George M. Nicol. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1904.

J. Johnson Ray to be postmaster at Norwich, in the county of Chenango and State of New York, in place of James H. Throop. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1904.

OHIO.

William W. Dennison to be postmaster at Batavia, in the county of Clermont and State of Ohio, in place of William H. Baum, removed.

Henry H. Dibble to be postmaster at Canal Winchester, in the county of Franklin and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

George R. Garver to be postmaster at Strasburg, in the county of Tuscarawas and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1903.

Peter Housel to be postmaster at Shreve, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio, in place of Peter Housel. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1904.

Thomas B. Van Horne to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Warren and State of Ohio, in place of Joseph B. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1904.

OREGON.

George M. Richey to be postmaster at La Grande, in the county of Union and State of Oregon, in place of John C. Ardrey, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John Francies to be postmaster at Allegheny, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania, in place of James A. Grier, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Ida A. Calhoun to be postmaster at Clemson College, in the county of Oconee and State of South Carolina, in place of Rebecca C. Calhoun, removed.

James E. Horton to be postmaster at Belton, in the county of Anderson and State of South Carolina. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

TENNESSEE.

Daniel M. Nobles to be postmaster at Paris, in the county of Henry and State of Tennessee, in place of Edward H. Blanton, removed.

VERMONT.

F. Henry Foss to be postmaster at Vergennes, in the county of Addison and State of Vermont, in place of F. Henry Foss. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

WISCONSIN.

Laurel G. Andrews to be postmaster at Mukwonago, in the county of Waukesha and State of Wisconsin. Office became Presidential October 1, 1904.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 1905.

CONSUL.

Howard D. Van Sant, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF MANUFACTURES.

J. Hampton Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Chief of Bureau of Manufactures, Department of Commerce and Labor.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick S. Stratton, of California, to be collector of customs for the district of San Francisco, in the State of California.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

Walter T. Merrick, of Pennsylvania, to be naval officer of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

L. D. Redfield to be postmaster at Benson, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona.

CALIFORNIA.

William Collins to be postmaster at Mojave, in the county of Kern and State of California.

ILLINOIS.

Eva J. Harrison to be postmaster at Johnston City, in the county of Williamson and State of Illinois.

Holly C. Marchildson to be postmaster at Thebes, in the county of Alexander and State of Illinois.

George M. Thompson to be postmaster at Bement, in the county of Piatt and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

John M. Atkins to be postmaster at Jasonville, in the county of Greene and State of Indiana.

MISSISSIPPI.

Robert C. Sharbrough to be postmaster at McHenry, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi.

Alexander Yates to be postmaster at Utica, in the county of Hinds and State of Mississippi.

NEW JERSEY.

Joshua L. Allen to be postmaster at Pennington, in the county of Mercer and State of New Jersey.

Farley F. Holcombe to be postmaster at Hopewell, in the county of Mercer and State of New Jersey.

Shepherd S. Hudson to be postmaster at Mays Landing, in the county of Atlantic and State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK.

George Bouse to be postmaster at Bay Side, in the county of Queens and State of New York.

Frederic J. Merriman to be postmaster at Madrid, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Erwin Q. Houston to be postmaster at Davidson, in the county of Mecklenburg and State of North Carolina.

Eugene C. Kapp to be postmaster at Mount Airy, in the county of Surry and State of North Carolina.

Robert P. Reinhardt to be postmaster at Newton, in the county of Catawba and State of North Carolina.

Jesse F. Walsh to be postmaster at Elkin, in the county of Surry and State of North Carolina.

OHIO.

Louis G. Bidwell to be postmaster at Kinsman, in the county of Trumbull and State of Ohio.

William Cline to be postmaster at Arcanum, in the county of Darke and State of Ohio.

Peter Cranker to be postmaster at West Toledo, in the county of Lucas and State of Ohio.

Willis E. Payne to be postmaster at Ashville, in the county of Pickaway and State of Ohio.

Granville W. Springer to be postmaster at Crooksville, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio.

Alva G. Sutton to be postmaster at Attica, in the county of Seneca and State of Ohio.

Ford H. Laning to be postmaster at Norwalk, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio.

Charles D. Wightman to be postmaster at Medina, in the county of Medina and State of Ohio.

WYOMING.

Newton H. Brown to be postmaster at Lander, in the county of Fremont and State of Wyoming.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 11, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

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

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

By unanimous consent, the bill (H. R. 16282) to authorize the city of Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River was laid on the table, a similar Senate bill having been passed yesterday.

COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following committee on the part of the House on inauguration ceremonies: Mr. DALZELL, Mr. CRUMPACKER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17473) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and pending that motion I would ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] if we can not agree upon some limit to general debate.

Mr. HAY. We would like one hour upon this side.

Mr. HULL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that three hours, or so much of that time as may be necessary, be agreed upon as the time for general debate, one half of that time to be controlled by myself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the general debate may be closed within three hours, one-half of the time to be under the control of the gentle-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

man from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and one-half under the control of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the army appropriation bill.

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

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 17473, the army appropriation bill, with Mr. BOUTELL in the chair.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take any time of the House on this measure. If the Members of the House will get the report they will see practically, I think, all matters of legislation referred to in the report, so that they can examine it before the bill is considered under the five-minute rule. The most important item of new legislation probably is that abolishing the office of assistant chief of the Record and Pension Office. When the bill consolidating the Bureau of the Adjutant-General with that of the Record and Pension Office was passed, there was no action taken by Congress with regard to the office of assistant chief of the Record and Pension Office. That office had heretofore been open, to be filled either from civil life or from the Army. In the consolidation it was supposed that the rules applying to the other staff corps would apply to this. The attention of the War Department was called to the matter, and it was suggested by the Chief of the War Department at that time that it would probably be no more than just if one place was left in the Army where men of distinguished service could be recognized by appointment as major in the staff corps, and if that office should be abolished it would require such distinguished officers to be made brigadier-generals, as we have lineal promotion up to and including the grade of colonel. The office has been twice filled since the consolidation was effected, and in neither case has there been an officer of the Army appointed to the position. Not only that, but it seemed to your committee—and I will say the committee was unanimous upon this point—that it should not be left open longer, but that all appointments to the staff corps, including those to the consolidated department, should be upon the same basis; so that the committee has unanimously reported a provision in this bill that when the office shall become vacant, either by death or promotion of the present incumbent, it shall cease and shall not thereafter be filled.

The amount appropriated this year by this bill, if it shall pass as reported by the committee, is $69,461,334.89.

The amount last year was something over $75,000,000. The amount estimated this year was something over $72,000,000. The reduction made by the committee was $2,615,983.10. We believe that it is ample for the Army as it is now constituted. The largest reduction made in the estimate was for transportation of the Army and its supplies, $3,000,000. Under this head a very large amount of items are included, and the committee and the Secretary of War both believe that $12,000,000 will be ample for the ensuing year.

There are some other items of legislation that will be subject to the point of order, and attention will be called to them as rapidly as they are reached. I think I am safe in saying, Mr. Chairman, that it is the first bill in several years where the committee is unanimously in favor of the items of the appropriations bill. Heretofore there has been some disagreement on items, not to amount to much, but some disagreement, but I can not now recall where there is a single disagreement on this bill. I reserve the balance of my time, and now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Oh, certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this proposition. I learned through the public press for the first time—not anybody's fault but mine that I did not understand it sooner—that retired officers drawing the pay of retired officers when employed by States or colleges or military organizations are not only authorized to make such arrangements and receive whatever pay the State or other persons may give to them, but, in addition to that, that they are restored at once to the full pay of an officer of the Army in active service. I would like to understand two things. First, when the law was passed that results in that sort of thing, and again, if the gentleman will be kind enough to tell me, the policy upon which that arrangement proceeds.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in his statement. The last appropriation act carried legislation that military attachés and officers acting with the National Guard who are assigned from the retired list could draw their full pay and allowances while so acting. Up to that time there was no officer in the position of military attaché. There were officers acting with the National Guard on the governors' staffs of several of the States in the Union. There was not a single officer, as I recall now, above the grade of captain so acting. These officers did not get any additional pay from the States. They were not adjutant-generals, but, Mr. Chairman, since the passage of that act officers of the highest rank have been apparently seeking these assignments. There are now nine brigadier-generals on the retired list acting with nine different States with the militia, and I have prepared an amendment which I wish to offer when we reach that part of the bill, and I will read it for the benefit of the gentleman.

I want to say here it is not the action of the committee; I did not bring it before the committee, because I forgot it, but I have prepared it since and shall offer it on my own responsibility. It will read as follows:

Provided, That no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty with the organized militia of the several States and Territories, receive from the United States any pay or allowance additional to his pay as a retired officer.

I want to put that amendment in at the proper place.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I entirely commend the gentleman for it. I can see no possible reason if a retired officer is only entitled to a certain pay, which is fixed, why we should increase that pay because somebody else is employing him.

Mr. HULL. I will say, Mr. Chairman, when you come to captains on the retired list and lieutenants on the retired list acting with the National Guard the question was raised that it is impossible to secure the number that was needed for the reason that their pay would not support them in the cities in which they would have to reside.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I can see that.

Mr. HULL. Nobody dreamed that the higher officers would immediately jump in and get this extra pay and act with the National Guard or Militia, but it seems they are absorbing it now, and, as I stated a while ago, within the last eight months nine brigadier-generals have been assigned. They get their full pay. They get $72 a month in addition to their pay for commutation of quarters; they get all the allowances of their grade. I think it is an imposition upon the Government of the United States, and I want to cut it off.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The effect of it is to make it desirable for an officer to avail himself of every possible means of retirement in order that he may get this better place.

Mr. HULL. He gets a better job, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not a fact that a retired lieutenant-general of the Army is now serving as a military attaché in one of the States of the Union?

Mr. HULL. That, I understand, is true; but I wish to say that my mind was made up on this long before that took place.

Mr. SCOTT. I simply wished to inquire.

Mr. HULL. I looked at the last Army Register and saw that nine brigadier-generals have gone into this matter simply for increased pay, and not because of patriotism. If you talked to most of them they would say it is a patriotic duty, but they were careful enough to exercise that option and never performed such patriotic duty until the Government of the United States passed that law at the last session.

Mr. SCOTT. What I wished to know was whether your law reached that case last session.

Mr. FOSTER. If I understand correctly from the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], these nine high retired army officers get their pay also from the State?

Mr. HULL. I think not. I think that they do not get any pay from the State. But I can say, as I said a while ago, there is no good reason why a captain or lieutenant, or even a major, could not live at the capital on the governor's staff and instruct the militia on his retired pay, and I can see a good reason for giving those ranks the full pay. But I can see no reason why a brigadier-general, a major-general, a lieutenant-general, or a colonel, getting as much pay as they do, should have increased pay out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] how the total amount reported by this bill compares with the amount reported last year?

Mr. HULL. It is over $5,000,000 less.

Mr. PERKINS. Five million dollars less than reported last year?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir. Now, if there are no other questions I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, economy being the watchword of the hour, I desire to submit a few observations on that important subject.

So far as I am advised the national platform of every political party in the country promised economy of administration. The Republican party, however, is the only one which has an opportunity to show that it really meant its ante-election promises. Day by day, here in this Chamber and through the public prints, we are told that this is to be an economical Congress, that appropriations are to be confined strictly to a provision of the lubricant which will keep the wheels of government turning, and that none but the essential expenditures will be undertaken.

Members who reside on navigable rivers are greatly distressed over the statement that there probably will not be a river and harbor bill. Those Members who represent seaports where a greater depth of water is needed to accommodate business are distressed over the thought that their traffic must for a while longer be adjusted to the heavy charges of light-draft vessels.

It is said we are to have no public buildings bill because money can not be found to pay for the buildings. In a word, sir, we have been given to understand that the business interests of the country can not be promoted, that urgently needed internal improvements can not be made because there is a deficit in the Treasury. Yet somehow money is to be provided for the promotion of the imperialistic ventures of the Government. Our stupendous Navy is to be made still greater. We can't deepen a harbor when demanded by commerce. We can't remove the snags and sand bars in our navigable rivers that railway freight charges may be kept down by river competition, but we can go on building battle ships, which we don't need, at a cost of six or seven million dollars each.

Under these circumstances, and because I conceive it to be my duty to help my friends who are distressed over the condition of the Treasury, I will point out one or two other small economies that might be practiced with perfect propriety.

If my suggestions are followed, Mr. Chairman, enough money may be saved to permit of a moderate expansion of the naval programme. I may not be able to show where the price of a battle ship can be saved, for they are the most expensive luxuries a government can have, but we may by pinching here and there save enough for a cruiser or at least a torpedo boat.

Gradually since the close of the Spanish-American war the appropriations for the Army have been reduced. Our friends of the opposition "point with pride" to this fact. They cackle over each reduction as if a great thing had been accomplished. They rejoice mightily over the fact that this bill only carries $69,307,724.89, as against $75,356,722.88 in the bill of last year. The more these bills resemble those that were passed under a Democratic Administration the louder they cackle.

In order that the majority may be inspired to do even better in the way of economy I will give the House the figures of the four bills that were passed during Mr. Cleveland's last term as President. They were as follows:

For the year ending June 30:

1894	$24, 225, 639. 78
1895	23, 592, 884. 68
1896	23, 252, 608. 09
1897	23, 278, 402. 73

Now, for the lesson of the contrast, I will invite the attention of the House to the last six army appropriation bills, to wit:

For the year ending June 30:

1900	$80, 080, 194. 06
1901	113, 669, 545. 55
1902	115, 734, 049. 10
1903	91, 246, 636. 41
1904	74, 637, 252. 83
1905	75, 356, 722. 88

If Members really want their harbors deepened and the navigation of their rivers improved, they have only to get the naval and military expenses of this Government back to the economical basis of a Democratic administration and hold it there for four or five years, and there will be money enough saved to dredge every stream in the country and to deepen every port on the seacoast.

At the proper time, while this bill is under consideration, I shall offer an amendment which will reduce the size of the Army by 520 enlisted men and 16 officers, and save to the taxpayers of the country a large sum of money each year, and return to their regiments five officers of the Regular Army, who are needed in their own proper places.

It is not an unreasonable reduction. It will not cripple the Administration in any way. It will not even impair in any appreciable manner the efficiency of the Army. It is a piece of legislation which was recommended by the Secretary of War, Mr. Root, in 1902. In his able report to Congress in December, 1902, he said:

PORTO RICO REGIMENT.

The act of February 2, 1901, provides that the Porto Rico Regiment shall be continued in service until further directed by Congress. I recommend that the discontinuance of that regiment be now directed, and that at the same time the right of enlistment in the Regular Army be extended to citizens of Porto Rico. There is no longer occasion for maintaining a special and peculiar force in the island, at the expense of the United States, outside of the coast-defense fortifications. Under the prosperous conditions which have followed the very liberal treatment of the island by the United States, the insular government is well able to support a police force adequate to preserve internal peace and order, and there is no more reason for maintaining a special United States force in addition to the Regular Army to protect Porto Rico against external attack than there is to maintain such a force to protect any part of our territory on the Atlantic coast. The people of Porto Rico should, however, have an opportunity to share in the general defense of the Government to which they owe allegiance and of the institutions which they enjoy.

My purpose is, Mr. Chairman, to offer an amendment to the pending bill, and I hope the House will support the amendment. If the majority is sincere in its talk of economy my amendment will be unanimously supported.

It is an open secret, Mr. Chairman, that but for the interest which some legislators had in certain officers employed in the Porto Rican Provisional Regiment that organization would have been legislated into civil life and self-support two years ago.

Certainly, sir, it is not conceivable that there could have been any reason for continuing it upon the muster roll of the Government which was not revealed to that very clever man and able Secretary of War, Mr. Root, who, until overcome by the pleadings of Senators and Members for the retention of their pets, advised its abolition. It is monstrous that this large and growing charge upon the people should be continued just to take care of a few young men who appear not to be able to take care of themselves in the struggles of civil life.

But the military departments of the Government do not offer the only opportunities for the practice of economy.

Year by year the Department chiefs have offered wise and practical suggestions for the promotion of the efficiency of administration, and which, if they were adopted, would save large sums of money to the taxpayers, but they have been persistently disregarded. Of course I can not speak with certainty as to why these reforms have not been carried out, but I suspect that if all the facts were known it would be developed that their execution would take some names off the pay rolls.

I have been here long enough to learn that where the inauguration of a reform involves the loss of patronage—that is, the decrease of the number of officeholders—the reforms are not inaugurated.

Somebody of influence—some prominent Administration Senator or distinguished Administration leader in the House—is always behind the useless officeholder, and no matter how good a case may be made for the people the useless official and his more or less expensive office are rarely abolished.

Time and again the chiefs of the Treasury Department have directed attention to the great number of useless and expensive customs districts and have asked the Congress to either abolish them, by consolidation with others, or to give the Secretary of the Treasury authority to do so.

I asked an eminent Member of this body why so patent an evil was not cured. He admitted that it should be done, but said that he was not willing to confer the authority to do so on the Secretary of the Treasury; that he was opposed to the suggestion that this body should turn over its privileges and duties to any executive officer, and that he hoped that Congress itself would consolidate the customs districts and reduce the expenses of administration. I don't know how fervently he may wish to see the reform worked in that way, nor how high his hopes are of seeing it done; but it is almost certain that it can not be done in the way he thinks it should be done.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, it does not appear to me to be an abrogation of the rights or duties of Congress to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to do certain things within certain and clearly defined boundaries. We are the representatives of the people, and it seems to me to be entirely proper for us to direct a servant of the people—the President, or the Secretary of the Treasury, for instance—to carry out reforms in the administration of their business, using discretion as to details. In this particular business of the administration of the customs the Secretary of the Treasury has a knowledge of details which we can not, in reason, be expected to have. If after we have clothed him with this discretion we find that he is not using it wisely we can recall the authority.

No member who will read the report of the Secretary of the

Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, can fail to be impressed with the urgency for this reform. He says that the cost of collecting the customs revenues of the Government was a little over 3 cents per dollar, which, he adds, is "much more than it should be." The Secretary contrasts this with the cost of collecting the internal-revenue taxes, which is much more economically done. It costs more than 3 cents to collect a dollar at the custom-houses, and only about 2 cents to collect one at the distilleries, breweries, and tobacco factories. The reason is plain to anyone who will read the report. In 1877 Congress authorized the President to consolidate the internal-revenue districts. The execution of the law resulted in reducing their number from 183 in 1876 to 66 in 1904, and in a great saving to the Government in the way of salaries and the expenses of administration.

It is worth while, sir, to examine a list of the customs offices at which it costs more than a dollar to collect a dollar. The list is found on page 28 of the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury. It took three officials at the port of Alexandria, Va., to collect $1,172.23, and they received as compensation $1,255.74. But Alexandria, from the point of view of the expense of collection, is one of the very best ports on the list. At Annapolis, Md., it cost $1,196.95 to get $14 of revenue for the Government, or $85.50 to collect each dollar.

Now, I know that Maryland is considered debatable political ground and party exigencies there are very great, but it does seem that under such stress of circumstances one deputy, if properly bonded, might be trusted to collect that $14. There are three employees at the Annapolis custom-house. How they spend their time without being bored to death heaven only knows, unless, after the day's work is done, they go a-fishing.

Beaufort, S. C., is what you might call a "top notcher." Down there it took two able-bodied customs officials, at a cost to the people of $1,509.28, to collect $1.55, or $973.72 of expense for each dollar collected.

Dear old South Carolina! Always a land of extremes. I love her and her people, but I do really believe that that custom-house might be spared unless, as it seems that he won't be happy without one, it be given to Crum, with the revenue for his compensation.

Then, there is the collection district of Brownsville, in Texas, to which the House might very properly give its attention.

Texas never does things in a small way. In another direction from that which distinguishes the South Carolina port, Brownsville is also a "top notcher."

Down there on the lower Rio Grande, at Brownsville, it took twenty-six officials, at an expense of $32,004.59, to collect $4,850.66.

Our revenues may not be heavy at Brownsville, but our pay roll is long. That district could also go without a convulsion of nature. But, Mr. Chairman, not all the sins of this sort are committed down in Dixie. This folly of maintaining customs districts where they are not needed and at places where the expense account is greater than the receipts is as broad as the continent.

Reform is needed on the northern Atlantic, on the Lakes, and on the Pacific, as well as on the Gulf and the south Atlantic.

There are more collection districts in Maine for the area, and they average less revenue to the district, than in any other part of the United States.

In this list of forty-six places given by Secretary Shaw, where it costs more than a dollar to collect a dollar, Maine is written down eight times.

At Castine it takes six employees to collect $692.84, and they charge the people $4,400 for doing it. At Frenchmans Bay five men, who are paid $3,606.65, manage to get for Uncle Sam $323.84. At Kennebunk the receipts and the expenses are both very small, the expense, of course, exceeding the revenue. Machias has five customs officials who are paid $4,311.47 to collect $734.35. The two overworked officials at Saco take in $13.40, and it costs the Government over $32 in salaries and other charges for every dollar collected. At Waldoboro the situation is a little better. There we only have seven officials, maintained at an expense of $6,751.59, who collect $1,362.60. Wiscasset is about on a par with Waldoboro, while York, Me., seems to be in the class of Beaufort, S. C. At York, however, one man manages, all by himself, to collect $2.50, while at Beaufort it takes two to handle the Government's $1.55.

At Nantucket, in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Government paid last year $378 to collect $8.50.

When we have reciprocity with Canada, which certain eminent Republican statesmen said we did not need, but which the people up there are clamoring for, I greatly fear that the revenues of the Nantucket office will go even lower.

Mr. Chairman, these officials in customs districts which yield no revenues to the Government may be very worthy people and they no doubt need the salaries they are drawing; but, if gentlemen will be frank, that would hardly be advanced as a reason for retaining them.

I have availed myself of this occasion to indicate where economies may be wisely practiced. I have done so because it appears that no one else will and because these useless officers, military and civil, should be abolished and the money of the people put to better uses.

In my opinion, sir, every dollar dedicated to internal improvements is devoted to a wise and useful purpose. I just as firmly believe that every dollar spent on the Army and Navy beyond the amount necessary to defend the liberty of continental Americans and to protect their commerce is worse than wasted. [Loud applause on Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CAPRON, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On December 21, 1904:

H. R. 14468. An act to authorize the sale and disposition of surplus or unallotted lands of the Yakima Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington.

On January 5, 1905:

H. R. 16445. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser.

On January 7, 1905:

H. R. 15590. An act to amend an act approved April 26, 1904, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of War to permit the erection of a lock and dam in aid of navigation in the Tennessee River near Chattanooga, Tenn., and for other purposes."

On January 11, 1905:

H. R. 6498. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize Washington and Westmoreland counties, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania," approved February 21, 1903.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE].

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, the military establishment bill is now under discussion by the committee. It shows a reduction over last year of $6,048,997.99. The measure has been gone over very carefully, and we have followed the suggestions of economy made and have pared down in every possible way the appropriation for the military establishment.

We have to-day a splendid Army, well equipped and well fed. It is well housed at home and in the noncontiguous territory of our country. Compared with the other armies of the world it is a well-paid Army.

The privates in the United States receive $13 per month; the privates in the army of Austria-Hungary receive 73 cents a month; the privates in the French army receive $1.74 a month; the privates in the German army receive $2.50 per month; the privates in the army of Great Britain receive $7.14 a month; the splendid Japanese soldiers receive 60 cents a month; the Russian soldier, who so strongly defended Port Arthur, receives 12 cents a month. That is the difference between the pay of an American private soldier and the pay of the private soldiers in the armies of other countries. Our Army consists now of 60,183 men.

Mr. HULL. That means Medical Corps, Staff Corps, and all?

Mr. PRINCE. The entire Army. The enlisted men number 56,439; the officers, 3,744 on the active list. We pay to the officers of the Army on the active list, by this appropriation bill, $5,000,000. We pay to the enlisted men in active service $9,250,000.

I desire to call attention to the retired officers of the Army—and I want Members of the House to listen patiently for a moment to this discussion of retirement. I desire the country likewise to know what I shall state on this subject in my few remarks. We pay to the retired officers of the Army $2,727,500, of which $500,000 is for additional length of service. The active list of officers of the Army, as now constituted, consists of 1 lieutenant-general. The retired list of the Army consists of 3 lieutenant-generals. We pay to the active lieutenant-general $11,000; we pay to the 3 retired officers, as lieutenant-generals,

$24,750. We have 6 major-generals on the active list; we have 18 major-generals on the retired list. We pay to them $101,250. We have 26 active officers as brigadier-generals; we have on the retired list as brigadier-generals 236. We pay to the retired brigadier-generals $973,500. We have on the active list 104 colonels; on the retired list 71 colonels. We have on the active list 125 lieutenant-colonels, and 70 on the retired list of lieutenant-colonels. Of majors we have 379 on the active list, and 237 on the retired list. I will not mention the captians on the active list, because as you go downward, there is no opportunity existing or desire or urgency to be promoted, and the promotions and retirements increase as they go upward. Of captains we have 179——

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PRINCE. Certainly.

