; of the congregation of the St. Luke's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Long Branch; of the congregation of the Simpson Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, of Long Branch; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Long Branch; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Long Branch; of the congregation of the Bethel Presbyterian Church, of East Orange; of the congregation of the Broad Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Trenton; of the congregation of the Calvary Presbyterian Church, of Camden; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ebenezer; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hope; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hope, and of the congregation of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church of Trenton, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah, which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. McCOMAS presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Monkton, of sundry citizens of Baltimore County, and of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Buckeystown, all in the State of Maryland, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Owensboro, Ky., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bloomington, Wis., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Grand Ledge, of the Christian Endeavor Society of Plainwell, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the congregation of the Protestant Church of Saranac, all in the State of Michigan, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association of Bridgeport; of Thomas Martin, of Bridgeport, and of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Local Union No. 43, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Ashland, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 43, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Ashland, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEXICAN WAR PENSIONS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I present a petition from an organization known as The Dames of 1846, praying for an increase of pension to the survivors of the Mexican war to $30 per month.

In this connection I should like to be permitted to state that in 1888, thirty-nine years after the close of the Mexican war, a service pension of $8 per month was granted to the survivors and the widows. A few years after it was amended, making it $12 per month to those who were in destitute circumstances and unable to labor, and at the last session of Congress a further amendment was made granting $12 per month to all the survivors of the Mexican war.

I do not venture to say how much merit there is in the petition of these good women, but of course the Committee on Pensions will give it proper consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

COST OF PRINTING DOCUMENTS.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, who were directed by a resolution of the Senate of March 12, 1903, to ascertain and report to the Senate the cost, for each session of the last four Congresses, of printing all such documents, other than executive or legislative documents, as may have been printed by order of the Senate, or by unanimous consent, on the request of individual Senators, submitted a report thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

A bill (S. 1321) granting a pension to Charles M. Clark;