Mr. ESCH. Have you statistics to show how many of these retirements resulted from injuries received in the service?

Mr. PRINCE. I have not.

Mr. HULL. Have you statistics to show what proportion have been promoted for retirement?

Mr. PRINCE. I have, but not right here with me; but I could produce them and submit them with my remarks.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman understands that in the last session of Congress we gave to all civil-war veterans one grade, whether on the active list or the retired list?

Mr. PRINCE. That is what I recollect.

Mr. HULL. As I remember it, that amounted to $251,000.

Mr. PRINCE. It was upward of $250,000.

The reason why I can not give my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the information is that the Army Register is not yet out. We are expecting it about the 15th of this month. I understand it will then be ready for distribution to us; but this bill has come up a little earlier than we anticipated.

Mr. ESCH. I merely suggested that by way of adding force to your argument. Can you state how many of those disabled in the service were advanced on this retired list by law?

Mr. PRINCE. I think there were a small number, if I understand your question.

Mr. ESCH. Six.

Mr. PRINCE. Of captains we have 179 on the retired list, of first lieutenants 51, and of second lieutenants 10, on the retired list.

Now, the law for retirements is familiar to members of this committee. When a young man enters army service he is supposed to dedicate himself to the Army of his country. He is supposed to separate himself from among the "captains of industry," from among professional men; he is supposed to draw the line upon politics and the influence of politicians; he is supposed to stand for all the people, stand for the majesty of his country, his flag and its honor, and to have the esprit de corps that ought to belong to officers of a great republic. He has taken an oath to manage and control and look after its interests. When the name of a young man is offered for West Point, that young man must enter into an agreement, if of majority, and if as a minor, his guardian or parent must enter into an agreement, that for eight years he will stay in the service of his country.

Few of these men resign later on, very few indeed; but they seem to come up and up, and when they become lieutenant-colonels and colonels they seem to move rapidly in the panoramic view until there are presented to the American people 236 men wearing the star of a brigadier-general on the retired list of their country. It seems to me that the oath they take, that the agreement they enter into with their country should be maintained in the highest sense of honor, and that they should retire under the age limit or by reason of disability or incapacity; that they should stand there for the Army that has educated them, that they should stand there with their experience and ability to use it for the best interests of their country, and not seek long before the right to retire, but for the purpose of making way for others, to be made in some form or other brigadier-generals and go on the retired list, and from and after that time cease to be of any use to their country, at an age when their experience and ability are worth something to the country that has been paying them for their services, and that has relied upon their honor and their swords to maintain the glory and the dignity of the country.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PRINCE. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Obviously it is not within the discretion of these men to promote themselves or to retire at will. The fault, therefore, must be either in the law or in the administration of it, and I should like to ask the gentleman's opinion as to where the fault does lie.

Mr. PRINCE. The fault is not in the law, because the law fixes the manner of retirement.

Mr. SCOTT. Then it must be in the administration of the law.

Mr. PRINCE. It must be, as I take it, in this way: Men get along to be colonels, say; somebody below them would like to be made a colonel. These men are induced—I am not prepared to state how they are induced—to desire to be made brigadier-generals, to be promoted and retired as brigadier-generals, so that they make way for promotions to follow as they are put out of line.

Mr. SCOTT. Who has to pass upon their applications to be promoted?

Mr. PRINCE. I think Congress, largely.

Mr. SCOTT. Do you say Congress has to pass upon their applications to be promoted?

Mr. PRINCE. I am speaking of Congress as a whole, not of this particular branch.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to ask the gentleman whether I am right in understanding him to say that no man can be promoted from the grade of colonel to that of brigadier-general except with the consent of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. PRINCE. No; I do not say that.

Mr. HULL. This branch of Congress has nothing to do with that.

Mr. PRINCE. We have nothing to do with that in this branch of Congress. I said the Congress.

Mr. HULL. What the gentleman refers to is hardly the Congress.

Mr. PRINCE. The gentleman would hardly expect me to criticise the other branch of Congress, and if I should do so I should be called down very quickly by the gentleman in the chair or by some Member of the House. I said the Congress. Of course, gentlemen can infer what I mean as well as I can.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course we understand that promotions are made by the appointment of the President, confirmed by the Senate. Now, what I am trying to get at is the opinion of the gentleman as to whether these numerous retirements have resulted from an over-indulgence on the part of the appointive power or whether it is a matter that can be reached by a change in the law.

Mr. PRINCE. I do not desire to answer——

Mr. SCOTT. You have no remedy to suggest then?

Mr. PRINCE. For the reason that if I should give my opinion it might be regarded as in the nature of a criticism upon a coordinate branch of the Government. I have stated the facts. It appears clearly to us all that if these officers had maintained their contract with the Government to remain until they had served continuously, as the law now directs, there would not be this great number of brigadier-generals on the retired list. An extract from the Military Laws of the United States will be the best answer to that. I read from the Military Laws of the United States, page 489:

1297. When an officer has served forty consecutive years as a commissioned officer, he shall, if he makes application therefor to the President, be retired from active service and placed upon the retired list. When the officer has been thirty years in the service, he may, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be so retired and placed on the retired list.

1298. When any officer has served forty-five years as a commissioned officer, or is 62 years old, he may be retired from active service at the discretion of the President.

1299. On and after the passage of this act, when an officer has served forty years either as an officer or soldier in the regular or volunteer service, or both, he shall, if he make application therefor to the President, be retired from active service and placed on the retired list, and when an officer is 64 years of age he shall be retired from active service and placed on the retired list.

The other conditions are provisional, but the latter is mandatory.

When officers have been placed on the retired list as established by sections—

Indicating the sections—

or shall have attained the age of 64, they shall be transferred from said limited retired list to the unlimited retired list.

Then there is another provision of law for the appointment of retiring boards, and the officers are called together, and if the board finds that an officer is incapacitated for active service and that his incapacity is the result of an incident of service, and such decision is approved by the President, said officer shall be retired from active service and placed upon the retired list.

Mr. HOLLIDAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it would not be possible, and probably better, by act of Congress to fix the length of time at which retirement should take place absolutely and not leave it to the discretion of the Administration?

Mr. HULL. We have fixed the time.

Mr. PRINCE. I question that, for this reason: Under the Constitution—I am not a constitutional lawyer—the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. HOLLIDAY. But he serves subject to the law of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman from Illinois has answered the question that I wanted to ask. I wanted a synopsis of the law governing retirement. I would like to ask the gentleman if these retirements, that seem to be taking place so rapidly, are, in his opinion, contrary to the law?

Mr. PRINCE. In answer to that I would say contrary to the law as expressed here, but when the Congress acts it can make by that act a subsequent law which suspends, as I take it, for the time being the law on the statute book.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me, is it not true that these retirements are under the law as he has read it, and that these are not special acts of Congress except as to the civil war veterans? That was a special act; it did not increase the retired list, but it did increase the grade of officers on the retired list. The point that I understand the gentleman is making is that there is a very large proportion of general officers on the retired list. That is not by act of Congress, except as it leaves in the discretion of the President the appointment of general officers. In other words, up to the grade of colonel officers having lineal promotion from the time they start in as second lieutenant and until they receive a commission as colonel the President can not jump one over another, but he can take a first or second lieutenant and make him a brigadier-general. He can take a captain or a major and make him a brigadier-general. That discretion is placed in his hands wisely, I think, so that in time of war he may have some liberty in the selection of the general officers of the Army. That has always been so.

Mr. NORRIS. In carrying out this policy, has that amounted to an increase of the retired list?

Mr. HULL. Not an increase of number, but an increase of rank; yes. It increases the rank in the line of brigadier-generals almost entirely because he could not, even to put a man on the retired list, make him a colonel or a lieutenant-colonel by lineal promotion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does it not increase the retired list in number in this way—that a number of officers who would not retire if they had to be retired as colonels, would retire willingly with the grade and rank of brigadier-general?

Mr. HULL. It may increase it a small amount, but if you notice, in the promotion to brigadier-generals on the retired list, they are almost all of them from the grade of colonel, and would retire in a very few weeks, or a few months in any event, as colonel. Now and then a man who has the rank of lieutenant-colonel is placed on the retired list of brigadier-generals, but it is a small increase in numbers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the gentleman will allow me, I would like to inquire how many brigadier-generals are on the retired list at the present time?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman from Illinois has stated that.

Mr. PRINCE. Two hundred and thirty-six. I think the gentleman was out of the Hall at the time I stated it.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. PRINCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. The gentleman spoke of a very large number of brigadier-generals on the retired list. Can he tell how many of those were retired on account of forty years' service? I would also like to ask him if he criticises the retiring of these officers after reaching the forty years' period of service?

Mr. PRINCE. In answer to the gentleman, I will say that I have not the slightest objection to an officer retiring under the law and receiving the pay of a retired officer of the rank that he has at the time he retires. But I am not yet convinced of the wisdom of taking an officer that will retire as a colonel in a year or so, and suggest perhaps that it might be wise for him to retire, promote him to the rank of a brigadier, and then retire him a year in advance, perhaps, of the time that he would have retired under the law as a colonel. It is next to impossible, as I take it, for the present 236 brigadier-generals to be retired by the operation of law at the grade that they have been retired.

It is possible to retire every officer of the Army, as now constituted, if the officers will consent to be retired along by that agreement and by that operation, and make them all brigadier-generals; and it now looks as though those being retired were being retired at the grade of brigadier-generals.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PRINCE. In one moment.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois did not quite answer the other branch of the question as to whether he could give us the number.

Mr. PRINCE. No; I said I could not, because the Army Register is not out, and there were a large number of officers retired under an act of Congress for prior service in the civil war, and they are included in this list. I stated that in answer to my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman as to who is responsible for the maladministration of law in retiring these officers before they arrive at the retiring age?

Mr. PRINCE. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say that it is a maladministration of the law, and I am not going to charge anyone with any such thing.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman is not going to say whom he thinks it is. Is that it?

Mr. PRINCE. Well, I do not like that idea, and I am not going to criticise now. I am stating the facts to the House and to the country, and they must be the judge.

Mr. HOLLIDAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if during the progress of his speech he is going to suggest any remedy? I have felt for a long time that there is a great injustice in this, but I do not know how to prevent it. I would like to know if the gentleman will suggest a remedy in the course of his remarks?

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say to my colleague on the committee that I don't know that I have any remedy at present to suggest, but I think it is something that we could consider, and perhaps, as the most of us on the committee will be retained there unless the Speaker changes us in the next two years, we might be able to figure out some suggestions to make to the Committee of the Whole in regard to the matter when we meet a year from now.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon one more question, I would like to ask him what the difference is between the pay of a retired brigadier and the pay of a retired colonel. I want to see how much of a motive there is for the promotion.

Mr. PRINCE. I will state this for the gentleman and he can figure it out. The pay of a brigadier-general is $5,500 on the active list. When retired he is entitled to three-fourths of that.

Mr. HULL. The difference is about $900.

Mr. PRINCE. A colonel on the active list gets $3,500.

Mr. HULL. He gets $4,200, counting his fogy pay. A colonel never gets his full fogy pay. Four thousand two hundred dollars is his maximum pay and $5,500 is the maximum pay of a brigadier. It is three-fourths of $1,300, the increased pay of a retired brigadier.

Mr. PRINCE. Well, about $900. It means $900 each year, and in addition to that it means this, I will further state to the gentleman: It means that under the provision of the law as passed in the last appropriation bill, if he is detailed for service by the Secretary of War, with his consent—that is, the officer's consent—to active duty in recruiting; for service in connection with the organized militia in the several States and Territories upon the request of the governor thereof; as military attaché upon courts-martial, courts of inquiry, to board and to staff duties not involving service with troops, such officer, while so assigned, shall receive the full pay and allowances of his grade. Further, as stated by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], nine brigadier-generals are now acting under assignment, with their consent, and as stated by General Chaffee——

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit just one word there?

Mr. PRINCE. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Those nine brigadier-generals not only get their $5,500 a year in full, but, in addition to that, $72 a month allowance for quarters.

Mr. PRINCE. Well, they get the full allowance of an active brigadier-general, whatever it is.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. PRINCE. Twenty-nine of them, I think, according to the statement here, are detailed as instructors in State colleges.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, can my colleague tell what these brigadier-generals would get on retired list if they could persuade a governor somewhere to appoint them as an adjutant-general?

Mr. PRINCE. They would get their full pay as a brigadier-general, with all the allowances that a brigadier-general would get in active service. Then if they want to pay them a small

addition to that I do not know any objection to their receiving that from the State.

Mr. MANN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. PRINCE. I will, sir.

Mr. MANN. Suppose there are 100 colonels within one year of the age of retirement. Is there any more reason why one of those colonels should be retired as a brigadier-general than that all of them should be retired as brigadier-generals?

Mr. PRINCE. Speaking as a Member of this body, with the knowledge I have, I would say no, unless one of the 100 officers had done distinguished and meritorious services that would single him out above his peers.

Mr. MANN. But have not the Secretary of War and the President recommended the promotion and retirement of these colonels as brigadier-generals for the express purpose of preventing the charge of favoritism?

Mr. PRINCE. No, sir; I would not answer that way, because we have a case in point. I know nothing of it by the record, but by reading the newspapers I understand that an officer who was a captain who distinguished himself, almost losing his life, was made a brigadier-general by nomination; that for a while, as I read the papers, the nomination was held up and later on he was made a brigadier-general. It was alleged by the public prints that he was jumped up over 800 different officers. I understand from the public prints that that is not a very uncommon thing so far as selecting a meritorious officer for promotion is concerned, and I am frank to say to you that I believe that power should be properly lodged in the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army. I do not believe men should be promoted—four thousand, in round numbers—by reason of the vacancy caused by the death of men in front of of them. I am not in favor of a system that makes it a dead level that every officer should mark time, standing and waiting for promotion, instead of going to work and doing something that would entitle them to promotion, and the effect of this kind of legislation is to say to 236 colonels, "You can hope to be brigadier-generals hereafter if you will only stand and mark time and be promoted alike," instead of saying, "I will select out of the 236 men the man who has done service for his country and let the other 235 be retired at the rank of the grade they held at the time they arrive at the age for retirement under the law." Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. MANN. I think it does.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my friend a question?

Mr. PRINCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT. In reference to the designation of certain retired officers for the position of military instructors to colleges, which under the law are entitled to have these instructors, does not the gentleman know, or does he know from his own experience or from information, that in many cases retired officers are appointed to these positions of military instructors to these colleges which have military attachments, who are unable to discharge the duty, and they are assigned in order to give them additional compensation to their pay as retired officers?

Mr. PRINCE. In answer to my colleague, I can not answer that, yes or no, for I do not know, but I do know——

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will permit, I will say in every case of that character the college selects and asks for the man and they arrange with the retired officer himself, so I should say he was competent or they would not ask for him or keep him.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman makes a statement which may be theoretically true as to the selection by the colleges of the officers, but in practice the college is very often put to the necessity of taking the man suggested or taking nobody.

Mr. HULL. Very well, they do not have to take anybody.

Mr. PRINCE. The best way, Mr. Chairman, I can answer that and in the shortest possible space of time is by reading the hearings before the Military Committee on page 4. Mr. STEVENS, a member of the committee from Minnesota, asked this question of General Chaffee, who was then before the Committee.

Mr. STEVENS. Now, can you not, for example, detail some of the retired officers to replace some of these men—for example, instructors in State colleges, of whom there are thirty-six?

General CHAFFEE. I asked the Secretary of War to come to Congress last year and give us legislation that we might employ retired officers, and got that legislation. State colleges and governors of States do not want retired officers, and it is the greatest difficulty that we have to secure their employment there. That is one reason for these details. If I had our monthly register I could show you that we have sixty-five officers on the retired list on duty with the colleges and the National Guard.

Mr. STEVENS. Do you not think they could do as good service?

General CHAFFEE. I think they could do very good service.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you not think that some of the friends of the officers on the active list desire that easy place for them? Is not that the trouble?

General CHAFFEE. I am very willing to say yes, sir.

I think that answers your question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, I think it does. I am glad to have the information from the gentleman, too.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. A moment ago you referred to a board for the purpose of retiring incapacitated officers. I know several officers who were retired for incapacity and who afterwards got thoroughly well, procured surgeons' certificates to that effect, and asked to be restored to active duty, but were refused. How can they be restored to active duty?

Mr. PRINCE. The only way I know of is by act of Congress.

Mr. HULL. They can be restored by act of Congress only.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And yet you say the President is the Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. HULL. The law authorizes all that the President is doing now. Whenever the Senate confirms his appointments it is absolutely under the law, but when he comes to put a man that has been retired, and whose place has been filled, back on the active list, he displaces somebody who is already on the active list.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why can not the President be ordered to put him back into active service on a surgeon's certificate?

Mr. HULL. Because the law does not permit it. If we passed a law authorizing the President to put a man on the active list who had been retired for disabilities and had recovered, he could do it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is the gentleman willing to have that amendment placed in this bill?

Mr. HULL. No.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why not?

Mr. HULL. Because it has got to come in general legislation. It covers a good many more than one man.

Mr. PRINCE. In order that the committee may know some of the class of legislation that is presented to the Military Committee I desire to make the following statement:

For desertions and corrections of records there are twelve hundred and sixty cases or bills pending before the committee; for correction of muster, 192; for retirement and restoration, and along the line of promotion and retirement to get on the retired list to receive pay for services not rendered, 170; miscellaneous, 150. In order, gentlemen of the committee, that I may not be misunderstood on this question of retirement, I have stated the law, and I have stated the number of men or officers on the list; I have stated the number of men or officers on the active list, and I have stated the number of officers on the retired list. I say that so that the committee and country may know where the money that is appropriated by the Military Committee goes. Nearly one-half, if not quite, goes to the officers, active and retired, for pay. The other, the balance of the money appropriated for pay of the Army, goes to the enlisted men. To put it in figures, so that we can understand it, the enlisted men receive, in round numbers, for pay $9,250,000. The officers on the active list and on the retired list receive, in round numbers, $7,500,000. Notwithstanding these appropriations, I still say there is not an Army in the world of more intelligence, of more patriotism, of more ability, and of better fighting qualities than the Army of the United States.

It is made up of a high grade of men. In the enlisted men the numbers that are now making application are much larger than the requirements of the law. The officers carefully guard the interests of the Government. They are careful in making selection of good physical men for the Army. They are careful in making selection of men of average intelligence and of moral conduct, until to-day the personnel of the American Army is of such high standard as has never been exceeded at any time in its history. The officers that go to make up the Army and control its affairs are men of the highest grade. Many of them are educated at the institution provided for that purpose, and after they leave the institution they then have to take a course of instruction in special institutions. They have to pass thorough examinations. In short, from the time that an officer is a second lieutenant until he acquires his majority he is constantly, at intervals, submitted to some kind of examination to see whether he is qualified and competent to fill the higher grade he seeks to attain by promotion. I do not want to be understood as speaking in criticism of anyone or any branch of the Government; I have only stated the facts so the committee and the country may know where the money goes and how it is divided up between the officers and men—the officers of the active list and the officers of the retired list. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WARNOCK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 3728. An act to provide for the construction and maintenance of roads, the establishment and maintenance of schools, and the care and support of insane persons in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes; and

S. R. 84. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect on March 4, 1905, etc.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 6019) to authorize the parish of Caldwell, La., to construct a bridge across Ouachita River.

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

H. R. 15810. An act to authorize Caldwell Parish, La., to construct a bridge across the Ouachita River.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman from Virginia consume some of his time now?

Mr. HAY. Yes, sir. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to avail myself of the latitude allowed in debate to discuss the cotton question. It is a serious question. It is serious to the South, because millions of people are engaged in making it, spinning it, and weaving it. It ought to be serious to the American people, because from year to year cotton is the great product that has added to our enormous balance of trade. Our cotton exports alone have amounted to $360,000,000 a year. To reduce the price of export cotton $30 per bale in one year means a falling off of millions and millions of dollars in our exports. A systematic effort has been made—unfortunately, a successful effort—to bear down the price of this great American staple, to the injury of all the people, and especially the people of the South.

I feel deeply upon this question because I represent on this floor not only one of the best cotton-growing districts in the South, but I represent the largest cotton-manufacturing district in the South. I am interested in the manufacturers, I am interested in the operatives, and I am interested in the growers. They are all my friends and I am their friend. There is no justification for the brutal campaign of deception and misrepresentation that has been carried on in order to bear the price of cotton. I know there are some kid-gloved gentry in New York who would not know a cotton patch from a pea patch or a pindar patch who are undertaking to tell the world what it costs to make cotton, and how much there is. I see it stated by some of that crowd that the southern farmer can make cotton at 4½ cents a pound. If I had the power—I have the will—to visit upon that crowd this punishment I would have every man who gambles in cotton on the New York Stock Exchange or elsewhere and believes that the southern farmer can make cotton at 4½ cents a pound go down South and with his own naked hands pull the bell cord over a mule and make some cotton at that price.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the gentleman if most of the men who are speculating on the New York Cotton Exchange are not southern men, or mostly receive their orders from southern men?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not care where they come from nor where they go, they are the enemies of the southern people and of good morals everywhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with the gentleman they are enemies, but I wish to put on record that the southern men themselves are the enemies, and it is not the northern man that is the enemy of the South.

Mr. JOHNSON. So much for that crowd, whoever they are, Mr. Chairman.

Now, I want to call the attention of the House and the country to some facts.

On the 1st day of September, 1904, which was the first day of the cotton year, there was less visible cotton in the world than there had been on the 1st day of September in many years, except September 1, 1903, and we exceeded the visible supply of September 1, 1903, by only 10,000 bales of cotton. I insert here a table:

World's visible supply of cotton.

	Bales.
September 1, 1904	1,123,887
September 1, 1903	1,113,435
September 1, 1902	1,308,831
September 1, 1901	1,437,601

Up to last Friday night, the 6th day of January, 1905, this was the condition: There were in Great Britain 925,000 bales of cotton; on the continent of Europe, 635,000 bales, making a total of 1,560,000 bales. One million five hundred and sixty thousand bales of cotton in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe will not run their mills over two months. They have a two months' supply of cotton and they must get somewhere four or five million bales of cotton to run them until September 1, 1905, when the next cotton crop will begin to be available. All the visible cotton in the world on the 6th day of January was 4,658,011 bales, or 608,121 bales in excess of the amount visible on corresponding date one year ago. Yet, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the visible supply of the world's cotton on last Friday night exceeded the visible supply on the corresponding day one year ago by only 608,121 bales, the difference in the price of cotton on those two days was $30 a bale. The 608,121 bales of cotton will not run the mills of the world two weeks. Instead of there being such an enormous crop of cotton that the world does not know what to do with it, I stand here to say that before the 1st day of September, 1905, thousands of spindles both in this country and in the old country will be idle because they can not get cotton to spin, unless the price of spot cotton advances materially. There is some cotton in the South, there is a good deal of it, but the people who have it have no more idea of parting with it at the prices that are now offered than the holders of United States bonds have of selling them at 25 cents on the dollar. Why should a man sell a thing for less than it cost him to make it? If I could reach the ear of every southern man who has cotton in his yard or in the warehouse I would say to him, "Hold your cotton and you will win the fight." If I could reach him for one other piece of advice it would be, "Plant only half as many acres this year as you did last. Do not try to make more than 6,000,000 bales; because if you make a 6,000,000-bale crop it will bring you $600,000,000, while if you make a 12,000,000-bale crop it will bring you just half that amount, or $300,000,000. It is easier to make six than it is to make twelve. It is less expensive to make six than it is to make twelve; and then the world will begin to appreciate cotton and clamor for it." Bankers, merchants, farmers, newspapers, in fact, all classes, are urging a reduction in acreage. If reducing in acreage is a good thing to do, and everybody says it is, then a reduction that will be felt and recognized around the whole world is the kind to make. A small reduction will leave the speculators an opportunity to carry on their business. It would be contended that the surplus of this year added to another crop less than the present by one or two million bales exceeds the world's needs.

Mr. SIMS. Do you seriously think it is practicable to plant with a view to a 6,000,000-bale crop under ordinary conditions at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON. Why, certainly it is.

Mr. SIMS. How would you go about it?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would let every man in the South, whether he be a large or a small grower, resolve that he will only plant half as much cotton as he did last year; and I hope there would not be a man in all that land who would prove to be his own enemy or a traitor to his fellows by doing otherwise.

Mr. SIMS. I am asking you to determine what is practicable, not what you or I hope.

Mr. JOHNSON. I believe they would do the fair and square thing.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would like to ask my friend if he is not aware of the fact that when there was a great shortage in the production of cotton during the civil war it caused a rapid development of the production of cotton in India, in Central and South America, and in Egypt; and if the gentleman does not believe that if we had a serious reduction in the amount of cotton produced in this country now, either because of the compact which he hopes the farmers would make among themselves and live up to or for any other reason, it would result in a very rapid development in cotton production in all other parts of the world where it is possible to grow that plant?

Mr. JOHNSON. It is not a fact that during the great civil war, when for four years the cotton of the South was denied to the commerce of the world, they were able to find any other place to produce it. Cotton advanced to $1.90 per pound and yet the world was unable to produce an appreciable quantity at

even those remunerative prices. However, India and all the other countries of the world that can produce cotton do not refrain from cultivating it because they particularly love us. They refrain from producing cotton for the same reason that Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut refrain from growing oranges. They simply can not do it.

Mr. SIMS. Does not the gentleman know that Germany——

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you represent a cotton district?

Mr. SIMS. I certainly do; every county in it. I will ask the gentleman if he does not know that it is a fact that Germany, England, and France are now by government aid making experiments in South Africa and other countries with a view to raising cotton themselves on account of the high price of cotton last year?

Mr. SLAYDEN. And that it has almost passed the experimental stage, and that it has been demonstrated that large areas of territory can and do produce cotton.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have before me the figures for the cotton crop of the world outside of the United States. They can not make cotton enough outside of the Southern States to run the mills of the world three months in the year. And I would say this, when it comes to the final analysis: If the people of the South have got to make cotton below the cost of production in order to keep the people of India and Egypt from making it, then let the people of India and Egypt make it.

Mr. BARTLETT. And we will make something else.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. This is, perhaps, the proper place to say that very little cotton competes with American cotton. India cotton is coarse and short and is used only for such purposes as linters and low grades of cotton. Egyptian cotton is used for making a class of goods that even long staple cotton from the Delta in Mississippi will not make. Peruvian cotton is really sold as wool, and its price is not controlled by the price of cotton, but by the price of wool.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield for an interruption?

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I presume it would be easily possible for the manufacturers of farming implements to vastly increase the demand for their products by cutting the supply in two, and it would probably be easier for the manufacturers to arrive at that sort of a bargain than it would for the cotton planters to reach the agreement suggested by the gentleman. I would like to inquire if he would approve of such a conspiracy on the part of the manufacturers to reduce their output in order that they might reap the advantage that would follow?

Mr. JOHNSON. My dear sir, I am interested in both the manufacturers and the growers. I can afford to be fair.

Mr. SCOTT. That is hardly an answer to my question.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would not expect the cotton mills to run from year to year at a loss any more than I would expect the farmer to raise cotton at a loss.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman be kind enough to answer specifically whether he would approve—whether he thinks it is in accordance with a sound public policy for the country to permit, if it had any possible way to prevent it, a conspiracy among the manufacturers of farming implements to limit their output to one-half of the present amount?

Mr. JOHNSON. I suppose they do that now.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will allow me to suggest, the word "conspiracy" means something unlawful and in secret. The cotton planters are not undertaking to do anything in secret.

Mr. JOHNSON. They are meeting in public all over the country, in every township in the South.

Mr. BARTLETT. And only curtailing the acreage that they shall plant.

Mr. SCOTT. I will accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia that "conspiracy" is not the right word, and substitute the word "agreement." I would like to ask if there is any difference between an agreement upon the part of the manufacturers of agricultural implements to shut down the factories one-half of the time and curtail their output by one-half and thereby raise the price of the agricultural implements—is there any difference between that kind of an agreement and an agreement such as is suggested among the cotton planters?

Mr. JOHNSON. If all the manufacturers of farming implements in the United States were being compelled to sell their products for less than it costs to make them, and they were told that the reason of that was that there were too many implements manufactured, that there were too many in the world, I should not think there would be anything wrong if these gentlemen got together, if all the stockholders met and decided for their own benefit that they would not manufacture farming implements but six months during the following year, and that they would manufacture other things that were more profitable. I see nothing wrong about it.

Mr. BARTLETT. And curtail their output?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, curtail their output.

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

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have but thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSON. I can yield to but one at a time.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think I can secure the gentleman a few minutes more time. I would like to submit a question and make a brief statement. I live in a cotton country, and I represent a cotton-producing people.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, I know that. I had a letter from one of my constituents the other day asking me to introduce a bill in Congress to prohibit the State of Texas from raising cotton. [Laughter.] That would settle the cotton question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The State of Texas can take care of itself on that proposition. I want to say to the gentleman that his suggestion that I, or any other man from the South, would want to see the cotton crop produced in such quantities as to be unprofitable to the farmer is a gross error. I want to see the Southern States of the American Union go on producing the major part of the cotton consumed by the world, and I believe, under normal and reasonable conditions, they will go on producing the major portion of it. But experience has shown, Mr. Chairman, that when the price is advanced to a certain figure we do encourage—we have encouraged—the production of it in other countries.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let me correct the gentleman right there. Cotton was higher in 1904 than it has been before for twenty-odd years.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the gentleman know that the crop in Egypt was considerably shorter in 1904 than it was in 1903, notwithstanding the tremendous price of cotton in the South? Why did they not increase their yield this year?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No man will question that there will be a great fluctuation in the yield of it from year to year in that country or in this country. But if the gentleman has taken pains to inform himself by reading the consular reports of two years ago, he will have discovered, as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee, that the governments of Europe possessing Asiatic and African colonies have undertaken, with the cooperation of manufacturers, merchants, and bankers, to secure an increase in the quantity of cotton from those territories under their own flag.

Mr. Chairman, we should not delude ourselves with the idea that we possess the only climate and the only soil which can produce cotton profitably. Now, I want to see this country, as I said a moment ago, go on making and supplying the world with the major portion of the cotton it requires, but I realize that when prices shall have been advanced to a certain figure it ceases to be profitable to the manufactureres of Europe, and causes the Governments and the spinners of those countries to undertake unusual methods to secure a supply from other sources. Why, in the history of the Philippine Islands there was a time when they grew and exported cotton, until the Spanish Government, in order to protect its state tobacco monopoly, compelled the planters to go into the cultivation of tobacco. Down here in Haiti, the negro republic in the West Indies, and in the West Indian islands possessed by the British Government, and in all parts of the world where they find the soil will produce it, they are taking unusual efforts to secure an increased supply.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], if he will not yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] some more time?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question, inasmuch as he has made such an eloquent speech. Does the gentleman know what the world's production of cotton is outside of the United States?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No man knows.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well; the world's production of commercial cotton—cotton that goes to the mills?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No man knows; and for this reason: The opinion of the best experts in the world is that the Chinese Empire produces, cards, spins, and weaves approximately two and three-quarters or three million bales of American cotton, in

quantity, but the statistics are unreliable. We only know there are three or four hundred millions of people there and that they wear cotton, and we know with reasonable accuracy the amount of cotton sent into the Chinese Enpire; but no man can tell how much they produce, and no man can positively tell how much they can produce when they have better methods of cultivation.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is all right, but I have the figures, and I just wanted to know if the gentleman had them.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, I have had them for twenty years.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, there may be, and all the authorities say that there is, a large quantity of cotton produced by the people in the interior of China, in the interior of India, and other places where the women spin it on their little wheels and weave it into cloth in their own homes for domestic purposes; but that cotton plays no part in the world's great commerce.

I am talking here to-day about the commercial crop of cotton. I am talking of the cotton that is packed into bales and shipped to the mills in the United States, in Canada, in Mexico, Great Britain, and all the world. I am talking about the cotton that it takes to run the nearly 120,000,000 of spindles in the world. I am talking about the commercial crop—the crop that reaches the markets for manufacture and is manufactured—the crop that everybody talks about. How much cotton do gentlemen think the world's cotton mills manufacture in a year? It takes between fourteen and fifteen millions of bales. During the last three years, when we know that thousands of spindles in all the countries of the world were forced to close down because they could not get cotton to spin, there was consumed in each year more than 14,000,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. SIMS. Is that last year?

Mr. JOHNSON. Nineteen hundred and one and 1902. I have not the figures before me for 1903.

Mr. SIMS. Well, the gentleman's figures are not according to the figures I have.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, I have the figures here. I am interested in cotton.

Mr. SIMS. So am I, but what is the gentleman's source of information?

Mr. JOHNSON. Government statistics.

Mr. SIMS. Is that for last year, 1903–4?

Mr. JOHNSON. For 1903–4 the world used 13,859,536 bales. I have the figures for the years running back of that. Nineteen hundred and four the gentleman knows the mills closed down. Cotton went to 17 cents, and thousands of spindles were idle because they could not get the cotton to spin. Latham, Alexander & Co. say that on an average all the spindles were idle one month. Of course, some were not idle at all, but some were idle many months. They say full time requires 15,000,000 bales a year.

Mr. SIMS. When cotton was 5 cents a pound in the gentleman's State and in my State, how much did the world consume that year, 1898–99? Fourteen million four hundred thousand and odd bales. That was during a time when cotton was the lowest ever known in the world.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, I guess I have the figures here. I am not in the habit of making statements that are not facts.

Mr. SIMS. I have the figures, too, and I have just referred to them. Eighteen hundred and ninety-eight and 1899.

Mr. JOHNSON. In 1901–2 the world consumed 14,349,000 bales of commercial cotton. In 1902–3 the world consumed 14,339,000 bales of commercial cotton.

I give these figures because the gentleman from Tennessee said that there never had been but one year in the history of cotton when 14,000,000 bales were consumed——

Mr. SIMS. Fourteen million four hundred and some odd thousand.

Mr. JOHNSON. In 1898 and 1899, when cotton was 5 cents. I will give you the figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. I understood the gentleman from Texas, who made a speech in my time, would see that I got more time.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. It is an interesting subject; give me as much as you can.

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman ten minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. In the year 1897–98, when cotton was below the cost of production, the world consumed 14,057,000 bales, 300,000 less than it consumed in 1901–2 and 1902–3.

Mr. SIMS. When it was at its lowest price.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have a table showing the world's consumption, which I will insert in the RECORD. The world needs fourteen and a half or fifteen million bales of cotton. The world's visible supply is not sufficient to run the mills until the 1st day of May, 1905. Now, Mr. Chairman, my friends a moment ago were talking about Egypt and India and all those countries raising cotton. If the people in India and Egypt could raise cotton successfully, with their people working for 5 and 10 cents a day, they would have done it long ago. They have not stood out of the cotton-raising business because they especially loved the people of the United States and the people of the South. They stood out of the business because they can not raise cotton, just like the people of New England have stood out of the orange business because they can not raise oranges. Let us see about India and Egypt. All the cotton received at all the ports in India and shipped from all the ports in India since the first week of September is 588,000 bales, not enough to run the cotton mills of the world two weeks.

All the cotton received at all the ports and shipped from all the ports in Egypt from the 1st day of September, 1904, down to last Saturday, was 3,618,145 cantars. I might as well state here that a cantar is 98 pounds of cotton, and 5 cantars would make a 490-pound bale of cotton. In 1903 the crop for the same time amounted to 4,411,652 cantars, or a difference in favor of the year before of 158,701 490-pound bales of cotton. In other words, the crop of Egypt has fallen off. How did the idea get abroad that we had so much cotton? Well, they said we had ginned such a large quantity up to the 1st of September and there would be so much ginned after that time that the crop would amount to 13,000,000 bales. Mr. Chairman, the cotton season was three weeks earlier than it ever was before. We had the best season for gathering we have ever had, and on the 14th day of December, when the last ginner's report was made, 98 per cent of the cotton crop of the South was picked and ginned. Why, I was talking to a ginner when I was at home during the Christmas holidays, and he told me up to the 13th of December he ginned 580 bales of cotton. From the 13th of December to the 3d of January he ginned 13 bales of cotton, and he supposed he would be able to get 7 more bales, making up the 600 bales. That, Mr. Chairman, is at the upper edge of the cotton belt. If that is true along the foot of the mountains, where the cotton is a month later than it is lower down in the belt, if we had ginned 98 per cent of the cotton on the 13th of December, it must be true of those portions of the cotton belt nearer the coast. So, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason for this brutal, deceitful, unwarranted attack upon one of the great products of this country. With only 600,000 bales of cotton more in sight now than one year ago, there is a difference of $30 to the bale.

Talk about raising cotton at 4½ or 5 or 6 or 7 cents; it can not be done. I saw in a New York paper that Col. J. M. Smith, in Georgia, on 200 acres of land, made 4,800 bushels of wheat and 200 bales of cotton.

They undertake to prove by an exceptional case like that that cotton can be made for 4½ cents. I could take that same illustration and convince the world that wheat could be made for 15 cents a bushel. I am familiar with the land upon which that wheat and cotton were grown. I know the man who made it. It has been cultivated and brought up to a high state of cultivation for forty years. He sowed it in wheat and it averaged 24 bushels to the acre, when the average in all the State of Georgia was only 7 bushels. He planted it in cotton after the wheat was cut off and made a bale to the acre. Of course, on a garden spot like that there is no telling how cheaply you can make wheat or how cheaply you can make cotton, but the question is, What is the average cost of making it? You might as well argue that because some men are gifted in the art of making money and can make a million dollars a month, therefore all other men can do the same thing. It is preposterous and absurd.

Mr. SIMS. I sympathize with what the gentleman wishes to do, but I would like to have something practical. I would like to have the acreage reduced, but how are you going to cut it down 50 per cent?

Mr. JOHNSON. In the first place, I will tell you what I want. I want the farmers of the Southern States to reduce the acreage to such an extent that will make people anxious to get cotton.

Mr. SIMS. Do you think it is practical to reduce the acreage one-half?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do. I think the farmer can do something for himself. He can hold his cotton. He can refuse to give it away or sell it for less than it costs to make it. He can reduce the acreage in order that he and his fellows may not be again found in this plight. And this Congress can do one thing, and ought to do it. I would like to see the American Congress stop

people from selling cotton on paper against the cotton that the people of the South raise from the ground.

Mr. SIMS. Or buying it on paper.

Mr. JOHNSON. Buying it on paper or selling it on paper.

Mr. SIMS. And stop all paper transactions.

Mr. JOHNSON. There are men who sell hundreds of bales of cotton who have never had a bale of cotton, and never expect to have. They do not mean to sell cotton. They are simply betting on the market to the injury of millions of other people. If they have a special mania for betting, and they can not make a living in any other way, instead of betting what cotton will be worth on the 1st of October, 1905, before a seed has been put in the ground, let them bet that on that day the wind will be blowing due north or due east or due west. It will be just as sensible, and would not hurt other people.

Mr. SIMS. Suppose a spinner in the gentleman's county wanted to buy a thousand bales delivered in January. I suppose he would not permit him to procure it?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, certainly.

Mr. SIMS. How can they buy unless some man sells?

Mr. JOHNSON. Why, my friend, it is as simple as anything in the world. I do not object to men like George H. McFadden & Bro., of Philadelphia, who deal in spot cotton, who buy cotton and sell cotton, selling a mill in my district 10,000 bales of cotton, to be delivered in January, February, and so on. Because, when McFadden makes that contract, he makes it in good faith and means to deliver the cotton. The mill is engaged in manufacturing cotton. It is buying in good faith and expects to receive the actual cotton, to pay for it and manufacture it.

When the mill makes that contract it means to take the cotton; and that is the whole thing.

Mr. SIMS. But still he made that contract, and he did not have the cotton at the time he made the sale.

Mr. JOHNSON. He is a bona fide cotton merchant.

Mr. Chairman, the mills and the growers are injured by the manipulations of the cotton market. It would be better for all concerned for the mills to pay the growers fair prices for the raw cotton and sell their products on the same basis. The wild speculation in cotton demoralizes growers and manufacturers. Let us have reasonably fair and steady prices for the cotton and the manufactured product, and prosperity for the grower, the operatives, and the mills.

The world's commercial cotton crop, 1865 to 1902.

[In thousands of bales.]

Commercial year.	Crop of United States.	Imports into Europe from all countries, excepting United States, in 500-pound bales.						Total crop.
		Brazil.	Egypt.	Turkey, etc.	Peru, West Indies, etc.	East Indies and China.	Total.	
1865	300	120	439	191	67	1,053	1,870	2,170
1866	2,269	177	223	129	62	1,377	1,968	4,237
1867	2,097	176	244	103	83	1,112	1,718	3,815
1868	2,519	247	284	116	68	1,181	1,896	4,415
1869	2,366	225	282	166	74	1,262	2,009	4,375
1870	3,122	174	303	109	63	845	1,494	4,616
1871	4,352	225	317	95	104	1,107	1,848	6,200
1872	2,974	302	391	110	97	1,221	2,121	5,095
1873	3,930	195	387	114	84	924	1,704	5,634
1874	4,170	202	426	74	78	1,054	1,834	6,004
1875	3,832	173	442	70	55	1,136	1,876	5,708
1876	4,632	135	599	71	44	908	1,757	6,389
1877	4,474	119	500	71	30	744	1,464	5,938
1878	4,773	54	366	41	58	651	1,170	5,943
1879	5,074	37	493	25	34	694	1,283	6,357
1880	5,761	63	467	19	26	859	1,434	7,195
1881	6,605	108	581	21	26	878	1,614	8,219
1882	5,456	133	478	30	25	1,342	2,008	7,464
1883	6,949	123	496	19	24	1,216	1,878	8,827
1884	5,713	104	562	50	24	1,242	1,982	7,695
1885	5,706	79	646	52	23	755	1,555	7,261
1886	6,575	77	567	37	24	1,045	1,750	8,325
1887	6,505	167	587	33	22	1,260	2,069	8,574
1888	7,046	121	510	22	27	913	1,593	8,639
1889	6,938	73	608	30	28	1,280	2,019	8,957
1890	7,311	94	631	24	34	1,510	2,293	9,604
1891	8,652	98	777	22	38	1,011	1,946	10,598
1892	9,035	69	953	50	39	898	2,009	11,044
1893	6,700	165	896	39	42	874	2,016	8,716
1894	7,550	122	997	36	22	930	2,107	9,657
1895	9,901	38	982	36	22	660	1,738	11,639
1896	7,161	34	974	33	25	853	1,919	9,080
1897	8,533	48	1,106	26	26	642	1,848	10,381
1898	10,898	39	1,125	2	36	543	1,745	12,643
1899	11,189	23	1,243	18	30	607	1,921	13,110
1900	9,137	108	1,022	49	27	242	1,448	10,585
1901	10,218	31	1,224	30	23	695	2,003	12,221
1902	10,380	146	1,243	22	35	604	2,050	12,430

The world's consumption of cotton, 1890-91 to 1903-4.

[Bales of 500 pounds.]

Date.	Great Britain.	Continent of Europe.	United States.	East Indies.	Japan.	Canada and Mexico.	Total.
Year ended Sept. 30—							
1890-91	3,384,000	3,631,000	2,367,000	924,000	100,000	107,000	10,513,000
1891-92	3,181,000	3,619,000	2,576,000	914,000	203,000	110,000	10,603,000
1892-93	2,866,000	3,661,000	2,551,000	918,000	191,000	110,000	10,297,000
1893-94	3,233,000	3,827,000	2,264,000	959,000	284,000	110,000	10,677,000
1894-95	3,250,000	4,030,000	2,743,000	1,052,000	360,000	130,000	11,565,000
1895-96	3,276,000	4,160,000	2,572,000	1,105,000	412,000	120,000	11,645,000
1896-97	3,224,000	4,368,000	2,738,000	1,019,000	495,000	120,000	11,964,000
1897-98	3,432,000	4,628,000	2,962,000	1,161,000	645,000	140,000	12,968,000
1898-99	3,519,000	4,784,000	3,553,000	1,314,000	747,000	140,000	14,057,000
1899-1900	3,334,000	4,576,000	3,856,000	1,139,000	706,000	130,000	13,741,000
1900-1901	3,269,000	4,576,000	3,727,000	1,059,000	536,000	130,000	13,297,000
1901-2	3,253,000	4,784,000	4,037,000	1,383,000	743,000	149,000	14,349,000
1902-3	3,185,000	5,148,000	4,015,000	1,350,000	439,000	202,000	14,339,000
1903-4	2,997,000	5,148,000	3,909,000	1,270,000	360,000	176,000	13,860,000

Mr. HULL. I yield twenty minutes, or so much as he may desire, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLLIDAY].

Mr. HOLLIDAY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the committee in framing this bill was to make army service attractive, so as to induce a better class of men to enlist. The plan was that we should have a small army, and that it should be the best equipped, the best fed, the best clothed, and the best cared for army in the world. It will be observed the appropriations this year are something less than last; but that does not grow out of any neglect of any of the branches of the Army. It is simply a consequence of the reduction of the Army.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to say in this connection, that I hope the gentlemen who compose the Committee on Naval Affairs will take the same view of economy. In other words, that they shall conclude that what the country needs is the best navy of its size in the world, but not necessarily the largest. I think we ought to provide for the completion of all the ships now authorized; I believe we should provide the very best equipment obtainable for all those ships, and that the officers and crews of those ships should be selected from the best material that can be found, and when found should be amply paid. But I do believe that the time has come in the history of the country when there should be a halt called in the matter of naval construction. I think I know something of the temper of the people. I know there is an unrest through the country growing out of the notion that all other departments are to be subordinated to the construction of a great navy. I do no believe that we should entirely cease the construction of war vessels. I expect to see new battle ships authorized; and if I should happen to be a Member of Congress in future years I expect to vote for such authorizations.

I believe at this time, considering the state of the Treasury, the question presents itself to this House that this is a good place to economize. We all understand the necessity for economy; we recognize the condition of the Treasury; but what we insist upon is that this economy must be symmetrical and not one-sided nor lopsided. The appropriations for carrying the mail to all the citizens of this great country must not be cut down. The appropriations for building up the agricultural interests of this country, upon which the prosperity of the country so greatly depends, must not be uncared for. The reclamation of arid lands, which in the future will give homes to thousands of men now homeless, must go on. In other words, I believe if anything must stop, the preference must be given to the arts of peace rather than to the arts of war. [Applause.]

I know from personal experience considerable about the horrors of war, and largely for that reason I believe in everything that makes for peace and good will among men throughout the whole world. I recognize there is at all times a possibility of war, and for that reason I would not have this nation fail to make the proper effort to put herself in a position for defense; but looking over the whole horizon at this time, I am very firmly of the opinion that our grandchildren will never see a war with which our present Navy is unable to cope.

I hope this matter will be taken into consideration. The great Middle West, which has done so much toward building up the prosperity of the country, and which gets less than other sections in return for it, has been thinking about this matter. I yield to no man in my patriotism. I would be willing to sacrifice the last man and the last dollar to protect the honor and interests of this country if they were assailed; but I do not believe in expending money simply for the glory that we may obtain either from great military or great naval establishments. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HULL. Does anyone on that side desire to speak?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I know of no one on this side who does. One moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HULL. I understood the gentleman from Virginia that there was one other gentleman on that side who desired to speak.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will say to the chairman of the committee that there is a gentleman who does want time, but he has stepped out for a moment. If the gentleman can go on and use a little time——

Mr. HULL. We have nobody who desires to speak. I understand the gentleman on that side wants fifteen minutes. I suggest that we proceed with the reading of the bill, and that the gentleman have fifteen minutes under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BASSETT].

Mr. BASSETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter a plea in behalf of the Medical Corps of the United States Army. A good many gentlemen may think that this is a rather unimportant subject. I used to think so, but as I have been studying it it seems to me to be one of the most important subjects that can come before this Congress. If we must have armies, and if we must have wars, why should we not give the best attention to the life-saving departments of the Army instead of giving all of the attention to the life-destroying departments? The advance of military science, especially in medicine and in surgery, has made this subject one of the greatest importance. When we think that three-fourths of those who are lost in war die from preventable disease we can better appreciate the great importance of this subject. And what has served to emphasize this is the great success that the Japanese army has had in its medical department. Some of these facts are only now coming to light. The result is marvelous, and I want to place before this House some of the facts that we are now learning upon this important subject.

In the civil war 80 per cent of those who succumbed died from preventable disease. In the South African war it was a higher per cent than this. In the Spanish war on our side 13 men died from preventable disease for every one who died in battle or from wounds received in battle.

Now, let us look at the illustration furnished by the Japanese army in the Manchurian campaign. Up to July 1 only about 1,100 wounded, and no medical cases reached Tokyo, and not one ended fatally. Of 9,800 men who were taken to Hiroshima hospital, part wounded and part sick, only 34 died up to August 1. Up to July 20 the hospital ship *Hakaui-Maru* brought 2,406 casualties from the front without losing a single case in transit.

So much for the saving of the wounded, but what is even more striking, loss of life from typhoid, dysentery, and other preventable diseases has practically been eliminated in the Japanese army. Improved commissariat and sanitation are such that these diseases do not get a start. Only those die who are severely wounded, and a very much higher percentage of the wounded are saved than have ever been saved before.

This serves not only to exemplify the advance that modern science has made, but the importance of this life-saving branch of the Army. A Japanese officer when asked at the beginning of the war how he expected his side could win when Russia could raise 2,000,000 men and Japan could raise only 500,000, said: "In every four men three die of disease for every one who falls from bullets. That will be the position of Russia in this war. We propose to eliminate disease as a factor. Every man who dies in our army must fall on the field of battle. In this way we shall neutralize the superiority of Russian numbers, and stand on a comparatively equal footing."

I wish to read from an article of Maj. L. L. Seaman, late surgeon in the United States Volunteer Engineers, just published in the Journal of Military Surgeons. He went to Japan at his own expense, as far as I can discover, to ascertain the exact truth of these facts. The Japanese authorities permitted our Government to send five military attachés to accompany their army in the field. Was a surgeon, quartermaster, or commissary officer detailed? No. They represented the life-saving departments and they were omitted. We considered their cavalry, which is the only weak, almost burlesque, feature of their army, of such importance as to be worthy of special study, but did not consider life-preserving methods worth official observation. Major Seaman says:

> Too much praise can not be bestowed upon the medical departments of the army and navy for their splendid preparatory work in this war. The Japanese are the first to recognize the true value of an army medical corps. Care of the sick and wounded consumes but a small part of their time. The solution of the greater problem, preserving the health and fighting value of the army in the field—by preventing disease, by careful supervision of the smallest details of subsisting, clothing, and sheltering the units—is their first and most important duty. Their capacity for detail is something phenomenal; nothing seems too small to escape their vigilance or too tedious to weary their patience, and everywhere—in the field with the scouts or in the base hospitals at home—the one great prevailing idea is the prevention of disease. The medical officer is omnipresent. You will find him in countless places where in an American or British army he has no place. He is as much at the front as in the rear. He is with the first screen of scouts with his microscope and chemicals, testing and labeling wells so the army to follow shall drink no contaminated water.

It is a fact that bad wells in the Spanish war caused far greater loss of life than the bullets of the enemy, and those bad wells should have been detected by a better-equipped and larger medical corps. I proceed:

> When the scouts reach a town he immediately institutes a thorough examination of its sanitary condition, and if contagion or infection is found he quarantines and places a guard around the dangerous district. Notices are posted, so the approaching column is warned, and no soldiers are billeted where danger exists. Microscopic blood tests are made in all fever cases, and bacteriological experts, fully equipped, form part of the staff of every divisional headquarters.
>
> The medical officer also accompanies foraging parties, and, with the commissariat officers, samples the various food, fruit, and vegetables sold by the natives along the line of march long before the arrival of the army. If the food is tainted or the fruit overripe or the water requires boiling, notice is posted to that effect, and such is the respect and discipline of every soldier from commanding officer to the file in the ranks that obedience to its order is absolute.
>
> The medical officer is also found in camp, lecturing the men on sanitation and the hundred and one details of personal hygiene—how to cook, to eat, and when not to drink, to bathe, and even to the direction of the paring and cleansing of the finger nails to prevent danger from bacteria. Long before the outbreak of hostilities he was with the advance agents of the army, testing provisions that were being collected for troops that were to follow—and as a consequence of these precautions he is not now found treating thousands of cases of intestinal diseases, diarrheas or dysenteries, contagion and fevers that follow improper subsistence and neglected sanitation—diseases that have brought more campaigns to disastrous terminations than the strategies of opposing generals or the bullets of their followers.

In our Army not only is the Medical Corps far insufficient, but they lack authority. The President of the United States considered this subject of enough importance to send a message on it to Congress two days ago. A bill is pending which I hope will receive careful consideration and will pass, giving greater dignity and authority and increased numbers to the Medical Corps. A great many doctors who come into the Army, especially in time of war, are on temporary contract. They are called "contract doctors," and it has been held, I understand, in a court-martial that they do not have authority, not being commissioned officers, and yet those who are regularly commissioned in our Army are so few in number that they can not do this sanitary work in advance that is done in the Japanese army; they can not do the chemical and biological work that would save thousands and thousands of lives, and the result is that preventable diseases have wiped out a far greater number of our levies than the bullets of the enemy.

The elevation of the Medical Corps will bring about a greater authority. They must be obeyed. Life in a modern army depends upon it. They must have sufficient number and sufficient authority to enforce their commands as other officers of the Army do. If a well is polluted, if the food is harmful, they do not now have the ability to condemn it and save life. Their usefulness is limited to trying to cure soldiers after they are allowed to get sick. This bill does not go far enough, in my opinion, in increasing the authority and the power of the Medical Corps in our Army. They should have authority over water, they should have authority over food, and they should have authority over clothing. These three items of our army preparation are of as much importance as the powder and guns and forts.

The rations that have been served to the Army in time of war, especially the Spanish war, have been largely canned food, unsuitable to the climate, and if the doctors had had greater authority they could have stopped a great deal of it and prevented much of the death and disease that followed.

It would be strange indeed if this civilized nation, after the proof that is now brought before us by advanced scientific knowledge and by the example of Japan in the Manchurian campaign, should longer delay in giving greater importance, dignity, and authority of the Medical Corps. It is better not to raise so many men than to let three-quarters of the men that die die from preventable diseases. [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has fifteen minutes.

Mr. HAY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DENNY].

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy more than the time allowed me, five minutes. As a member of the Military Committee, which has reported this bill, I wish to say that the committee has cut down the appropriations as far as the bill can well be cut to maintain the present status of the Army in the country. I believe that the committee's work deserves the favorable consideration and fair treatment of this House. It is,

as reported, in the line of economy. I am in favor of keeping a good army, commensurate with the needs of the country, and also a very substantial navy, but I am not in favor of increasing appropriations of either the Army or Navy at the present time at the expense of the commercial interests of the whole country. I beg to say that, while we ought to maintain our Army and Navy on the basis of substantial protection to the country, the peace that now exists throughout our country does not justify us in largely increasing the Department of War, which is constantly pressing upon our attention for large additions. Let the Army be kept within the limits of public requirements.

But I want to say to the House, Mr. Chairman, that if there is one important measure that ought to receive attention and liberal recognition from this House, in addition to the liberal appropriations for the Army and Navy, it is an appropriation just and liberal for the commercial importance of our seaports. Our seaports are clamoring for increased provision for the accommodation of modern ships now carrying the commerce of the world. In my own city of Baltimore we have had reports from the Chief Engineer of the Army, session after session, stating that the depth of the ship channel to that port was insufficient for ships now using that port. Boston has a channel 35 feet, New York 40 feet, and there is no reason why Baltimore should not have the same facilities. We often hear it said that we have to support the Army and Navy, and that all these appropriations must be made, even at the expense of the commercial interests of our great shipping interests.

Only two weeks ago in the main ship channel leading to the city of Baltimore one of the great steamships of the Johnson Line, loaded and drawing 29½ feet of water, stuck in the mud in the center of the channel. It is not only possible that our commerce suffers for want of depth in the channel, but the interests of all the shippers of the West to the port are seriously affected. The want of depth is a continuous menace which is presented at the port of Baltimore, and I hear the same trouble exists at other Atlantic and Pacific ports. Baltimore is absolutely deprived of the commerce to which that great city as an eastern seaport is entitled, simply because of the lack of appropriations upon the part of the Government to deepen the channel. The city of Baltimore has expended over $3,000,000 in the past in opening its own harbor, and never a cent has come from the Government of the United States for the harbor of Baltimore. We ask the Government to deepen the ship channel to 35 feet; nothing for our harbor. Baltimore has recently, notwithstanding the troubles through which it has passed by fire, appropriated about $10,000,000, for which we have taxed ourselves, to deepen and widen our docks at that port, and yet the great ship channel leading to that city is but 30 feet deep and can not accommodate the vessels that come from abroad, and all because of a lack of appropriation to deepen the channel. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, the great importing cities of this country, as well as many other places throughout the country of less importance, should receive liberal consideration at the hands of this House, even at the expense of cutting down the appropriations for the Army and the Navy. The internal commerce of our country must be protected. We must provide for the coming business of the whole country, but do not let us build our navies and increase our armies and incur additional expense incident thereto at the expense of the interests of the people who are engaged in commerce, agriculture, and in other industries that require immediate recognition.

I make these remarks, Mr. Chairman, in order to impress upon this House the importance of at once preparing for the commerce of the country now clamoring for reasonable recognition, and on the success of which depends our great commercial advancement. I say, without hesitation, that it is unjust, as far as my own city is concerned, to longer delay the appropriation in the interests of commerce in order that ships may come into our port, and especially at this time when we ourselves as a city are expending about $10,000,000 in preparing for the business of the country that seeks our port. I intend to vote for this appropriation bill for the Army. I have assisted in the committee as far as possible in its preparation, and I believe that the Military Committee has acted with great discretion and integrity in the preparation of the bill; but I am opposed to the continued extension either of the Army or the Navy until the commercial interests of the country have been fully protected, so that the people at large in the country may be benefited and the seaports may be made commensurate with the commerce of the country. Let us in times of peace prepare for business, and let us not spend so much for unanticipated war. Let us be just to the great commercial interests of the country, and take care of our great seaports. [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, we heard a very interesting talk this morning by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] on the question of cotton statistics and restriction of the production of cotton. I listened with a great deal of interest to a question propounded to him by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT], who, I am sorry to see, is not now in his seat, but it does seem to me that the question of the gentleman from Kansas misses the parallel which he attempted to draw between a combination of manufacturers having for its object the restriction of the production of their goods, and that of a combination or agreement of farmers in the South having for its object the restriction of the production of cotton. Mr. Chairman, the parallel is not a good one, and for this reason: If the manufacturers of agricultural machinery, to which I believe he particularly referred, for instance, enter into a combination having for its purpose the restriction of the production of agricultural machinery, what happens? Those factories are not used for the production of electrical appliances; they are not used for the production of engines, of railway cars, or of anything else; they are idle a part of the time as a result of such restriction of output. In other words, those factories are used only one-half of the year and there is a lessening of production to that amount. But if the farmers of the South could enter into an agreement—which, in my mind, is impossible—that a certain portion of the acreage which they now use should not next year be used in the production of cotton, that acreage would not be idle. It would be used in the production of corn or other farm products, and therefore there would not be a restriction in the aggregate production of farm products even in Southern States. Therefore, the parallel which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] attempted to draw for the purpose of proving an equal criminality on the part of southern cotton planters does not exist. But, Mr. Chairman, what would the effect be if such an agreement were made? The effect would necessarily be to increase the competition now existing on the part of the producers of corn, and it might easily happen that the increased acreage devoted to corn would result in bringing about the same condition of affairs as to corn as now exists as to cotton. There would, therefore, be no relief for the farming community at all; it would merely be extending the territory so that the farmers of Kansas would probably ask: Why don't those southern farmers go back to cotton, and so relieve us of this new competition? The farmers, of course, propose to use that acreage in the production of wealth. Now, when the manufacturer restricts his production, not only does he only produce but half of the previous amount, but he receives the same price for 50 per cent as heretofore he has received for 100 per cent of his output, while he has restricted the demand for labor, and hundreds of thousands of workers are now turned into what is an apparently already overflowing labor market, and they would come in competition with those that are even now receiving only a small return for their labor.

That would be the effect and it always is the effect of every combination which has for its purpose the restriction of production and the enhancement of prices by manufacturers; but no such combination could be made among the farmers, and if it were made the land would be used for other purposes and probably just as much labor would be employed. But, Mr. Chairman, what is the bottom of this whole proposition? The proposition is that there shall be an artificial interference with the production of wealth. The reason that poverty exists in this country to-day to the alarming extent it does exist, the reason it exists all over the so-called "civilized world," is because through legislative enactments the natural laws of production and the natural laws of exchange are constantly interfered with. Artificial barriers are erected which make more difficult the exchange of wealth, and when you see the results as you see them here in the United States you say, "Oh, we must have a commission to inquire what is to be done to remedy such a condition of affairs." We have had such a commission, the results of which the gentlemen on the other side are about to give us, in which they will say the shipping industry is a languishing industry. We must give it "pap," just as you have been giving "pap" to many other industries in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, why this cry of the farmers of the South? Why this talk of an agreement to limit the production of cotton? Is cotton a bad thing? Has civilization too much of it? No; cotton is one of the most universally useful of all of nature's products.

Mr. Chairman, this demand for a restriction of the production of cotton, so far as it is legitimate—i. e., comes from the producer and not from the speculator in cotton—is nothing but an outburst of feeling that they are not getting a "square deal." It is a crude method of expressing their conviction that radical steps must be taken to prevent their suffering for their beneficent acts—for the growing of cotton, Mr. Chairman, is a benefi-

cent act and would at all times appear so to the whole world if it were not for our social maladjustments, which, in this case, as in many others, apparently turns a blessing into a curse.

If we had not become accustomed to seeing these things out of gear, all awry, so that they really appear to us in an inverted form, we should ridicule the suggestion that there ever was too much cotton in the world. What a misuse of words to say that there is too much cotton produced when there are hundreds of thousands—yes, millions—in need of cotton goods!

"Oh," some of you gentlemen will say, "but those people are unable to buy them!" True. But why? Haven't they the hands, the arms, and the brains with which to produce other wealth to exchange for cotton? Aye, haven't they willingness to toil so as to obtain the wherewithal to purchase cotton goods? Then why this seeming anomaly on the one hand of the producer of cotton unable to dispose of his product, because there is no apparent demand for it, while on the other hand there are millions who want the cotton but are unable to buy? Oh, some of you, as well as self-satisfied people on the outside of this House, you who assert that this is the best of all possible worlds, you say there is nothing seriously wrong with our economic conditions; if men are suffering for the necessaries of life it is because they are shiftless, indolent, lazy, and improvident; if they desired to work they could get work. As a distinguished Member of this House said a year ago, "There is work in every part of this country for whoever wants to work, and at a compensating wage."

To such let me read something which ought to convince even them that the charge that men are starving because they will not work is a heartless, cruel libel. I read from The Public of Chicago, a paper which I have heretofore commended to this House for lucidity of expression. It quotes the superintendent of the municipal lodging house of New York City as saying that—

on a recent Saturday night that had followed a day when there was snow shoveling to be done, there had been but 207 applicants for lodgings, whereas on the ordinary nights the number ranges from 400 to 500.

As The Public says:

Little jobs at shoveling snow had put men in condition to pay for lodgings. Having an opportunity to work they sought no charity.

Listen to what the superintendent says of those who come to the lodging house when a snowstorm has visited the city:

We make it a point to see that they are aroused earlier than the others—about 5 o'clock—so that they may apply for a job at snow shoveling.

Mr. Chairman, just imagine some of our self-satisfied people going out soon after 5 o'clock on a bitter winter's morning with only a piece of bread and a bowl of soup in their stomachs to face a day of snow shoveling, and even that job has to be hunted for, and may not be obtained unless you get there ahead of some other poor wretch equally as anxious to get it as you are.

Only "the lazy and shiftless," we are told, need ever want. Listen again to what this superintendent has to say about these men. He says:

In spite of the remarks made by men who do not know—

And he might with almost equal truth have said "and who do not care." Perhaps he had some of our "prosperity" touters in mind—

you ought to see how many of them jump at the chance to work, and hustle on their clothes in the morning.

He says:

Most of them have not enough protection as to clothes to take a street-cleaning job; but—

He says—

still many of them try it and come back in the evening with their toes tied up in newspapers, because they are frozen.

Mr. Chairman, think of men who are "indolent, shiftless, and improvident" undergoing such hardships rather than beg or steal. Well may the editor of The Public declare, that—

Facts like these ought to bring the blush of shame to men and women of the idle-rich class, who account for poverty with the ready explanation that the poor are lazy and idle.

But my friends from the cotton-producing States say the reason of the low price of cotton is due to slackened demand from abroad. Quite true, but they will hardly contend that everybody abroad have had their needs for cotton goods supplied. In Europe, Africa, and Asia there are countless millions who would be demanding an enormous additional quantity of cotton goods if they were receiving a "compensating wage" for their toil, many of them being unable to even secure the opportunity to toil, and therefore can not become consumers of the products which others produce.

Mr. Chairman, I will quote again from that great Chicago weekly, The Public, whose editor, Louis F. Post, is one of America's leading economists, one of its most lucid writers, and one of its truest humanitarians. Mr. Post says:

Reports of suffering from poverty in London are harrowing. At a relief meeting on the 31st it was reported that 200,000 people in that city alone are living on the verge of starvation. In the midst of all this suffering there is something shocking, in spite of the evident good intentions of those in attendance, about the self-satisfaction of the luxurious persons constituting the relief meeting at which this report was made. The meeting was held in the house of a duke whose great income flows unearned into his private coffers from the common inheritance of all Londoners.

The duke referred to is the Duke of Westminster, the Astor of London, the income of whose immediate predecessor was some £800,000, or $4,000,000 a year, even as much as twenty years ago. Doubtless the present duke's income from London ground rents is twice that sum, and therefore approximates in amount the enormous tribute which William Waldorf Astor levies upon the industry and thrift of the people of my city in the form of ground rents. This enormous outflow of wealth, for which Mr. Astor gives nothing in return, accounts in part for what is called the "favorable" balance of trade excess of outgo as compared with income—which the gentleman from South Carolina was so fearful this morning might be disturbed by the present low price of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, I can comprehend the solicitude the gentleman displayed over the desperate straits that he says the farmers of his State have been brought to as a result of this "overproduction" of cotton, but for the life of me I can not comprehend how the country would be more prosperous if our cotton exports are entered upon the national balance sheet at a billion dollars instead of about half that amount (as I understood the gentleman to put it at), unless it resulted in $500,000,000 more goods coming into the United States. And yet, from the view point of those who advance this preposterous theory that a nation is made rich by sending more goods out than are brought in, we should be so much poorer by the receipt of those additional goods, as the "favorable" balance of trade theory is based upon the assumption that we grow rich as we export more and import less. Of course none of the advocates of this theory want that principle applied to his own affairs. Personally he wants an excess of income as compared with his outgo, but by some peculiar process of thought he determines that what is good for individuals is bad for them in the aggregate.

Carry this reductio ad absurdum to its logical conclusion, and what is the result? Why, this; that that country would be the most prosperous which sent a large quantity of goods out but permitted none to come in, and the more it then sent abroad the better off it would be.

Mr. Chairman, if that is the royal road to prosperity why don't the cotton planters of the South send all their cotton abroad and refuse to receive any goods in payment therefor? See how much that would increase our "favorable" balance of trade. There are two countries which have adopted this plan—Ireland and India. Both are constantly sending more goods to England than they receive in return. And yet their inhabitants are apparently the most ungrateful of creatures, as they are always asserting that the process is making them poor while it is making Great Britain rich. So anxious have the people of Ireland been to escape the beneficent action of this "favorable" balance of trade theory that for years they have been kicking because the landlords of Ireland took from them in the form of rent most of their produce, insisting that the process was all right for the landlord, as it enabled him to live in luxury in London on the results of their toil, but that it was nothing less than robbery of them. What the absentee landlord should do is to import some of our "favorable" balance of trade theorists to explain to the Irish tenant farmer that "the more he sends out and the less he gets back the richer he is." I am surprised they have never adopted so simple a scheme to allay the discontent of their tenants.

The New York Journal of Commerce has an excellent article exposing the fallacy of this theory.

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, Monday, January 9, 1905.]

"BALANCE OF TRADE" WITH CANADA.

With what does Canada pay for her imports from the United States? It is with her exports, whether they come here direct or go to Europe to pay for other things which come here burdened with a double charge for transportation. Suppose this kind of argument should be applied to the trade of our Northern States with those of the South or of the Eastern States with the Western? Who does not see the advantage in increasing the exchange of commodities in any and all directions? Who cares whether in any particular instance the balance is one way or the other? It will balance all around in the course of the whole business, with advantage and benefit to all concerned. Any barrier put in the way would increase cost, diminish profit, and discourage both trade and production. This is just as true of trade between New England and Canada as of trade between New England and New York, or the East and the West. This pestilent balance of trade microbe infects the reasoning power of its victims deplorably.

But, Mr. Chairman, I must come back to this article in The Public. Mr. Post continues:

A duchess, whose family lives in luxury on incomes also wrung unearned from people who work, occupied the chair. Among those participating were other titled personages whose luxurious incomes are enjoyed at the expense of their starving fellows whose sufferings they had assembled to relieve. But all they proposed to do was to spend pennies here and there for sweet charity. Sweet charity! Yes, sweet; so sweet to those who dole it out, and so bitter to those who must humbly take it or starve. Not one word escaped the lips of any of this charitable assemblage in recognition of the element of justice. To know that 200,000 fellow men and women were on the verge of starvation excited their human sympathies; but that the starving horde were starving because privileged drones and titled parasites revel in unearned incomes, clearly manifest as is the relation here of cause and effect, did not concern the relief meeting. It was something like this that Tolstoy had in mind when, with characteristic simplicity and directness, he said: "The rich are willing to do anything for the poor but get off their backs."

There, Mr. Chairman, is the cause of the inability of the cotton planter of the South to get an adequate price for his cotton. The "rich are on the backs of the poor," and they won't get off. Unfortunately the poor haven't intelligence enough to know how to throw them off. My friend from South Carolina may regard this as farfetched, but it is not so. Through the possession of special privileges not only are those who possess them enabled to drain from producers a large part of the wealth they create, but they thereby largely destroy the consuming power of the wealth-creating class, so that even if the southern planter did not suffer from that system of indirect taxation euphemistically termed "protection" he would still suffer from the partial destruction of his market, the great mass of the people, all of whom use cotton goods.

Mr. Chairman, only last evening I picked up a book, the author of which is probably as competent as any man in this country to dilate upon the subject which is treated in that book, which is this very question of poverty. He does not use any high-sounding title for his book, but simply calls his book "Poverty." Just think, in this twentieth century, with the tremendous advances that have been made in production and exchange, the tremendous advances that have been made in the capacity of the human individual to produce a greater amount of wealth than was previously produced in the same time and with the same expenditure of effort, we have a book exciting very general comment, commented upon by the press of the country, devoted entirely to this question of poverty. Mr. Robert Hunter, who is at the head of the University Settlement, of New York, married a very wealthy woman, a daughter of Anson Phelps Stokes, and therefore presumably is not prejudiced against the rich. Mr. Hunter says even in so-called "prosperous times" there are in the United States of America probably 10,000,000 people who are practically starving.

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

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The gentleman from New York is on a subject we all desire to avoid, and I was going to move that he be allowed to conclude his remarks. The subject he is upon is very interesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New Jersey that the time has been limited by the committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] is again recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite grasp the purpose or relevancy of the gentleman's remarks. If he means that this matter of poverty is one which the individual members of this House desire to avoid, I apprehend his remarks.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The gentleman has it.

Mr. BAKER. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not here as individuals. We are here in our representative capacity, and in that capacity it is our duty to bring the best intelligence of which we are capable to the solution of this fearful problem, this problem of the persistence of poverty amid increasing wealth. Mr. Chairman, I have said that in this book Mr. Robert Hunter says there are perhaps 10,000,000 people in the United States, even in the most prosperous times, who are practically in a condition of starvation; that is, they are underfed, underclothed, and have not got ample, decent, living quarters. That constitutes poverty. Now, is not that a fearful arraignment of our social order, of our boasted progress, that as the result of a hundred and twenty-five years of the development of this country, with the brightest brains in the country presumably devoted to a permanent solution of this question, that no one here in this House, the representative body of our 80,000,000 people, no one proposes to do the slightest thing; no one proposes to direct public attention to the subject; no one proposes to take any step whatever to find out what is the cause of this universal condition of poverty and what is the natural solution for it.

Just listen to this:

[From the Washington Post, January 8, 1905.]

THOUSANDS ARE STARVING—NEW YORK FACING GREATEST PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYED IN ITS HISTORY—50,000 CHILDREN GO TO SCHOOL BREAKFASTLESS—AT LEAST 100,000 MEN ARE IDLE—APPEAL TO SARGENT.

Some startling statements are contained in a letter received by Frank P. Sargent, Commissioner-General of Immigration, from a New York philanthropist, a man who is identified prominently with charity and correction work in the great city. In part, Commissioner Sargent's correspondent writes:

"New York has now the largest proportion of unemployed of any great city in the country. There are at least 100,000 idle men in the city to-day, or 40 per cent more than at this time last year. Fifty thousand children go to school breakfastless, which means idle fathers. So overwhelmed is the department of charities, with tens of thousands of applications from men out of work, that it finds itself unable to cope with the situation In short, the metropolis this winter is facing a problem with regard to the unemployed such as has never been known in past years."

Commissioner Sargent is working now on a plan by the adoption of which he hopes to break up colonies of aliens in the large cities and scatter them over the country, where they may be able to obtain work at living wages, thus relieving the congestion in the cities, particularly in New York, where a great majority of the aliens are landed.

The Commissioner, we are told, is "working on a plan * * * to scatter them (the aliens) over the country where they may be able to obtain work at living wages"

How simple, Mr. Chairman. Is it not surprising that no one has ever before thought of such a simple solution. But will the Commissioner kindly indicate where these places are where these people "may be able to obtain work at living wages?"

Mr. Hunter tells us "that the most conservative estimate of distress existing in the industrial States is 14 per cent of the total population;" that "one-fifth (6,600,000 persons) in the States of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan are in poverty;" and that of the 10,000,000 whom he estimates are in poverty in the United States, "4,000,000 are estimated to be dependent upon some form of public relief."

I therefore ask this very wise Commissioner "where are these people to obtain work at living wages?"

Of course, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sargent is not to be specially blamed for these conditions. No one is, you know. It is not Mr. Sargent's business to settle economic problems, that's the business of this House. Not only is it our business, but it is the most important business that devolves upon us. Despite the fearful condition Mr. Hunter shows exists we shall do nothing. We can devote hours upon hours to the question of whether some man with epaulets shall or shall not receive pay from one of the States as well as from the Federal Treasury, but the question of questions, that of the cause and persistence of poverty amid increasing wealth, we have no time to bother with the under dog, although he is shown to number some 10,000,000.

According to Mr. Hunter, there were 6,468,964 persons unemployed a part of the year preceding the census of 1900. Of these, 2,069,546 were unemployed from four to six months, and about half a million were unemployed practically the entire year. He also says that 10,000 die of tuberculosis—a "poverty" disease—every year in New York City.

Listen to this from page 178 of "Poverty:"

THE PRAYER OF THE TENEMENT—"BREATH, BREATH, GIVE ME BREATH"—A YIDDISH WHISPER, ON A NIGHT IN APRIL, 1903, FROM THE HEART OF THE NEW YORK GHETTO.

At 18 Clinton street, back in the rear tenement, a young Roumanian Jew lay dying of consumption. With every breath I felt the heavy, foul odor from poverty, ignorance, filth, disease. In this room, 10 feet square, six people lay on the floor. The other room was a closet, 6 by 7. In that closet four were sleeping.

"Breath, breath, give me breath." The man's disease was infectious, and yet for two long weeks he had lain there dying. From his soiled bed he could touch the one table where the two families ate; the cooking stove was 6 feet from him; the cupboard over his pillow. His wasted body was too feeble to rise; too choked, too tortured to lie down.

"Breath, breath, breath. Oh, kill me! oh, kill me!"

Two years ago this man had come to America. He came young, well, and hopeful. It was a new country, a new home, a fresh start, a land to breathe in. "Breath, breath, give me breath." He had breathed no air here but the close, heavy air of the sweatshop from 6 in the morning until 10 at night. Sometimes, he whispered, he worked on until 11.

In New York are 50,000 like him working. There are 361,000 such closets in the city.

And this was his home.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, if such a story as this could be burnt into the brain of every man in this House, there to remain, ever and ever to rise to torture its Members until they had determined to

consecrate themselves to the task of discovering the remedy for this condition of hell upon earth.

Does my friend from South Carolina realize that here is an enormous army of potential consumers of the cotton of the South? All that is required to make it an effective demand is to stop the robbery of these and millions of others that is now done through the possession of special privileges.

Think, Mr. Chairman, that scores of millions of dollars are drawn every year to England and other foreign countries in ground rents by the Astors, Vanderbilts, Bradley-Martins, and others. And this deplorable condition which Mr. Hunter depicts is caused by that very thing, by their being compelled to pay to these private individuals one-third, aye, one-half, if their scanty earnings for the privilege of living on the island of Manhattan, whose land values are due to the industry of these very sweat-shop workers and its other toilers.

Does my friend from South Carolina realize that all over the world there are millions of people who are being pauperized by the idle rich, who collect fabulous sums in tribute as the price of permitting their fellow-men to occupy sites made valuable by the very people who pay the ground rent? That if that ground rent were paid into the public Treasury instead of into the private pockets of the Astors, Goelets, Rhinelanders, Gerrys. Stewarts, et al., then there would be no need for any form of indirect taxation; consequently every penny now paid for tariff taxes and other forms of the indirect taxation would remain in the pockets of the masses of the people and would be used by them in buying cotton goods and other products of the South and West.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the working of this operation of the absorbing of ground rent has never been more succinctly portrayed than in a little story I have here in a book called the "Game of Life," which I hold in my hand, the author of which is Bolton Hall, of New York. It is entitled:

"THE WORKINGMAN AND THE THINKINGMAN."

A Workingman had a bit of ground on which he lived. It seemed to be worth very little, so, after a while, he gave it to the Thinkingman. Nevertheless, the Workingman had to live on the land, so the Thinkingman charged him rent. Then the Workingman called the Thinkingman a Monopolist.

The Thinkingman thought and made a law; then he nominated lawmakers and the Workingman voted for them—the lawmakers adopted a Constitution, to prevent any change. The Workingman called the Thinkingman an Autocrat.

The Workingman worked and made a gun; then he gave it to the Thinkingman for the rent. The Thinkingman said, "What good is a gun to me unless I have a man to use it? I can't risk my own life." So the Workingman voted an appropriation out of his wages to the Thinkingman to hire a man to use the gun. Then the Workingman called the Thinkingman an Aristocrat.

The appropriation set the Workingman behind with his rent, so the Thinkingman sent the hired man (with the gun) to turn the Workingman out of his tenement. The Workingman called the Thinkingman a Plutocrat.

Now, the question is, who really dispossessed that Workingman?

Mr. Chairman, I have here another of these little parables of Mr. Hall's, from his Game of Life, which may be more effective than I have been in suggesting to the Members of this House how it is that these terrible conditions exist and also how many forces there are always operating to prevent any real investigation—any investigation, I mean—that shall go to the root of the evil and not be merely superficial.

This one is headed:

IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE RIGHTEOUS.

"Let us talk about why we that produce nothing are rich, while those that produce everything are poor," said the Gentleman.

"It isn't true," said the Statistician.

"Nor new," said the Historian.

"Nor pleasant," said the Lady.

"Nor permanent," said the Benevolist.

"Nor profitable," said the Clergyman.

"Nor nothing," said the Politician.

"It may foster discontent," said the President, "and alienate—ahem—support from our institution. Let us discuss a subject agreeable to us all—eh, 'The drink evil among the lower classes.'"

If that is not sufficiently illuminating, perhaps the Members of this House will get a clearer comprehension of the why those who toil have not, while those who neither toil nor spin are arrayed as gorgeous as the lilies of the field.

The title of this little parable is "The Fall of Troy (Oklahoma)" and is also from Mr. Hall's "Game of Life."

Some pioneers settled in Oklahoma Territory, where the land was worthless. They called it "Troy," because they went there as exiles, with nothing. At first there was no travel, few people, and hardly any houses; so there was no need for roads or sidewalks, street lights, police, or fire department. But as the town grew, and houses, churches, shops, and stores were put up, they began to need such public improvements; and, at the same time, the land, being occupied, began to rise in value. The settlers saw that it was the increase of population and the improvements that made the land more valuable, so the town meeting laid an annual tax on that value, to pay for the improvements. Of course, any land that was not worth anything paid no tax.

One day a man appeared in the town with an old Indian deed to the land on which the town was built. He showed that it was in proper legal form, and politely asked the settlers to come to his office and settle with him for the rent. They did not like this. They foolishly argued: "Your land was worth nothing whatever before we came, and now, because we have made it valuable, you want us to pay rent." However, that was clearly according to law, and the landlord insisted on his "rights."

Well, the settlers left their shanties, loaded their portable goods on rafts, and paddled across to the other side of the river. They took with them the most valuable thing they had, yet it was not in the boats; no one carried it, and everyone forgot it. And they took it from a place where it was no longer needed to a place where they could not have an honest government without it. What was it? The value of the land.

Bolton Hall is not the only author who recognizes the fundamental cause of poverty. Listen to another well-known author on this subject:

[From the New York American of January 3, 1905.]

POULTNEY BIGELOW KNOWS TWO BIBLES—ONE OF THEM, HE SAYS, ON RETURN TO HIS NATIVE LAND, IS BY HENRY GEORGE.

SAN FRANCISCO, *January* 2.

Poultney Bigelow, historian and traveler, arrived here to-day on his way to Boston to deliver a series of twenty-five lectures on the subject of colonization and expansion.

"When I come back to my own country," he said, "and I look around at the great monopolies, trusts, combines, I come to the conclusion that there are only two Bibles—and the other one is Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty.'"

Now, Mr. Chairman, the time is too brief for me to go into any extended discussion as to the solution, but the solution is as clear as the solution of any sum in mathematics; it is to wipe off of the statute books of this country every law that gives one man a special privilege as against another man, remove all the artificial obstructions that have been erected against the natural order of production and exchange. And when you do that, you solve the poverty question. You solve the industrial question. There will not then be men getting up on this floor, as there have been for the last few days, and talking about the fearful conditions of the farmers of the South. There will not be other men, who sometimes, but very seldom, get up and speak of the deplorable condition of many among the laboring classes. There will not even then be men who will come into this House and say as to certain individuals who are already inordinately wealthy they ought to have more special privileges given to them, for the purpose, I assume, of making them wealthier still.

Mr. Chairman, I have already quoted two of the little sketches from The Game of Life, by Bolton Hall, to show the underlying cause of "poverty." I now desire to call the attention of the House to another parable from this same thought-inciting little volume. It is called the "Remedy of publicity," and outlines a few questions that might well be put by legislative investigating committees in every State of the Union to the public-service corporations and other beneficiaries of special privilege.

THE REMEDY OF PUBLICITY.

Questions to be asked by Mr. Roosevelt's proposed superintendent of trusts:

1. "Where did you get it," and what is the difference between a dividend and a "divy?"
2. What legislatures do you own?
3. What is the average of the combined salaries of your president and your office boys?
4. Why did the grand jury fail to indict you?
5. What time is your president allowed for lunch, and has the advance in the price of beef improverished him?
6. How many persons have you run over, ruined, or otherwise killed during the year? Why?
7. Who is your judge?
8. Do you pay him by the job or by the year? Of what church is he a member?
9. State all sums paid during the last year for false witnesses.
10. Are your contributions to both political parties dictated by love for mankind or by business considerations?
11. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"
12. How much of the total consumption do you control, and why can't you tell?
13. Do you believe in socialism or in anarchy?
14. How were the books lost?
15 Why don't your directors know anything about the business?
16. Where do you expect to go when you die?

Sworn to by JANITOR.

N. B.—The typewriter's oath will not be accepted unless she has reached years of discretion.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the difficulty of attempting even to suggest to the Members of this House the relationship of cause and effect which exists between the granting of special privileges and the suffering of the southern cotton planters, due to the low price of that staple, and yet that relationship does exist, the latter has followed the former as certain as night follows day. And it is because the effect—low prices to the producers of beef, as well as to cotton planters—is the inevitable result of the cause—special-privilege legislation—that I propose to include as an appendix to my remarks an article I contributed to the Arena magazine which appears in its September issue, and also extended extracts from articles on the same subject by Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, who, regardless of his motives,

whether they are merely those of revenge or the far higher one of a genuine desire to do his part to destroy the cancer of special privilege which is sapping the very life of the people of this Republic, is performing a great service to the public, as these articles have already attracted widespread attention, have incited very general discussion, and will, I believe, assist in clarifying public thought, which I hope will soon result in the complete uprooting of the cancer.

APPENDIX.

FRENZIED FINANCE—THE STORY OF AMALGAMATED.

[By Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, in Everybody's Magazine, July, 1904.]

There will be set down, in the series of articles of which this is the foreword, in as simple and direct a fashion as I can write it, "The Story of Amalgamated Copper" and of the "system" of which it is the most flagrant example. This "system" is a process or a device for the incubation of wealth from the people's savings in the banks, trust, and insurance companies, and the public funds. Through its workings during the last twenty years there has grown up in this country a set of colossal corporations, in which unmeasured success and continued immunity from punishment have bred an insolent disregard of law, of common morality, and of public and private right, together with a grim determination to hold on to, at all hazards, the great possessions they have gulped or captured.

* * * * * * *

With the men I have had close and intimate intercourse, and

* * * * * * *

The enormous losses, millions upon millions—to my personal knowledge over a hundred millions of dollars—which were made because of Amalgamated; the large number of suicides—to my personal knowledge over thirty—which were directly caused by Amalgamated; the large number of previously reputable citizens who were made prison convicts—to my personal knowledge over twenty—directly because of Amalgamated were caused by acts of this "system," of which Henry H. Rogers and his immediate associates were the direct administrators; and yet Mr. Rogers and his immediate associates, while these great wrongs were occurring, led social lives which, measured by the most rigid yardstick of mental or moral rectitude, were as near perfect as it is possible for human lives to be.

* * * * * * *

And yet these men, to whose eyes I have seen come the tears for others' sufferings, and whose voices I have heard grow husky in recounting the woes of their less fortunate brothers—these men under the spell of the brutal code of modern dollar making are converted into beasts of prey, and put to shame the denizens of the deep which devour their kind that they may live.

* * * * * * *

My desire in writing "The Story of Amalgamated," while tinged perhaps with hatred for and revenge against the "system" as a whole and some of its votaries, is more truly pervaded with a strong conviction that the most effective way to educate the public to realize the evils of which such affairs as the Amalgamated are the direct result is to expose before them the brutal facts as to the conception, birth, and nursery breeding of this the foremost of all the unsavory offspring of the "system." Thus they may learn that it is within their power to destroy the brood already in existence and render impossible the creation of their like.

FRENZIED FINANCE—THE STORY OF AMALGAMATED.

[By Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, in Everybody's Magazine, August, 1904.]

This is the start of the great story. In the foreword, published last month, Mr. Lawson told of the terrible losses, defalcations, and the suicides caused by Amalgamated Copper, and pledged himself to expose the brutal facts concerning its organization and the financial "system" through which the public was plundered. In this installment Mr. Lawson tells of the "system" and its master, and how the hideous "crime of Amalgamated" was born at the home of the "system," 26 Broadway.—Editor's Note.

CHAPTER I—THE TORTUOUS COURSE OF AMALGAMATED.

Amalgamated Copper was begotten in 1898, born in 1899, and in the first five years of its existence plundered the public to the extent of over $100,000,000.

* * * * * * *

From its inception it was known as a "Standard Oil" creature, because its birthplace was the National City Bank of New York (the "Standard Oil" bank), and its parents the leading "Standard Oil" lights, Henry H. Rogers, William Rockefeller, and James Stillman.

It has from its birth to present writing been responsible for more hell than any other trust or financial thing since the world began. Because of it the people have sustained incalculable losses and have suffered untold miseries.

But for the existence of the National City Bank of New York, the tremendous losses and necessarily corresponding profits could not have been made.

* * * * * * *

There are only three men who can lend the name "Standard Oil," even in the most remote way, to any project, for there is no more heinous crime in the "Standard Oil" decalogue than using the name "Standard Oil" unauthorized. The three men are Henry H. Rogers, William Rockefeller, and John D. Rockefeller.

* * * * * * *

The success of "Standard Oil" is largely due to two things—the loyalty of its members to each other and to "Standard Oil," and the punishment of its enemies. Each member before initiation knows its religion to be reward for friends and extermination for enemies. While a "Standard Oil" man's reward is always ample and satisfactory, he is constantly reminded in a thousand and one ways that punishment for disloyalty is sure and terrible, and that in no corner of the earth can he escape it, nor can any power on earth protect him from it.

Mr. Chairman, what does this mean? If Mr. Lawson's picture is a true one, then Standard Oil has a power greater than any government on earth; that of the Czar of Russia, with all of its thousands of spies, is not equal to this. And we are told that the head of this organization is a "philanthropist."

During the past twenty years, whenever the great political parties have lined up for their regular once-in-four-years tussle, there would be found Henry H. Rogers, calm as a race-track gambler, "sizing up" the entries, their weights, and handicaps. Every twist and turn in the pedigrees and records of Republicans and Democrats are as familiar to him as the "dope sheets" are to the gambler, for is he not at the receiving end of the greatest information bureau in the world?

A Standard Oil agent is in every hamlet in the country, and who better than these trained and intelligent observers to interpret the varying trends of feeling of their communities? Tabulated and analyzed, these reports enable Rogers, the sagacious politician, to diagnose the drift of the country far ahead of the most astute of campaign managers. He is never in doubt about who will win the election. Before the contest is under way he has picked his winner and is beside him with generous offers of war expenses.

[From the September, 1904, number of Everybody's Magazine.]

CHAPTER V.—THE POWER OF DOLLARS.

At no time in the history of the United States has the power of dollars been as great as now. Freedom and equity are controlled by dollars. The laws which should preserve and enforce all rights are made and enforced by dollars. It is possible to-day, with dollars, to "steer" the selection of the candidates of both the great parties for the highest office in our Republic, that of President of the United States, so that the people, as a matter of fact, must elect one of the "steered" candidates. It is possible to repeat the operation in the selection of candidates for the executive and legislative conduct and control of every State and municipality in the United States, and with a sufficient number of dollars to "steer" the doings of the lawmakers and law enforcers of the national, State, and municipal governments of the people and a sufficient proportion of the court decisions to make absolute any power created by such direction.

* * * * * * *

I shall go further and say that there exists to-day uncontrolled in the hands of a set of men a power to make dollars from nothing.

* * * * * * *

About the time that the world had begun mistily to take in the tremendous forces which radiated from "Standard Oil" there occurred a financial crash, and the people saw their savings, invested in what they supposed were the legal and absolute titles of ownership in the material things of their country, suddenly decline in value and contract to prices representing a loss to them of billions of dollars. Throughout the misery and suffering this terrible collapse occasioned "Standard Oil" remained undisturbed as before, and amid all the confusion kept sternly on its "dollar-making" way. Indeed, it seemed to gain in bulk as other institutions diminished or disappeared. Then it was that the people began to demand, and are now fiercely demanding, "What is this 'Standard Oil?'" "What is its secret?" "Whence came it?" and "Can our Republic endure if it, too, endures?"

* * * * * * *

The next move represents another of the dazzling devices of finance in which "Standard Oil" is adept, and brings the process of artificial expansion still further along. Control of a certain number of these savings and national banks and trust and insurance companies having been acquired, the funds of each were so manipulated by depositing those of one institution with another, and the latter's in turn with the first, as to swell their deposits and create in all of them an apparently legitimate basis for increases of capitalization. At the same time there was shown an apparently legitimate necessity for the establishment of additional banking and trust companies, which were duly organized and their assets juggled around by the same process. The result of all this manipulation defies description. Throughout the series of correlated institutions loans and deposits are multiplied in such an intricacy of duplication that only a few able experts, employed by the "system" because of their mathematical genius, are able to unravel the tangle to the degree of approximating the proportion the legitimate funds bear to those which have been created by the financial jugglery I have indicated.

When "Standard Oil" had gathered into its net sufficient of the important private institutions of finance there still remained the Federal Government, the largest handler of money in the country. It was not hard for "Standard Oil" to introduce its expert votaries into the United States Treasury and thus to steer the millions of the nation into the banks subject to the "system's" control. This accomplished, the structure was complete and the process of "making" dollars proceeded on a magnificent scale.

* * * * * * *

In showing how thirty-six millions were made in the brief space of this creature's (Amalgamated Copper's) life, I deal with reality and not romance, but let my readers for a moment give their imaginations play and picture to themselves one scene in this stupendous drama. A great room in the greatest banking house in America, if not in the world—silent, solemn—an atmosphere of impregnable rectitude—the solid furniture, the heavy carpets, the chill high walls, the massive desks, the impressive chairs, the great majestic table portentously suggestive of power.

* * * * * * *

The door closes—silence again. Then the air vibrates with the sound of a hearty handslap and the genial, whole-souled greeting of the "master" to his partner. "William, I feel as though I had done an honest day's labor! Thirty-six million dollars 'made' and no hitch, no delay!" Then follows the partner's mild answer: "Yes, Harry, but don't forget James's and the others' shares will shrink it up quite a bit."

[From the November, 1904, number of Everybody's Magazine.]

In this installment (the fourth in a series which may continue for a year or more—see With Everybody's Publishers, page 721) Mr. Lawson tells of his great fight against the "system" on behalf of the Westinghouse companies, describes his first encounter and subsequent alliance with Addicks against H. H. Rogers, and then gives particulars of the terrific struggle of the Bay State gas cohorts against the forces of "Standard Oil" for supremacy in Boston. The long-continued warring culminates in a meeting between Lawson and Rogers to discuss a settlement. The interview, big with significance to both men, is one of the

great scenes in Mr. Lawson's story, and affords, perhaps, the most vivid and dramatic report of a business conversation extant.—THE EDITORS.

When the American people are aroused, as they surely will be, to demand restitution and are in the act of brushing, with a mighty sweep of indignation, back into the laps of the plundered the billions of which they have been robbed, and "Standard Oil" and the "system" break and fall like reeds before the gale, I doubt, even if H. H. Rogers be brought face to face with ruin, that he will feel half the pain I shall, for I know that the picture of that memorable night will surely come back to me with all the vividness of reality.

But as my mind harks back there clashes with this another, a hellish picture, which the same Henry H. Rogers painted with the brush of Amalgamated, and a procession of convicts and suicides trails slowly toward me out of the canvas. Then I realize that my pen is but the instrument of a righteous retribution and that no personal feelings, however tender, must be allowed to interfere.

* * * * * * *

From that time on Mr. Rogers's able brain was working day and night, first to get John Hay to run against Roosevelt, next Root, then Uncle Mark Hanna; but owing to one of those complicated entanglements that old Dame Fate now and then reels out of her crochet-basket to the bewilderment of slick mortals, his efforts went for naught, and he was compelled to fall back on a more dangerous and expensive plan. He laid out on his campaign table the "most available" (what worlds of eel-skin, political piety those two words cover!) Democrats, and it didn't take him long to make his selection of a man who would, if President of the United States, allow those who put him there to "run the shop." When his selection was made he called in his faithful hired man, Senator "Pat" McCarren, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and gave his orders, the same kind of orders as he gives for the purchase of an oil well or the knocking in the head of a business rival or the setting up of an Amalgamated knock-down-and-drag-out—"Go here!" "Go there!" "Buy this!" "Sell that!" "Billy Sheehan to captain that company, and Dave Hill to dig that mine!" In short order the venture was all covered to its finality, and there has never been a slip of a cog or the ungearing of a wheel that was not foreseen and provided for. To try to balk a part of his game I posted Bryan in advance of the St. Louis convention, and we all know how he upset their plans in the committee, but we also know it took but the pressure of one finger on one button at 26 Broadway and the gold telegram episode to put things back into the smooth-running groove.

[From the December (1904) number of Everybody's Maxazine.]

I had always held, do now, and always shall hold, that the meanest crime in the calendar of vice is bribery of the servants of the people.

* * * * * * *

At this period I knew nothing whatever of the workings or the wire-pullings of State legislatures. I had not troubled myself about franchises or how they were obtained. In a general way I knew political corruption existed. That Rogers had obtained favors for his Brookline Company through bribing officials I had good grounds to believe. I had read of strange doings in connection with H. M. Whitney's West End Railway franchise obtained from the Massachusetts legislature amid an accompaniment of much public scandal; but being quite without personal experience I had no clear conception of how things were done and, innocently enough, I asked Whitney before we parted:

"How is it possible for you to get this valuable charter from the legislature, particularly with such a strong and honest man as Roger Wolcott in the governor's chair, when Addicks has been trying continuously for four or five years, regardless of expense, to secure an ordinary one under which he can combine our gas companies?"

George Towle answered for Whitney:

"Lawson, that part is no affair of yours. Mr. Whitney will absolutely guarantee to deliver all those goods, and if it is necessary to override the governor in getting them, he will also guarantee to do that too. You can call all that done the minute we sign papers."

* * * * * * *

I do not hesitate to say, then:

The Massachusetts legislature is bought and sold as are sausages and fish at the markets and wharves. That the largest, wealthiest, and most prominent corporations in New England, whose affairs are conducted by our most representative citizens, habitually corrupt the Massachusetts legislature, and the man of wealth among them who would enter protest against the iniquity would be looked on as a "class anarchist." I will go further and say that if in New England a man of the type of Folk, of Missouri, can be found who will give over six months to turning up the legislative and Boston municipal sod of the past ten years, who does not expose to the world a condition of rottenness more rotten than was ever before exhibited in any community in the civilized world, it will be because he has been suffocated by the stench of what he exhumes.

After this I again saw Whitney and Towle, and they, not relishing my remarks on the subject of bribery, told me frankly to attend to my own part of the affair and leave their part to them.

* * * * * * *

If an outsider could possibly have obtained the entry to the headquarters of the Whitney Massachusetts Pipe Line, say at 9 o'clock any evening during the session, he might easily have imagined himself at the Madison Square Garden or at Tattersall's on the night of the first day of an international horse sale. This is what he would see: In parlor 10, seated at a long table, a dozen of Mr. Towle's chiefs, all in their shirt sleeves, smoking voluminously; before each a sheet of paper, on which was printed a list of the members of the legislature; against every name a blank space for memoranda; at the head of the table Towle himself, frowning severely over a similar sheet having broader memoranda spaces. One after another the chiefs would call off the names of the legislators, reporting as they went along. The outsider would hear droned monotonously: "——— from ——— not my man; ——— from ——— my man and ———'s man; seen to-day, stood same as yesterday; ——— from ———, raised price $20, making it $150; agreed; $10 paid on account, total of $90 due; raised because ——— told him that he had got $20 more from ———."

As each man reported, the other chiefs and Towle discussed the details, and when a decision on disputed points was arrived at, Towle would make a memorandum on his blank, and the chief concerned recorded the order in the little notebook which each carried. All reports in at last, Towle retired to room 11 and speedily returned with the "stuff," consisting of cash, stock, puts, calls, or transportation tickets, which he dealt out to the chiefs to fulfill the promises they had made for the day.

* * * * * * *

Early next morning there came to my office two wild-eyed, desperate creatures, Towle and Mr. Patch.

When I looked upon the big, powerful man who had always seemed in any light in which I had heretofore beheld him to fear neither man nor God—when I looked and saw his plight I pitied him deeply, sincerely. He carried a large traveling bag, and Mr. Patch two others.

"Lawson, for God's sake, don't do what they are all doing—don't upbraid me! I've got to get out into the world and be dead to all I know—family, friends, everyone. If I stay it's State's prison or worse, and Whitney says I must go. I've got all the papers together, and Whitney has given me what cash he had on hand and this check of $10,000. Do me one last favor; get me gold for it. I know I have no right to ask any favors of you, but think if you were in my place. I have a wife and children, and—" and the great, strong man wept like a child.

I called my secretary, and in a short time George Towle, with the $10,000 in gold and the bags of "evidence" faded out of my life and into the gray mist of eternity.

A few days after a vessel dropped anchor off the island of Jamaica; George Towle's body was carried ashore and buried, and Mr. Patch was escorted back to the ship. A few days later, with weights of lead to carry it to its last resting place on the ocean's bottom, the latter's dead body was dropped over the vessel's side. And somewhere floating the high seas is a venturesome sailor-captain and a crew who, when in their cups, 'tis said, tell strange tales of bags of gold and queer documents.

Simultaneously the members of the great and good court of the old Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six received, none of them could tell from where, their promised vote money in the form of a yarn that the "stuff" belonging to them had been delivered to George Towle, but that Towle had decamped with it to foreign shores, where he was living in luxury with Mr. Patch.

'Tis writ that some crimes are so black and foul that they will not down, and when I read over what is written here I wonder if there will not some day be another chapter of "Frenzied Finance" written by another pen than mine.

[From the January, 1905, number of Everybody's Magazine.]

Rogers refused absolutely to be a party to any payment that could be traced back to him. He canvassed the sources of hazard: First, through treachery on the part of Foster, Braman, or Addicks, he might be accused of bribing a court officer, the receiver; Addicks might blackmail him by charging him with conspiracy, or a conspiracy charge might be brought by Bay State stockholders, and he be held for tremendous damages. He refused to put himself into any such trap. I put forward a dozen ways to meet the emergency, but he would have none of them. Finally, he suggested a method which was certainly perfect of its kind. He began by letting me into the secret that the chances of a McKinley victory in the election the following week looked pretty bad, and that the latest canvass of the States showed that unless something radical were done Bryan would surely win. Hanna had called into consultation half a dozen of the biggest financiers in Wall street, and it was decided to turn at least five of the doubtful States. To do this a fund of $5,000,000 had been raised under Rogers's direction to be turned over to Mark Hanna and McKinley's cousin, Osborne, through John Moore, the Wall Street broker, who was acting as Rogers's representative in collecting the money. It would be legitimate for the national committee to pay out money to carry Delaware, and he, Rogers, would arrange it that the coin to satisfy Braman and Foster should come through this channel. Thus he would be completely protected.

"Lawson," said Mr. Rogers, looking at me with intense and deadly seriousness, his voice charged with conviction, "if Bryan's elected there will be such a panic in this country as the world has never seen, and with his money ideas and the crazy-headed radicals he will call to Washington to administer the nation's affairs business will surely be destroyed and the working people suffer untold misery."

As I listened to Rogers's exordium on the duties of a citizen in an emergency, I remembered the "Standard Oil" code—"Everything for God (our God); God (our God) in everything." It was so essentially "Standard Oil," this willingness to commit even that greatest wrong, subverting the will of the people in the exercise of their highest function—the election of a President—but only that good (their good) might come of it. It was no more than selfish greed tricked out in the noble trappings of morality, an infamous crime disguised as patriotism. Doubtless, the excellent, God-fearing, law-abiding citizens of the doubtful States who read this and learn how the "System" defeated their will at the polls, will cry: "Monstrous! Can such things be in America?" and then will resume their interrupted occupation of "letting well enough alone." However, this is aside from my story.

Having clearly set forth the political situation through which we should be saved, Mr. Rogers proceeded to map out my own programme. First, I must perfect an alibi for him by going to Foster and Braman, and impressing them that he was absolutely out of the affair, and must under no circumstances be brought into it; next, I must convince Addicks to the same effect, and in addition tell him that Mr. Rogers had angrily refused to get into the mix-up; that I should then hold myself in readiness to meet John Moore and Hanna or Osborne as soon as an appointment could be arranged. That afternoon I got the word and went to 26 Broadway, and from there Mr. Rogers and I went over to John Moore's office, slipping in the private door from the rear street.

"John," said Mr. Rogers, "I am going to turn this matter over to you and Lawson, and I am to have nothing further to do with it. What you two agree to will be satisfactory to me, and remember, both of you, every dollar that is paid is paid by the national committee, but after it's all settled, and if there is no slip-up, I will look to Lawson for whatever is expended. Is it understood?"

We agreed that it was, and Rogers left us.

CHAPTER XXVII.—COURT CORRUPTION AND COIN.

The closing scene of this most significant drama was enacted before Judge Wales on that eventual Saturday morning in the Wilmington circuit court-room.

The dramatis personæ were gathered in little groups representing the separate interests—Addicks and some of his lieutenants, my partner at the telephone, John Moore's partner and Rogers's counsel with their heads together; Braman and Foster nearer the judge, their eyes wandering toward two dress-suit cases piled before John Moore's partner, which, it was understood, contained the money.

* * * * * * *

Court came to order. Foster rose, announced that the claims of his client had been satisfied, and made a formal motion to dismiss the receivership. Judge Wales formally consented, and as the clerk of the court was entering the dismissal in his minute-book my partner telephoned the facts to me. I sent back the word that my directors were resigning—had resigned—that Rogers's directors were being elected—had been elected—that the Boston gas companies were now transferred to Rogers. My partner whispered my words to John Moore's partner and Rogers's counsel. At once the two dress-suit cases, each loaded with currency, were slipped to Braman and Foster.

* * * * * * *

It was all over in a few minutes, and when my partner said: "It's done," and "By jove, there go Dwight Braman and Roger Foster on the dead run with a dress-suit case apiece!" I held my sides as Parker Chandler in his inimitable way bawled: "Tom, let's leave our straw hats on the pegs, for we'll probably be back next spring, figuring out how to pump air enough through the gas-measuring meters to pay for that money we've just loaned Braman and Foster for a day or two."

Chandler is a cynic.

THE REIGN OF GRAFT AND THE REMEDY.

[By Hon. Robert Baker, Member of Congress from the Sixth New York district, in the Arena, September, 1904.]

For the better part of a year the disclosures of corruption in the Post-Office Department were made the occasion for thousands of editorials; Machen, Beavers, and other Department officials and the contractors who were said to have divided with them being held up by Democratic organs as the inevitable product of Republican rule, while Republican speakers and editors either denied its existence or asserted that the corruption was merely desultory and would be ferreted out and punished. To read the discussions of the matter at the time it engrossed a large share of public attention one would have assumed that there had been an outbreak of a new disease, which if taken promptly in hand could be thoroughly stamped out. There was much denunciation of graft in the Post-Office and other Departments of the Federal Government, but none of graft per se. Nothing could have been more essentially superficial or could have more clearly indicated the entire lack of conception of its cause, its persistence, and how it could be prevented; its extent and persistence being ascribed to every cause but the real one.

To understand the genesis of graft one must look deeper than is usually done by those who so learnedly discuss it. Graft is no new disease of the body politic, nor were the Post-Office scandals a sudden eruption of an old but dormant one; nor can it be eradicated by superficial measures, nor by holding up certain bureau chiefs and the contractors they dealt with as extraordinarily vicious. This is not saying that they should not be punished if found guilty, nor that new safeguards, wherever possible, be not devised to prevent the repetition of such occurrences. The community will, however, gain little therefrom, nor will graft be thereby eradicated. Greater ingenuity is always likely to be shown in the evading of law than in the drafting of it. The larger the prospective gain from its evasion the more ingenious the methods to circumvent it.

Society should give more thought to the underlying cause of graft than to finding new obstacles to its continuance or new penalties for those who practice it. It may be well to first ask whether its prevalence is generally recognized. To assume that it is confined to the dealings of contractors with Department officials is to overlook its larger and more profitable field of operation.

Before citing some of the more flagrant instances it would be well to first ask, What is graft? In the last analysis it is the obtaining of something for nothing—through collusion.

A hint of the extent to which graft has even permeated the commercial world is indicated in the case of a buyer for a large Washington department store, who last winter exhibited to her friends a magnificent array of "presents" received from business houses from whom she regularly bought goods for her employers. They were all of considerable pecuniary value, while she frankly said that the donors all understood she could buy wherever she pleased. It is immaterial whether the "presents" were bribes or blackmail; either the donors or her employers were "grafted." And yet she would have waxed indignant if anyone had suggested either alternative.

A few years ago we heard much of how the wholesale dry-goods merchants in New York were harried by the police when they occupied the sidewalks with their packing cases unless they submitted to "blackmail." It certainly was blackmail for the police to collect this tribute, but those who were admittedly occupying public property without paying the city for the privilege were the real grafters; they merely divided with the police the value of monopolizing the city's streets.

There is no more reason why cases of boots and shoes, dry goods, hardware, machinery; why furniture, fruits, and vegetables should be allowed for hours to occupy sidewalks to the obstruction of pedestrians than that he who sells meals should have his restaurant on the sidewalk or that the barber, doctor, or lawyer should have their offices there. The virtuous indignation of these merchants was not due to a high conception of civic duty—against some one obtaining something for nothing, against graft per se—but was due to their no longer being permitted to retain all the value of the privileges they were preempting.

At the very time when these merchants were crying out against police blackmail and were giving more or less open countenance to the movement to overthrow the city government, one of the wealthiest dry-goods merchants made strenuous efforts to privately induce the one member of the administration who was standing like adamant in opposition to colossal schemes of public spoliation to withdraw his opposition to a piece of wholesale graft—the abatement of the assessment for the Elm street widening. Had this high city official yielded to these blandishments this millionaire and his fellow property owners along that thoroughfare would have "grafted" the city to the extent of some $2,000,000, probably ten times the amount that the police had obtained from the merchants who monopolized the city's sidewalks during all the years that they had bribed the police for that privilege.

In denouncing "graft" let us maintain some sense of proportion. Let our demand for punishment "fit the crime." While expressing hostility to the methods shown to have existed in the contracting department of the Post-Office, and venting our indignation on the petty contractors and bureau chiefs, who have defrauded the people of some hundreds of thousands of dollars, let us reserve some of our condemnation for those greater criminals who, through collusion with higher officials and party chiefs, have taken from the Treasury millions every year in excessive mail-transportation payments. The graft to the railroads in the thirty-nine millions appropriated for inland railroad mail transportation is many times the total of the pickings of bureau chiefs and petty contractors. Some six millions are also appropriated for rental of mail cars at a cost equal to the original cost of the car, many being over twenty years old, and, in the opinion of the railway mail clerks, are a constant menace to their lives.

What is it but graft when Congressmen and Senators accept (when they do not solicit) passes and telegraph franks—some not only asking for themselves, but constantly applying for them for friends? Their conduct is different only in degree from that of the purchasing agent of a Department who divides with the contractor the increased price charged for his goods—each uses his official position to get something for nothing. The Congressman may try to delude himself with the idea that the railroad pass or telegraph frank is given him as a "courtesy," but we may be sure that the railroad or telegraph company fully realizes its subtle influence even where it is not openly issued as a bribe.

It must be remembered that it is not only in affirmative legislation that a legislator can render a great service to railroads and other special-privilege corporations; the statu quo is frequently as serviceable to them as legislation openly in their interest. When the ablest judge of the supreme court of the State of New York (William J. Gaynor) describes favoritism in railroad freight rates "as the greatest crime of our day and generation," and says that "more wrong has been done by it than by all the crimes defined by our statutes," and that "it has crushed and beggared thousands all over the land," it can be readily seen that the most effective service a legislator can render to these criminal corporations is to quietly put to sleep what the companies are pleased to call "hostile" legislation; to put off all consideration by the Judiciary Committee; by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads—always so liberal in its appropriations for railway-mail transportation; by the Committee on the District of Columbia, where the two great railway systems having depots there were aided out of the joint treasuries of the District and of the United States to an amount variously estimated at from $4,000,000 to $7,000,000 during the Fifty-seventh Congress; by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where bills to extend the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission so that they could enforce their decrees instead of, as now, having them set at naught by the railroads, are quietly slumbering; or by the Public Lands Committee, which ought to have something to say, but doesn't, as to whether the transcontinental roads are living up to their agreements entered into as a part consideration, at least, for the hundreds of millions of acres and scores of millions of dollars in money that they bribed and cajoled former Congresses into granting them; or even by the Labor Committee, which for five months fooled with an eight-hour bill and then referred it to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to report on, on the ground that it had not the time itself to investigate the subject—hostile legislation in the vocabulary of the railroads being any measure to lessen extortionate tolls; to prevent freight rebates and discriminations; to compel compliance with the decisions of the courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission; to enforce the law for automatic safety appliances; or any other law drawn primarily in the interest of the public or of railroad employees.

A jurist of international reputation—Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court—has recently pointed out another and an extremely insidious form of bribery. In speaking of a lawmaking lawyer's temptation which has come with the development of these enormous special-privilege corporations, he says:

"These interests are colossal in size, alluring by the magnitude of their achievements, tempting not merely by the money they possess and with which they can reward, but more by the influence they can exert in favor of the individual lawmaker in the furtherance of his personal advancement.

"No one can be blind to the fact that these mighty corporations are holding out most tempting inducements to lawmakers to regard in their lawmaking those interests rather than the nation.

"There may be no written agreement. There may be in fact no agreement at all, and yet when the lawmaker understands that that power exists which may make for his advancement or otherwise, that it will be exerted according to the pliancy with which he yields to its solicitations, it lifts the corporation into a position of constant danger to republican institutions."

For years the business interests of New York have beseeched Congress to make more adequate provision for its constantly increasing postal business, but no appropriation for a building was made. I learned during the recent session that the money could have been had at almost any session during the past ten years only for the opposition of the New York Central Railroad. So general was this view that no attempt to gloss over the real cause was made, even when correspondents of New York papers were present at informal gatherings endeavoring to secure an appropriation, although it was tacitly understood that they would not be so discreet as to put the blame for the delay where it belonged. The New York Central, having direct representation in the Senate, could block any proposition not in conformity with what it was pleased to consider its interest. Having finally come to terms with its great rival, the Pennsylvania, and those two corporations having agreed between themselves as to what they would permit to be done in the matter, it goes without saying that every difficulty was removed, every obstacle overcome; Cabinet officers quickly approved, and the appropriations were duly made. The New York merchants who cried in vain so long for improved postal facilities will no doubt refrain from applying the term "hold-up" to the whole proceeding. We in the East have too great a reverence for great wealth to do anything more than complain, being equally careful with the correspondents not to say anything rude of those who have for so long prevented action, even if the result is to buttress private ownership of interstate highways by tying up the Post-Office Department to the New York Central with a 50-year lease. The records will, I think, be searched in vain during all this period for evidence that even one member has openly charged any railroad with being the real obstructionist. Of course no one would suggest that failure to do this was in any way related to the question of railroad passes.

Another piece of graft is the excess fare which this road exacts from all who purchase tickets from New York to Albany, or vice versa. Although limited by law to a 2-cent rate, passengers are charged $3.10, the distance being 146 miles. The only excuse I have ever heard for this extra fare is that the company has to pay the difference to another company which owns the railroad bridge at Albany. This is bad enough, but when one learns that the bridge is the private property of the Vanderbilt family and their immediate friends, one sees that not only is the public milked, but the graft does not even go to the stockholders of the road that most of the passengers think they pay it to, but to that little inner circle of men who control the railroad company, and who were shrewd enough to hit upon so simple a

scheme for deflecting a considerable revenue into their pockets. Like the operation of tariff taxes, nearly all who pay this little honorarium to one of the "great" families of America have no conception that they have been taxed at all.

What is it but graft when a United States Senator, the head of an express company, not only uses his position to protect his own and allied companies from legislative "attacks," insuring them in the continuation of their extremely valuable privileges, but secures to the railroads from whom these valuable privileges are derived extortionate prices for transporting the mails?

What was it but graft when Huntington, Hopkins, Stanford, and Crocker organized a construction company to build the Pacific railroads, paying themselves out of the treasury of the railroads enormous sums for work at inflated prices, under which they got possession of most of its bonds and stocks?

What was it but graft when big financiers forced the United States Government to accept in full settlement but a part of the large debt the Union Pacific owed?

What is it but graft when the controlling forces of a railroad system organize an express or dispatch company to which valuable privileges are granted on far lower terms than it could, or would, obtain if the grantee company were not in effect themselves?

What is it but graft when the directors of a railroad company organize an industrial company, locate it along the line of their road, then accord it lower freight rates than are charged to competitors in the same business?

What is it but graft when the directors of a railroad have special cars placed at their disposal whenever they desire them for social or business purposes?

What is it but graft when the President of the United States accepts the "courtesy" of special railroad trains or cars, for vote-hunting trips or for social visits?

What was it but graft when old and almost useless ships were foisted on the Navy Department at the outbreak of the Spanish war?

What is it but graft when the anthracite coal roads form a pool not only to limit production but to fix the price of transportation at from three to four times what would earn a reasonable dividend on the actual capital invested? Occasionally these highway robbers fall out among themselves as to a division of the booty; and we find the general coal sales agent of the Philadelphia and Reading (the Goliath of the coal trust) testifying under oath before the Interstate Commerce Commission as to what happened if the Reading cut its regular price, "that they denied it if they did," not even, it seems, maintaining that honor which is supposed to exist among thieves—i. e., thieves without the pale of the law.

What is it but graft when the Big Four who compose the beef trust get special freight rates which enable them to drive competitors out of business?

What is it but graft when heads of Departments—chiefs and deputy chiefs of bureaus in Washington—use public carriages for pleasure and to maintain their social "prestige?"

What was it but graft when those who purchased United States bonds during the civil war in depreciated currency years later "induced" Congress to make them redeemable in gold?

What was it but graft when the employer of a recent law partner of a President entered into a secret deal with the head of the Government to issue bonds to his syndicate at from 8 to 12 per cent less than they were worth?

What is it but graft when this same leader in haute finance organizes the United States Steel Corporation and invites a confiding public to purchase "securities," three-quarters, if not four-fifths of which represent nothing but water? How many thousands of ignorant but innocent investors, relying upon the "high character," "deserved reputation," "commanding influence," "great ability," "financial stability," and "unblemished business honor" of these men have been ruined by having these securities foisted upon them? All the graft of the Machens and Beavers, who have been in Government employ for a score of years, including even the "star-route" frauds, look puny and insignificant beside the colossal sums squeezed out of the people through the floating and manipulation of steel corporation stock, to say nothing of the scores of millions wrung from the people in inflated prices charged for its products because it was "protected" by a tariff of from $7.84 a ton and upward on its manufactures.

What was it but graft when the Western Union Telegraph Company supplied pool rooms with racing news in defiance of law, charging some $5,000,000 for the service, which perhaps cost them a tenth of that sum? When burglars are caught with the goods on them they are not permitted to go their way because they insist that hereafter they will be law-abiding. But, then, among that profession there are no multimillionaire "philanthropists."

What is it but graft when the special-privilege corporations of New York City—this same Western Union, the telephone, the gas and electric, the surface and elevated railroad companies—refuse to pay even the totally inadequate and ridiculously low rate of taxation levied against them, so that, according to a recent issue of the New York World, they owe the city some nineteen millions of dollars for arrears of taxes?

I was recently told of an incident that occurred in the home city of The Arena. A Boston firm, a regular shipper to the extent of several hundred packages a week by the Adams Express Company, had been paying 40 cents a package. A friend in another business, happening to drop in and seeing a pile of packages ready for shipment, asked, "How much apiece do you pay on them?" On being told, he said, "What? I don't know anything about your business, but I'll take a contract right now to ship them for you by the same company for 35 cents." To test the matter his name was pasted over that of the actual shipper and he proceeded to the express office, asking for a quotation for several hundred packages a week. On their quoting a rate of 28 cents he said, "I guess I'll send them by mail. The only reason I wanted to ship them by your company was to get an individual receipt for each package." He was then offered a 23-cent rate. It is needless to say that the real shippers were astounded when the rate at which the company were prepared to carry their packages was reported to them. But in view of the tremendous difference in the charges for sending packages by "parcels post" abroad—which rates are frequently less than one-half what Americans have to pay for the privilege of having a Government function exploited for private benefit—it is not surprising that the express "ring" is able to shunt all investigation of the subject and to kill off all bills for an American parcels post. The railroads and express companies have too many direct and indirect representatives in the House and the Senate to permit any legislation of that nature even being considered in committee, let alone reported to and acted upon on the floor of Congress; the "graft" is too big.

What is it but graft when the schoolbook trust is able to force its books into the schools and keep other books out?

There is another method of getting something for nothing—graft—which is even more generally practiced than any of the foregoing, which is more insidious, because one does not have to seek legislative privileges before engaging in it. I refer to the successful guessing as to the trend of population; where and when great public improvements are to be made; where a railroad—interstate or urban—is to be run, etc. Of course the successful guessers are mostly those who have secured advanced information that these projects are to be carried on. Many a fortune has been acquired in this way, and the richest politician is not necessarily he who has held the most lucrative office for the longest period. He may never have held any office, but if he can secure positive information in advance of others where public improvements are to be carried out; above all, if he can himself direct and control officials who have to do with their location, he can amass a fortune in a few years. All he has to do is to get hold, either in his own or his wife's name, but better still in the name of a dummy, of a large section of the land to be taken for the public improvement, or that which will surely be enhanced in value thereby, and he will become rich not only by reason of the natural increase of value which always attaches to land when these improvements are assured, but by reason of the fact that the communities always pay more for property than the owners could obtain elsewhere. If in addition the real owner controls the commission which awards the damages, or fixes the price to be paid, then a far larger price is obtained and the "graft" is so much larger.

This practice, which has been found so fruitful for politicians in our great cities, has also been followed by some of those who control the great transportation systems. As a case in point might be cited the action of the controlling forces that, when the Northern Pacific Railroad was pushing its way to the ocean, gave out that they intended to locate their terminus at (I think it was) Tacoma. The result was, as they well know it would be, that every land speculator in that section of the country and probably many from the East, rushed there and forced up the price of the land in that vicinity. While this was going on agents of the men who knew what point was really selected quietly bought up every foot of land obtainable at Seattle (as I am informed); of course obtaining it at a comparatively low figure in the face of the announcement that the terminus was to be located elsewhere. They then announced that they had changed their minds and Seattle would be made the terminus, with the result that fortunes were made out of the rise in land values which inevitably followed the completion of the road to that point. As a practical matter it would have made no difference whether the false announcement was made or not (even if it were not so made), it would only have affected the result in degree. Fortunes, although perhaps not so large, would have still been made through the increase in land values consequent on the building of the road.

Now as to the remedy, if remedy there be, to this apparently all-pervading graft. First let us have an end to the idea that he who corrupts the public officials (directly or indirectly) and thus secures a valuable special privilege, thereby obtaining millions, has "made" his money by business acumen, enterprise and foresight, while the few hundreds secured by petty swindlers through collusion with corrupt contractors have secured theirs by "graft." Whoever obtains something for nothing, whether it takes the form of "water" in an interstate railroad or a trolley line, in a telegraph or telephone company, in an electric-light or gas company; whether it is an unloading of the "securities" of a steel trust, the milking of the public through a tariff on sugar, woolens, steel, salt, or borax; whether it is in the form of a Standard Oil monopoly or a monopoly of copper; whether it takes the form of forestalling population (either with or without advance information of what is projected), and thereby reaping an enormous harvest in "unearned increment"—all are "grafting" upon the body politic.

The form of graft which has been most destructive of public morality is unquestionably that of the public-service corporations. There is not a clean page in their whole history; it has been one of long-continued, persistent bribery, not only in connection with the "fine work" which has been almost uniformly practiced in inducing legislative bodies to grant the original franchises; the periodic bribery of subsequent legislatures through which extensions and modifications have been obtained, but equally persistently of the officials who are charged with the duty of enforcing the laws applicable to these corporations and of seeing to it that the terms of their charters are complied with.

Even the military dictator at Cripple Creek, Gen. Sherman Bell, in an interview with Henry George, jr., speaking of the dishonest elections in Denver, said:

"The water, electric-light, telephone, and tram corporations rule that city. They control the police force and sheriff's office, and they stop at nothing to debauch the ballot, stuff the boxes with fraudulent votes, and count out qualified voters.

"Some of their franchises are about to expire. They want new ones. They believed they could get them on terms satisfactory to themselves only from men they themselves should elect to office. All newspapers and most all respectable people opposed their candidates. But they were successful. I am prepared to say that these corporations had 14,000 fraudulent votes cast and counted, and that they spent $190,000 on election.

"But this money they regarded as a good financial investment in return for franchise privileges they expect to receive."

In view of his use of the military to shut down the Portland mine solely because union men were employed there, and his wholesale deporting of men simply because they were members of organized labor, his further statement as to the Denver election is illuminating as to who controlled Governor Peabody. Bell said: "I wanted to use militia against these thugs and repeaters and bad men these corporations paid for bringing into the city, but I was prevented from doing so, and corruptionists had full swing."

So successful have the special-privilege corporations—interstate railways, urban and interurban railways, gas, water, electric-light, telephone, and telegraph companies—been in their evasion of the terms of their charters and of the laws governing their operation, and of those levying taxes thereon, that it has become the common expression: "You don't suppose 'they' obey the laws, do you?"

It is notorious that they habitually ignore, nullify, and trample upon the laws affecting them, but at the first sign of discontent displayed by their employees at the onerous conditions under which they are compelled to work—frequently in open violation of law, such as the laws limiting the number of hours that street-railway employees shall work during a day—these nullifiers of law are loud and insistent in their demand that "law" and order be maintained, no matter who is hurt. Law and order should be maintained at all times, but it should be enforced against a street-railway corporation which does not

pay its taxes, which violates the law regulating hours of employment, just as much and just as rigorously as against those who smash car windows or cut trolley wires. In fact, it is largely because the laws regulating these corporations are persistently nullified that strikers or those who sympathize with them are guilty of the more spectacular infractions of law.

But it is not alone in the securing of these frequently enormously valuable franchises by the bribery of the people's representatives and the subsequent bribery of executive officials that these special-privileged corporations do evil; the public are, of course, robbed both in the extortionate charges for these services and in the refusal of the companies to pay their share of taxation, but they are also injuriously affected in another way. A considerable part of the gigantic fortunes which those who control these corporations have acquired has been squeezed out of the investing public by what is nothing more or less than "thimblerigging" of the stock market.

Whenever it suits the purpose of these gentlemen, statements get abroad and are given marked consideration by the newspapers in which they are interested or can influence, hinting at the wonderful developments at hand and prospective increase of dividends. Result, the stock goes up. When they have unloaded, it suddenly appears (from the same sources) that owing to unusual expenses or from some other cause, the company is not doing as well as formerly. Result, the price is forced down, the innocent who bought at high prices are squeezed out, and the process is gone over again, of course with variations, as those who control and manipulate the stock are exceedingly resourceful and are past masters in the art of devising new schemes to catch Wall-street lambs. To vary the monotony of the procedure mergers are from time to time put through and the presses put at work printing new "securities," which not only afford the insiders the opportunity for commissions for underwriting, but greatly increased amounts of stock are then issued in exchange for others which are retired, the public being called upon to pay dividends upon an increased capitalization, which is made the basis of the contention that there can be no reduction of fares if the "widows and orphans" are not to be deprived of dividends.

The same process is gone through with in the case of the gas and electric-light companies, the result being that despite the known economies in production which are being made from time to time, the public is constantly confronted with the fact that they are all the time called upon to pay dividends upon larger and larger capitalizations, the large capitalization being seriously advanced by the attorneys of these monopolies at legislative hearings as a reason why no legislative reductions in price should be made. To say that by these and allied methods a score of men in New York City have made (?) fortunes aggregating even more than the total capitalization of the public-service corporations which they control, is probably rather to underestimate than overstate the fabulous sums they have milked from the public, but indicates the extent of their "graft."

Even if all the evils which the agents of these men are constantly predicting as sure to follow "municipal ownership" were really to result, public morality would be immensely improved by the elimination of these wholesale bribers from our legislative halls; while the vast sums now paid for protection from "hostile" legislation and as the price of law evasion would no longer find their way into party campaign chests—or to private individuals—to corrupt our elections and our legislatures. Until this is done, until public-ownership and operation are substituted for private exploitation and manipulation of public functions, we may expect these conditions to continue. The prizes are so enormous, the "graft" is on such a colossal scale that the ablest, shrewdest, and most unscrupulous minds in the country inevitably make it their sphere of operation and do not hesitate at wholesale debauchery and corruption of the suffrage to secure the fortunes thus obtainable.

With the adoption of municipal ownership of public utilities in our cities and governmental ownership of railroads, telegraphs, and telephones in the nation; with the obliteration of the tariff wall, which greed and avarice have erected between us and the people of other nations, we shall have removed from our legislative bodies and from politics generally the most prolific sources of graft. There will then remain only that other potent but personally less corrupting form—private absorption of "unearned increment."

While in the aggregate—for it extends all over the country—even larger sums are wrung from the people by the private appropriation of ground rent than are obtained in the ways I have herein set forth, yet its demoralizing influence upon public and private morals is not so great. All recognize when money is paid to an alderman, an assemblyman, or a Congressman as the price of his voting the briber a special privilege, that not only is the act corrupt, but that the legislator is thereafter incapable of doing his duty to the people in other legislative matters, his perspective is ever after clouded and his conception of right and wrong perverted. But where there is no act of personal corruption, and the individual simply takes advantage of opportunities that are apparently free to all to get wealthy without labor; when he shows "shrewdness" and "foresight" in anticipating the trend of population, where public improvements are to be made; or when he merely sits down and holds land for a rise, he is not lowering the tone of public morals or contributing to the debauchery of the suffrage. But, nevertheless, his appropriation of ground rent, equally with the more corrupting and demoralizing act of the exploiter of public-service privileges, is the cause of graft in the public service.

While the people are directly robbed in excess fares for street-car service and in extortionate charges for water, gas, or electricity, and through the evasion of taxation by the companies operating these public functions, they are also indirectly robbed by him who appropriates ground rent; for those values which the community produces, and which should be collected for the benefit of the community, going as they now do almost entirely into private pockets, result in the institution of various forms of taxation upon industry and thrift and upon consumption which would be entirely unnecessary were the annual rental value of land taken in taxation, instead of being left to private individuals to collect for their own private use.

But more: It is not alone in the amount of wealth thus wrongfully taken from those who produce it that evil is done. An evil equally as great of another kind results. Because land values are not taxed into the public Treasury it becomes profitable to hold land out of use; land speculation—the locking up of land—is encouraged. As a consequence, less land is used for farming; for homes and stores; for the production of coal, iron, coper, zinc, lead, salt, borax, clay, and oil; for power in the form of waterfalls; for wharves and docks, and for manufacturing purposes generally, than there is need for. As a result all forms of wealth production are restricted, while the prices of such things as can readily be monopolized are enchanced to the final consumer. The high prices resulting in a restricted demand, many are unable to find employment even in so-called "good times." They are therefore compelled, in order to live at all, to offer their services at a lower rate than those who are employed, wages thus always tending to the minimum of subsistence. With increase of population and increased demand for land, the value of land becomes greater, and those who monopolize it are able to exact, either in the original purchase price or in annual ground rent, an ever-increasing proportion of the total wealth produced.

The cause of graft in the public service, as in business or private life, is primarily due to the inability of many to secure in competition with their fellows that reward for their labor that is justly due them. To some extent the artificial conditions that are caused by the private appropriation of ground rent and by the private exploitation of public functions, with its attendant accumulation of large fortunes ostentatiously displayed, may have a reflex influence in exciting graft, for it is but natural that these wasteful expenditures should excite emulation even if on a smaller scale. Again, in our State capitals, and particularly in the capital of the nation, the means which have been employed to secure valuable franchises are so well known to politicians it is not surprising that among lesser public officials there should grow up a feeling that graft is justifiable under the present régime. If party chiefs can collect enormous campaign funds from the railroads and other special-privilege corporations for favorable legislation and for defeating "hostile" measures, and from the trusts for tariff favors, why should not minor officials feather their nests by dividing with contractors?

If we would abolish graft we must strike at the root of the evil, which is to be found in the private appropriation of ground rent coupled with its more corrupting twin, private exploitation of public functions. When we have abolished these fundamental causes we shall have destroyed the incentive to graft and we shall have restored that healthy tone now so sadly lacking in public affairs. It will not be necessary for men to seek Government positions or starve. The opportunities for profitable employment will be unlimited, and because men—all men—will then be able to obtain for their services the full value of the wealth they create (monopoly no longer being able to exact the lion's share, giving nothing in return), there will be no need for them to sell their souls to some politician for a mess of pottage, while those who seek political service, finding the atmosphere in which they move clarified by the elimination of the present corrupting influences, will not be incited to make their positions a mere channel for "graft."

ROBERT BAKER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Army for the year ending June 30, 1906.

Mr. LITTLE. I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, after the word "six," in line 6, page 1, the following proviso:

"*Provided, however,* That no part of the moneys appropriated in this act shall be expended for the support and maintenance of more than 30,000 men, including officers and enlisted men."

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order that the gentleman's amendment changes existing law.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] withhold that point for a moment?

Mr. HULL. I see no good reason for withholding it, but I will.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I see by the report of the Military Secretary that we have now in our Army 3,871 officers and 65,946 enlisted men. I do not know of any better time or place than this, at least it is the only privilege we get on this side, to indicate our views as to the extent of the Army we ought to have. I think really the amendment could be well sustained and the point of order overruled; but it does seem to me, if the House has the power to make an appropriation for the support of the Army, they can cut that appropriation in two if they desire to do so. The wisdom of that suggestion, of course, would be for the House to determine, but I think that 30,000 men is all the Army that this country needs now or will likely need in the next forty years. The fact is the American people are not standing-army soldiers, but are fighting soldiers.

I find in this very report that I hold in my hand that in the last year there were desertions to the enormous number of 5,873. I also find for the year ending June 19, 1903, that the number of desertions amounted to 6,428, and it is a fact, I think, within the knowledge of at least many of the Members of this House that the young and thoughtless men of the country are induced in one way and another to enlist in the Army, and these 5,000 deserters are represented in a great measure by the young men of the country, who not realizing the gravity of their offense tire of the restraints and humdrum of their useless service and break away.

If, Mr. Chairman, it was a time of war, when the services of these men were necessary, they would be behind the guns rather than behind the bars, they would be sustaining the honor of their country rather than being dishonored by it. To say that we need 70,000 men as a standing army of this country is to deny the history of the past and to defy the good judgment and patriotism of those who have gone before us. There are no threats of internal strife, and if there be none why is it that we want to keep this burden of sixty or seventy millions of

dollars resting upon the backs of the people of this country? Why not adopt this amendment, which will by its operation reduce the standing army to 30,000 people? Yea, amply as many as the country needs; yea, more than it needs, for with the well-organized State guards throughout the several States we can look to them for our defense in our time of need rather than to a great standing army. The civilian soldier—the citizen—has borne to victory American arms in every conflict in the past and is able and willing to do so in the future. I have no patience with the proposition that because foreign countries burden their people with heavy standing armies it is necessary for the free people of this free Republic to burden their people and their resources by keeping an unnecessarily large army. And I say this without reference to what may be necessary as to the Navy. We will meet that question when we come to it.

I do not believe that any gentleman sitting within the sound of my voice, or elsewhere in this country, can assign a good and sufficient reason why we should be called upon to support an army of 60,000 or 70,000 men. The average American is a born soldier and fighter and ready to defend the honor of his country, but he asks you to save him from the payment of a hundred million dollars a year to support a standing army in time of peace. With an army of 25,000 or 30,000 men as a nucleus we could be ready to meet and destroy the army of any nation on earth that could be landed before their transports could touch our shores—yea, our fleets would meet and send them to the bottom of the sea before they ever reached our shores.

What are we doing with our Army of 70,000 men? They are loitering around the barracks and camps, answering roll calls, many of them thoughtless boys who have enlisted. It is inviting them to desert, and they do desert from their duty, and they will continue to do so until the spirit of their young manhood is crushed out. I know myself of two young men, as good as any country produces, one of them the son of an honest blacksmith, who enlisted in the Army in his thoughtless, reckless youth, without knowing the real penalty that would attach to their leaving the Army. One of them is now within prison walls and the other has just completed his term. These boys, honest and true, if war should call them to duty for their country, would render service as brave and daring as that rendered by their fathers, the one for the blue, the other for the gray, in the late civil war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, just one word.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be given five minutes more.

Mr. HULL. Does the gentleman want five minutes more? [After a pause.] He does not seem to want any.

I now want to say a word in reply to the gentleman. We have now an Army of about 60,000 men for this great nation, with all of its responsibilities. We have expended over $90,000,000 in coast defense alone. There are 18,000 men required to man the guns, and it will not give one shift to a gun. There are many guns of the Army to-day that are simply in the hands of care takers. That would leave 12,000 for the cavalry and infantry. It would leave only 12,000 men for the Hospital Corps and all. If the gentleman's amendment were in order and should be adopted, it would virtually mean that the Government of the United States would have no standing army. It is true that our Army costs more than that of any other nation—more than half more. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] gave a reason for that. We pay our enlisted men higher. That makes it cost enormously higher than other nations. In place of reduction, there is a proposition before Congress, without regard to party, that calls for an increase in the artillery now, in order to make effective our coast-defense system. The gentleman can not make the people of the United States believe that 60,000 men for more than 80,000,000 people is a large standing army. He can not make the people of the United States believe that that number of men is a menace or burden to the people of the United States.

We fought this out in two national campaigns, when the standard bearer of the Democratic party raised the question of militarism, and each time the people rebuked him at the polls by saying that 80,000,000 of freemen are not afraid of 60,000 of their own citizens, even if they are organized in an army. The Army of the United States has never been a menace to our liberties. It has been the bulwark of civic govermnent and the maintenance of the flag in all our wars and in all our past. No man on this side of the House desires an army except as a skeleton—the first line of defense, the smallest that it is possible to keep and meet the demands of the Government. In every war of the future, as in every war of the past, it is the volunteer who carries it on when any great struggle comes to the Government of the United States. No man who knows anything about its past and the present situation will claim for a minute that 60,000 men would amount to anything in a great war. We had 250,000 volunteers for the Spanish war alone. We did not need them, but the people of the United States volunteered, and the Government organized them for fear we might need them. So that this Regular Army, small as it is, is no menace to nor burden upon the people of the United States. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. HULL. The point of order is that there is a law of the United States which fixes to-day the maximum and minimum Army of the United States. It may, in the discretion of the President, be recruited up to 100,000; it may, in the discretion of the President, be reduced below 60,000 men. In the present bill it is reduced to the minimum of 56,000 enlisted men.

This amendment changes that law by making an army of not to exceed 30,000 men. It is a change of law.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, my position about this, while I am not a learned parliamentarian, is that we have an Army, and Congress is now called upon to provide for its support. This amendment simply provides for the support of 30,000 soldiers, including officers and enlisted men, and is a limitation upon the appropriation. Congress could refuse to appropriate a dollar for the Army. If it can refuse to appropriate a dollar, it can refuse to appropriate more than half the amount carried by this bill. And this amendment simply indicates how the money shall be used, namely, for the support of an Army not to exceed 30,000 men, including enlisted men and officers.

Mr. HULL. On that point I just want to say one word. If the gentleman wants to cut down the appropriation, I concede the right of this House to reduce the appropriation to any amount it may desire; but when the gentleman fixes the limit at 30,000 men, he virtually fixes the Army at 30,000 men. It is quite a different proposition from refusing to appropriate under existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Iowa that this amendment appears to be drawn in conformity with a number of precedents in the form of limitations. Careful examination discloses the fact that this amendment does not in terms cut down the number of officers or enlisted men in the Army, but simply limits the appropriation in this bill to a certain number of officers and men. It is quite clear to the Chair that the officers and enlisted men who are not provided for in this bill would have a clear claim against the United States Government for their services; but it also seems to the Chair that this amendment is in the form of such a limitation as has been held not to be subject to a point of order, and that the amendment therefore should be left to the vote of the committee.

Mr. HULL. Does it not in express terms fix the number of the Army?

The CHAIRMAN. It states in express terms the number of men for whom appropriation is made in this act, that is all.

Mr. HULL. Of course I will not appeal from the decision of the Chair, but it strikes me as quite a different proposition from making a provision, when we come to the specific appropriation, to cut down the amount of it. This is in the very beginning of the bill, and fixes the number of men in the Army at 30,000 if it has any effect whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair has said, it seems, from careful examination of the amendment, to be in strict conformity with several amendments on which points of order have been overruled, as it merely places a limitation upon the use of the money appropriated in this act, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LITTLE demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 52, noes 70.

Accordingly, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY TO CLERKS, MESSENGERS, AND LABORERS AT HEADQUARTERS OF DIVISIONS, AND DEPARTMENTS AND OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

One chief clerk, at the office of the Chief of Staff, $2,000 per annum.
Six clerks at $1,800 each per annum.
Thirteen clerks at $1,600 each per annum.
Twenty-six clerks at $1,400 each per annum.
Seventy clerks at $1,200 each per annum.
Ninety-five clerks at $1,000 each per annum.
Two clerks at $900 each per annum.
One clerk at $720 per annum.
Two messengers at $840 each per annum.
Sixty-nine messengers at $720 each per annum.

Two messengers at $600 each per annum.
One laborer at $660 per annum.
One laborer at $480 per annum.
In all, $305,220.

And said clerks and messengers and laborers shall be employed and assigned by the Secretary of War to the offices and positions in which they are to serve.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman if it has not been customary in the past to provide that the clerks who come in under this shall not be assigned to service in Washington?

Mr. HULL. There are some of them assigned to service in Washington. The language is the same that we have always had, but the clerks are not clerks that are in the Department. Some of the clerks of the Chief of Staff and the General Staff are taken out of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and now carried on this bill for the first time. There is no increase in the number of clerks, taking the two bills together, but there is an increase in this bill on account of dropping from the legislative bill certain clerks so as to make all the division and staff corps clerks come under this bill.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The gentleman of course recognizes the fact that my thought was that inasmuch as the clerks in Washington and the clerks outside of Washington are covered in two different bills there is danger that the Department, by changing them, might evade the purpose of Congress.

Mr. HULL. No; these clerks are only appropriated for in this bill for the General Staff and for the division and department headquarters, and can not be used in the Department proper.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That is the point I wished to be sure about.

Mr. HULL. A part of these clerks were heretofore carried on the legislative bill, but the Committee on Appropriations dropped them out of their bill and notified the Committee on Military Affairs that they would have to take care of them here. There is no increase whatever and no change in the law.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That when a vacancy shall next occur in the office of assistant chief of the Record and Pension Office that such vacancy shall not be filled and said office shall then cease and determine.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, in line 24 I move to strike out the word "that." It is a clerical error.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RETIRED OFFICERS.

For pay of officers on the retired list and for officers who may be placed thereon during the current year, $2,158,324.71.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to add the following proviso:

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of line 21, page 12, the following:

"*Provided*, That no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty with the organized militia of the several States and Territories, receive from the United States any pay or allowance additional to his pay as retired officer."

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have that amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I would like to hear some explanation from the gentleman.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I called the attention of the House to this in my preliminary remarks, stating that, in my judgment, there should be a limitation in this line, for the reason that before we passed the act at the last session of Congress giving full pay, there was not an officer acting with the several States or Territories above the grade of major. Since we gave the full pay and allowance to officers serving with governors of the different States, we have had nine brigadier-generals in these positions. We are making a great charge upon the Treasury in the extra pay of these officers of high rank. I can see a reason, as I stated before, for officers of the lower rank getting full pay, because captains, with three-quarters pay, may not be able to live at the capitals of the different States, lieutenants may not be able to live at the capitals of the different States, and I have no objection to giving them their full pay; but when it comes to a brigadier-general or a major-general, or a lieutenant-general, or a colonel, with large pay, who get a larger allowance for commutation, I can see very serious objection to their receiving full pay and allowances while performing no services for the General Government, except as a well-drilled militia might be of benefit to the General Government.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Is not that a significant and important service—the improvement of the militia?

Mr. HULL. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that for all the years we have allowed retired officers to be assigned the officers of the lower grades have been entirely satisfactory to the States. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am inclined to think that a captain or a major will give more real service and work to the drilling and discipline and work of an ordinary militia of the several States than a higher officer will.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I confess, Mr. Chairman, I do not see the force of the gentleman's statement. Why should a superior officer be denied the opportunity to render an important service to a State if, in the judgment of the State, that particular officer would be a most efficient public servant?

Mr. HULL. I do not understand that we are denying them the privilege of serving the State. They can still go there if they desire, but, Mr. Chairman, up to the time we passed the bill last spring giving the increased pay there was not a single one of the high officers on duty with the governor of a State; they declined to serve. Now, when these lower-grade officers did go on to serve, even when they got less than full pay, I can see some reason why they should be recognized, but it seems to me that a man who has reached the grade of a brigadier-general, who is probably then at the age of 64, has got past the time when he is hunting up new work; he is simply taking it to get the pay, and not from a patriotic motive at all.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. The gentleman's apprehension, to be justified, would require a concurrence between the State appointing him and the officer occupying the position, to work any mischief. Do I understand from the gentleman from Iowa that superior officers are to be penalized in seeking these State appointments, while inferior officers are to be encouraged? Is that his position?

Mr. HULL. I do not understand that we are penalizing anybody.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. There is a difference in treatment——

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will allow me to explain, a captain, if he is a captain of infantry, gets $1,800 a year; if he is a captain of cavalry he gets $2,000 a year. Heretofore these captains have largely done this work. Now, my understanding is that the $1,800 or $2,000, with three-quarters fogy pay, would not be sufficient for them to live at the capitals.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. What capital?

Mr. HULL. Any capital of any State. There is where they do live. My understanding is that a man who gets $5,500 would still get three-quarters of that if we passed this provision, which would be largely in excess of what we propose to do for the subordinate officers, and it is for the purpose of enabling the officers that do the work to live as they should live in these different local States that we limit it to the majors. I don't understand it is penalizing. At the time the law was passed it was understood we were helping only that class and nobody dreamed that the higher officers would want this kind of assignment. It has to be, as the gentleman says, by the concurrent action of the officers themselves and the governor of the State. That is not changed by this provision.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. No; but I understand the gentleman imposes a penalty upon a superior officer's assuming that function and rendering that kind of service, and the penalty is a withdrawal of some of his compensation.

Mr. HULL. We have no penalty and we withdraw no compensation that he would get as a retired officer. We give him that full compensation.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Then what does the gentleman take away from him?

Mr. HULL. We take away simply his full pay and allowance and give him the full pay of a retired officer.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. That is the penalty which is imposed upon him.

Mr. HULL. Not at all. He is not entitled to it except by the grace of the Government anyway.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. That is the discrimination, then, between superior and inferior officers rendering this form of service?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why do that?

Mr. HULL. I have stated once or twice that at the time we did this nearly all of the men acting with the governors were men of the grade of captain or below. The three-quarters pay of those men was not enough to enable them to live in comfort while performing this duty.

Mr. BURLESON. Can the gentleman name the officers affected by this amendment?

Mr. HULL. There are nine brigadiers, according to the Army Register, on the list.

Mr. BURLESON. Are there any officers above the rank of brigadier?

Mr. HULL. I understand there is one.

Mr. BURLESON. Who is the one above that rank?

Mr. McCALL. Will this apply to Lieutenant-General Miles, who is upon the staff of Governor Douglas, of the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. HULL. It would.

Mr. BURLESON. Who is the officer above the rank of brigadier?

Mr. HULL. Here is the list that I made up my mind ought to be stopped. If anyone desires the list, if he will look on the Army Register of December 20, he will find it. We have here one brigadier-general, Edward M. Hayes; we have another brigadier-general, Charles L. Cooper; another one, Henry B. Freeman; another one, Henry Jackson; another one, Aaron S. Daggett; another one, James Miller, and another one, Chambers McKibbin. There are nine of them. That is the list that caused me to make it up.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Iowa had the floor. I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say that these general officers had reached an age when they would try to get a job and would not be apt to act from patriotic motives.

Mr. HULL. No; I did not say that.

Mr. McCALL. The gentleman said something about their being less liable to act.

Mr. HULL. I said the gentlemen had reached the age of retirement, passed 64 years, and were not likely to hunt for work.

Mr. McCALL. I think the gentleman will find the reporter's notes will show he said they would not take the jobs from patriotic motives.

Mr. HULL. I said they had not done it from those motives, because none of them had done it in the past before the pay was increased.

Mr. McCALL. I trust the gentleman is not reflecting upon Lieutenant-General Miles, who at that time was in active service and could not have taken the position he now has.

Mr. HULL. I would not reflect upon anybody, only I wanted to state a fact, that before Congress gave this increased pay there was nobody above the grade of major who wanted the place, and since Congress gave the increased pay it seems the generals on the retired list all want it.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like now to resume my colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. Is it the purpose of this amendment to discourage the States from utilizing the services of superior officers in the management of the militia and confining those States in this respect to the services of officers of a lower grade?

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. What else can be the object?

Mr. HULL. But I do not believe that a man getting as large pay as they do on the retired list should come in and get full pay for the service that he does for the State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman a question? Suppose an officer were upon the retired list and served in this House as a Member of Congress, would he not draw his $5,000 a year and also his retired pay?

Mr. HULL. They have done it when they were here before.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, sir; I remember an instance of that, and that is why I call the gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. HULL. But we did not increase their pay when they served here.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have a complete statement of the reasons why the committee favors this amendment, and I most respectfully submit that they should be decisive for its rejection. If the attitude of the committee be intelligent it is that the States of the Union which may desire to utilize the services of retired army officers to improve the discipline of their militia shall be discouraged from employing officers of a superior grade, or at least that officers of a superior grade shall be penalized if they accept such employment. Now, that proposal must be justified on one of two grounds; either on the ground of doubtful conduct by the State or by the superior officer, on one hand, or else that an inferior officer is likely to prove more efficient. The first assumption is inconceivable, the second incomprehensible. Can it be pretended that a man who has served his country so faithfully in battle and out of it that he has risen to high honor shall be treated as a person less free to utilize his retirement for the benefit of his country and his own dignity than if he had struggled along the pathway of service and had been retired while he was still subordinate in rank though of mature years? Can it be possible that the House of Representatives will take an attitude of hostility to merit and place upon it certain disqualifications from which it sedulously and carefully relieves officers who according to their records have rendered less meritorious services and therefore acquired less prominent positions?

I would like to know just here if the Committee on Military Affairs has suggested this amendment or does it proceed simply from the wisdom of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] himself?

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

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I would like to know if this amendment is the result of action by the Committee on Military Affairs or simply the fruit of your wisdom?

Mr. HULL. I stated this morning when I proposed to offer it that I had not submitted it to the committee; that I proposed to offer it here, but that each member of the committee could do as he pleased.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Then, Mr. Chairman, I desire to qualify what I have said so far as it may sound in any way like a criticism of the committee, and modify it so that it will apply simply to the attitude of the gentleman from Iowa. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will vote down the amendment, that it shall not appear as if the House of Representatives regarded the superior, the best officers of the Army with distrust, reserving its special favors for the men who did not succeed in acquiring equal dignity in the military service.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it will be well to understand what the situation is and has been concerning the use of these retired officers in connection with the discipline, drill, and inspection of the National Guard. That for some years, by the law, retired officers might have served in any State in connection with the National Guard has been true, as stated by the chairman of the committee, and that officers of higher rank have not availed themselves of that service, and the governors of the States have not sought or used them up to the present year is equally true. The reason for that is this, that the older officers, especially colonels, brigadier-generals, major-generals, and lieutenant-generals, as a rule, are not fitted to do that work as it should be done for the benefit of the Guard. This is a peculiar and when properly done a service of much labor. It is that of careful inspection, of going about to the different stations and companies, of examining the various commands, supplies and equipments, battalions, regiments, and brigades in their encampments, wherever they may be, of holding schools or a system of instruction, and of doing the personal work of examination and of supervising their accounts and watching and guarding the property of the Government. The older officers of higher rank of the Army are not accustomed to this kind of work and have not been accustomed to do that in the performance of their duty for many years past. It is hard, irksome, and continuous, and yet necessary if it is to be of any use to the Guard. It is not a showy tin-soldier sort of service, not filled with social functions, but with hard work.

The older officers are not as well calculated, after they are 64 years of age and more, to do that work as are the captains, majors, and lieutenant-colonels of the Army whose daily duty it has been to do that work. These are the men who ought to be detailed. Yet the result of the passage of the amendment one year ago has been that there has been an unseemly scramble among the officers of higher rank to be assigned to this service so they can get more pay. They have used their social and political influence and done whatever they could to secure desirable assignments. That is the way it has worked out.

The result will be to deteriorate the efficiency of the National Guard if this be allowed to continue. Now, this has not been brought before the Committee on Military Affairs, but as one of the members of that committee I am strongly in favor of the passage of this resolution for two reasons: First, to improve the efficiency of the National Guard; the other to improve the conduct of the officers of the Army by notifying them that they should continue to preserve their dignity, instead of going around and seeking all kinds of influence by which to be assigned to the National Guard in the several States, so that their main function will be to receive the higher compensation provided by the act of one year ago. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] has now given a reason for this amendment which is absolutely conclusive, if the facts justify his statement. If the conduct of these retired officers has come to be so meretricious as he describes, it is necessary that we should take action to defend not merely the State militia from their corrupting influences, but the good name of the country from their degradation. But surely, if this unseemly scramble has arisen, if soldiers whose names we have been accustomed to hold in something akin to reverence as the heroes of our national admiration have descended to such practices, it is fitting and proper that we should have the circumstances of their abasement and the names of the fallen. I do hope they have not all become tainted. I do hope that the prospect of small rewards in their old age has not made them utterly unmindful of all the credit that they have won for themselves and their country in their prime. There must be a few exceptions, and therefore I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] to specify the facts on which he makes the statement, and to give the names of those general officers who have brought discredit upon their illustrious calling. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. The gentleman, as usual, is very careful to shoot wide of the mark. I said this, that officers had besought men who have influence with governors of the States, asking for assignments. I do not propose to give any names, because it is not a corrupt thing to do, and they have a right to do it under the law. I just stated it was unseemly. I thought so then and I think so now. I think that sort of thing ought to be discouraged.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. So do I.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. And the way to discourage that and to make efficient service in the National Guard is to pass an amendment like the one now pending.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] that the proper term is "unseemly." I am far from applying the term "corrupt."

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. You did apply it.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. But an unseemly act by a general officer of the Army, such as seeking opportunity to draw pay from the United States Treasury without rendering service, by reason of the illustrious deeds that he must have performed to reach that rank, is a degradation of the national honor. Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] states that such has been the conduct of these illustrious men and that it is unseemly, but declines to give us the names of the persons who have been guilty of the unseemly, degrading practices. Sir, I submit to him this characterization extends to nine general officers. I wish to remind him that as he puts it it extends to nine men whose fame has hitherto been not merely spotless but shining. He can not possibly mean that it extends to more than one or two. It is almost impossible that he could have personal knowledge of more exclusive delinquencies. Let us have the exact extent to which these unseemly and, for men of that stamp, demoralizing and degrading practices have been carried, and then, perhaps, we can agree more closely on the remedy that should be applied. Let us have the names of at least some of these general officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] has expired.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I appeal to the gentleman and beg him in some portion of the five minutes that have fallen to me now by reason of having made this motion to give that enlightenment to the House which I think is absolutely essential for a proper and dignified disposition of this motion. Give us the name of one governor to whom such unseemly applications have been made. Let us have one fact to justify this language of singular strength in which the gentleman has indulged. I ask for one fact, Mr. Chairman, for the name of one general officer or of one governor. [A pause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, since we are not to have that information, I have but to add that I differ from the gentleman from Minnesota as to the "proper remedy" or as to the existence of any evil that requires remedy in this respect. "The proper remedy" is not to pass this measure, which he declares necessary, on the assumption that general officers are universally guilty of unseemly conduct. I deny the fairness of the assumption. It is not justified by anything before this House. I deny it; and the gentleman's silence is a withdrawal of the imputation. I say it would be an outrage upon men of illustrious character if this House should adopt this amendment without any other justification than the imputation which the gentleman from Minnesota has cast upon general officers of the United States Army now in a state of retirement. As to the imputation that these generals are disqualified by age from an efficient discharge of these duties, let me suggest that Blucher was older than they when he fought the battle of Waterloo, and Von Moltke when the battle of Gravalotte was fought, and age did not militate against the ability of either to win victory for his army, advantage for his country, enduring glory for himself.

Mr. HULL. I desire to say to this House, having talked with one or two members of the Military Committee, when I made the statement on the floor that the purpose was to reduce the expense of the Army as far as we could without injury to the service of the country, we think it will probably cut off at least fifteen or twenty thousand dollars by way of salary to the higher officers. It must be remembered that until last year the officers who have been doing this work have been giving their service for nothing except retired pay, and have been doing it on these terms for years. We believed it would not impair the service if we could cut down, and when we looked around where we could reduce the expenses and give those who have been doing the work a little recognition and save the Government the difference in the pay between retired and active pay for the higher officers, it would meet the commendation of those who on that side are continuously crying against military expense.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. How much will it save?

Mr. HULL. I have not figured it out. It would save in difference in pay of higher officers between full pay and full allowance and three-quarters pay and no allowance for quarters.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. And what is the total of the army appropriation?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman on my right says it might run up to $100,000. It is admitted to be true that the duty which has heretofore been performed by captains and majors without increase of pay the higher officers are largely taking now that the pay is increased.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, in my time, how long the law has been in force which it is now proposed to amend?

Mr. HULL. Since the passage of the last appropriation act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It was law for the first time then?

Mr. HULL. It was law for the first time then.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This law was then considered by the Committee on Military Affairs and advisedly passed without the amendment which the gentleman now offers?

Mr. HULL. It was; and then no high officers were involved in that service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment either goes too far or it does not go far enough. It seems carefully confined to a certain set of retired officers who have accepted a certain sort of service from the States.

If the idea were economy, and if the motive were that these officers receive from other sources a sufficient compensation, and therefore are not to receive this additional compensation, this amendment ought to go further. It ought to provide that whenever an officer out of the ranks of the Army shall be in the service of a State or the United States, either receiving pay as a military, naval, executive, or legislative officer, that he should forfeit this additional pay. The gentleman and I sat upon this floor at a time when a distinguished general officer of the Army was receiving his full retired pay and at the same time receiving a salary as a Member of this House and $72 per month pension, and no complaint was ever made. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is well enough for gentlemen to be perfectly frank with one another and frank with the country.

I very much fear a very recent occurrence has had something to do with the present offering of this resolution. It has not been long since I read from the public press that a late general of the United States Army—a lieutenant-general at that—had been appointed by the governor of Massachusetts as his adjutant-general of the State guard. I make no charges; but I very much fear that the real motive behind this motion now is an attack upon that general, to wit, General Miles, who is extremely persona non grata in high circles in the Republican party, and I am all the more disposed to believe it because I have not caught my colleagues upon that side of the Chamber hitherto suffering with sudden and ill-digested spasms of economy—economy especially in homeopathic doses.

It seems to me that something besides the mere money to be saved is behind this amendment. The argument of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] "will not wash." It will not do to tell us that a lieutenant-colonel or a colonel, both in grade superior to a major—and this amendment cuts off all above majors—much less a lieutenant-general, is less capable of doing inspector's duty or adjutant-general's duty for a State guard than majors and men under that grade. Or can it be, Mr.

Chairman, that there is an envy on the part of the gentleman from Iowa of this fearfully and wonderfully constructed piece of machinery that has been lately described as emerging from the great State of Massachusetts—the general staff of its governor? Not long ago I read a description in the Washington Post of the manner in which that staff would go forth when it shall be fully appareled, and I gathered from it that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. [Laughter.] And now, simply because there is a general officer who happens not to agree in politics with my genial friend from Iowa [Mr. HULL], who has become a part of this fearfully and wonderfully constructed and appareled piece of State militia machinery, the entire force and power of Congress is to be invoked to strike him down in the day of his coming glory. [Laughter.] It is well enough to be candid, I say. It is no new thing that the Republican party should slight the heroes of the nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. I ask that the gentleman have such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be allowed time to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it is not a new thing that a Republican Administration, now and then, in its desire to push its favorites to the front, whether they are mere colonels and surgeons, or surgeons with the rank of colonel, or colonels with the rank of surgeon, or what not, should in some way or other slight the men who have done great service to the country and should put them aside for the time being without due honor.

It has not been long since the country witnessed the manner in which Schley was treated; it has not been long since the country witnessed the manner in which General Miles was snubbed in public, nor the little honor which Admiral Dewey received in Administration circles, for what reason I know not. But do not resnub General Miles in his new State militia uniform. Do not take that away from him in the time of his pride. Suppose this had been a Republican major instead of a Democratic Lieutenant-General, do you suppose that there would have been heard a single utterance, a single syllable, of criticism upon that side of the Chamber? When was this suddenly-born Republican appetite for economy invoked upon a pretense so slight and for a sum so small? [Laughter.]

If you want to be economical we can tell you from this side how to be economical. This country grew to be a great country, it entered upon the Spanish-American war with 25,000 men of all arms, 25,000 men not only magnificently trained as soldiers, but magnificently born as citizens, and that is what chiefly made them good soldiers.

You can be economical with our help, if you will. We will vote with you right now. We will not make the point that your amendment is not germane. Offer a motion here now to direct the Secretary of War to reduce the size of the Army as soon as practicable to 35,000 men—25,000 men to put it upon its old antebellum Hispano-American footing, and 10,000 men additional to form a highly trained corps for the management of heavy artillery in the coast defense—and then your economy will speak in millions and not in mere thousands, and your economy will relieve some of the tension into which you have gotten. I say economize, yes, and I say, moreover, use what money you are going to use for a different set of purposes. Already we hear that our great harbors are to be allowed to shoal up, that our great rivers are to be permitted to become obstructed, that the Government is to go on paying extravagant rents for public buildings which it can build with its own money at the cost of 2 per cent per annum. And why is it? Because you insist on keeping an army that is absolutely useless for any purpose immediately to be foretold. Build and maintain an adequate navy, having a due annual increase. Sink your enemies on the seas before they land upon the American coast. Get rid of your outer fringe of useless dependencies, that require forty-eight more battle ships than would be required without them, and that furnish you with an excuse for this enormous army in time of peace. Do not take it all out of General Miles's additional pay and his Massachusetts State militia uniform. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if I thought that the motive suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] was the real purpose of this amendment and that it was aimed at General Miles I certainly should vote against it. But I believe that this amendment was offered with the honest purpose of economy and that the case of General Miles merely happens to fall within it.

The Democratic party always professes to be in favor of economy, but it is very noticeable that any particular economy which comes before the House they generally oppose and want to economize in some other way. They are in favor of the principle, but against its application.

Now, take this case of General Miles, which the gentleman speaks of. It illustrates how, under this amendment, the States can still accomplish the same result, if desirable, because if they want a chief officer of high rank they can always offer a compensation. Massachusetts did it in this case, expecting to pay General Miles a salary; but, with a magnanimity which was rare and most commendable, he declined the salary which Massachusetts offered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The amendment does not read as I fear the gentleman thinks it does. It does not apply to officers who are receiving pay from the States in the militia; whether they are receiving pay or not it applies. It reads:

> When assigned to active duty with the organized militia of the several States and Territories.

So that would deprive General Miles of additional pay, although he is receiving nothing from the State.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly, and in that case the State of Massachusetts would make it up to him, and that is the point I was making. It is always within the power of a State that wants a general officer to offer him a salary.

Now, unquestionably most of the duties which these retired officers of the Army perform with the militia can just as well be performed by a lower-grade officer as by a general, and they always have been; but there may be an occasional case, like this of Massachusetts, where they are ambitious and have some special purpose for which they want an officer high in rank. In that case let them offer him some additional pay and they will get him. In most cases a captain or a major is quite sufficient to perform the office and will perform it quite as well, and therefore let the State that will be content with the ordinary services take the ordinary man and let the State which thinks it ought to have a general officer contribute something and thereby save the United States treasury. My only reason for supporting this amendment is because it seems to be a genuine economy—it saves the United States a material sum without in any way impairing the efficiency of the militia, and it allows any State not satisfied with the lower-grade officer to procure a higher one by adding to his United States income a State salary.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in answer to the gentleman from Mississippi, by making the statement positive that the amendment was not aimed at General Miles or any other gentleman. My attention was called to it when I received the Army Register. General Miles's name is not on the Army Register, and for that reason could not have been in contemplation by me as striking at any individual man. I am for the amendment because I believe it is right.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What is the date of the Register?

Mr. HULL. December 20, which has the list of officers.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I called the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs this morning to the question which is now under discussion. If I had any feeling one way or the other, as far as General Miles is concerned, it would be one of great personal friendship. General Miles married an Ohio lady, a niece of General Sherman and of John Sherman, a lady whose father was born in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, and she was always a personal friend. I confess that my attention was called to this provision of a former appropriation bill by a newspaper statement in regard to General Miles. Then I hunted up the condition of affairs and found that nine brigadier-generals, who had been retired on retired pay, had in this way, and by virtue of this provision, become entitled to draw full pay and allowances, commutation, and everything of that character, as though they were on duty with their full rank. I thought that it was not the right sort of legislation, and I think so now. I know of no reason why a man retired, with the pay that Congress gives to him on the retired list, should, by virtue of employment where he can make money, suddenly be transferred back again to the position of the soldier or officer of the United States who is discharging the duty of his rank in the front.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the general officer, retired, had employment in a corporation, would that interfere with his compensation from the General Government?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will permit, I will say no, not so far as his retired compensation is concerned.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not at all.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I understand the gentleman makes the distinction between accepting public employment for the improvement of the militia and accepting employment for his own emolument.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did not make any objection of that character. I object to giving to any retired officer his full pay and emolument simply because he can make money in addition to that by any sort of procedure whatever.

Mr. HULL. The gentlman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] seems to have it in his mind that if this proviso is adopted the officer does not get any retired pay.

Mr. COCKRAN. No; I have not that in my mind.

Mr. HULL. Well, the gentleman's questions would seem to indicate that.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. My question is, Would it make any difference to the retired officer?

Mr. HULL. He would not, if he entered the employment of a private corporation, get any increased pay on the retired list, would he?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not think the gentleman from New York understands what the operation of the law is.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I did not get the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think I can make the gentleman understand it. The law as it now stands, provided an appropriation bill has carried the law forward, which I doubt very much, provides that a retired officer who takes a contract with a State militia to drill the militia or to officer the militia shall thereupon not only draw his retired pay but be restored at once upon the pay rolls of the Army to his full pay and emoluments as though on the active list. If there is anybody on earth who can explain to me the logic, the fairness, the justice, or the sense of such a provision as that, I would be very glad to get that information. Now, then, about this political matter.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I understand there is no intention of disturbing that precise character of regulation as to an inferior or as to officers below the rank of major.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will tell the gentleman why. We have been in the habit of assigning officers who have been disabled and thereby retired as attachés of our embassies and legations abroad and to certain other duties of like character. The law was intended to aid those young men or those men in being able to afford to go to those positions. I myself on one occasion, at one of the great embassies of the United States abroad, saw one of these young men. I first met him at some public function, dressed in a most gorgeous uniform and looking well fed and well kept. He afterwards invited me to the place where he lived, and he was living upon the merest, scantiest possible provision for life. He told me the reason was that he could not afford anything else under the pay he got. Now, it was intended to help out just such things as that.

Let me call the attention of gentlemen on the other side to this. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has found something in the shape of politics in this matter. He says General Miles is a Democrat. That is the first I ever heard of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; the gentleman can not ask me a question. I am in the midst of a most important point. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman always is when I want to ask him a question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, what authority has the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for stating that General Miles is a Democrat? If the public prints do not falsify, he sought the nomination for the Presidency on the Prohibition ticket, and God knows that the extreme antipodes were reached then. [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

Now, there are nine brigadier-generals at present that are in this same position. I do not know the name of one of them. I do not know whether they are Democrats or Republicans. The probability is they are intelligent men, men of education, men of efficiency, and the further probability is that nearly all of them are Republicans. Yet this same proposed amendment has the same operation on those gentlemen that it has on General Miles. So there ought not to be any political consideration in it. But suppose there is, can our friends, can this committee afford to pay such an unreasonable sum of money as this to nine officers—how many more I do not know—a gift of that character that can not be supported by any reasonable argument whatever? I disclaim in supporting this measure any suggestion of hostility against any man. I did not know until I read in the paper that General Miles will be affected by it. I do not know now who else will be affected by it. I know that the law of Congress has put every one of these men upon the retired list at a certain salary, and I can not see any reason why they should be retired at full pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This amendment simply applies to those who are above the rank of major, so if the gentleman's argument is well taken then the amendment ought to apply to all retired officers.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have already pointed out, and the gentleman did not understand me, I think—I pointed out the original purpose was to give it to certain officers who drew but small pay; that the retired pay of that low grade was so small a salary that they were not able to take these employments abroad and elsewhere, because their salaries under the retired pay were not sufficient.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The second object of my interruption was to state that, as I understand it, the object of the original law was to increase the efficiency of the National Guard by encouraging and causing men upon the retired list, who were well trained in military affairs, to become identified with the National Guard in its organization and its training. Now, if that be the object of the law——

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will yield for a moment; I desire to correct him a little there. The main object of the committee was to get back to the active list the men who were serving governors and allowing those on the retired list to get a rate of pay so they could live at their respective assignments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Very well, then, the object was twofold—to get back the men into the active service of the nation instead of the State, and, secondly, to build up and train and organize better the National Guard itself by encouraging men of long and expert military training to become identified with the National Guard in various capacities. Now, the gentleman says he can not see any object in giving this additional pay. That was the object, and it seems to me a very laudable object, and one that would produce more good with less money than most military expenditures.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, my time has been occupied and I would ask for about three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, my answer to the gentleman from Mississippi is twofold, and in the first place I state my own views. I am very much opposed to the spectacular development of the State militia. I have some views on that subject that came to me as I witnessed the blood of dead men upon the streets of the town in which I lived. I do not believe in the organization of the State militia into divisions and army corps and parades and maneuvers. The State militia should be organized in companies, drilled and perfected in the school of the soldier and of the company for the purpose of suppressing insurrections and riots and to fit a set of young men for the possibilities of war; but to get up great spectacular parades and to undertake to maneuver twelve or fourteen thousand men in the form of corps drills and sham battles is a gross waste of public money and utterly valueless to the soldier upon whom the money is expended. Now, that is my first proposition. My second suggestion is that an officer of low rank, such as lieutenant, captain, or possibly major, is quite sufficient for all these purposes. Ninety-nine out of every hundred of the captains and majors of the United States Army to-day are more familiar with the school of the soldier, of the company, and of the battalion than is the brigadier-general retired.

Therefore, I can find no excuse for this extravagant expenditure of money.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question has been raised here as to why we should draw a distinction between the officers of the lower rank and the officers above the rank of major. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is a very simple answer to that question. As I understand, under existing law if an officer of the rank of captain is assigned to this work in one of the States he is thereby given full pay as a captain, which means an in-

crease of expense on behalf of the Government of the United States of perhaps four or five hundred dollars. If, on the contrary, a general takes one of these positions in any of the different States, he is given full pay as a general, which means an increase of expense to the Government of the United States in the matter of his salary of something like $1,300, and in addition to that, as I understand, $72 a month for quarters, and perhaps some other emoluments that would not go to an officer of a lower rank. And while the Government of the United States may be willing and may properly think it is wise to expend four or five hundred dollars in each of these cases in order to secure the services of an officer of a lower rank than major, the same reasons would not exist for expending for each of these officers an increase of nearly $2,000 or $1,800 with the nine major-generals who are now employed in such capacities. It seems to me, therefore, that there is a very good reason why the distinction should be drawn with reference to the rank of the officer who should be restored to his full pay when he assumes duties of this character.

Mr. THAYER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, from what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has said that there are nine persons holding rank above that of major that have, since this law went into effect, something like a year ago, accepted positions on the staffs of different governors of different States. That fact was known, probably, to the Committee on Military Affairs when they prepared this bill; and it is evident that they paid but little attention to the fact until within a few days, when it is known that a man carrying the highest military title in the gift of this country was besought by the Democratic governor of Massachusetts to go upon his staff as chief inspector of the militia of that State. I wish to ask, if it is not perfectly apparent that this bill is intended as a thrust against General Miles, why was it that this committee did not remember that eight others, military gentlemen on the retired list, had accepted positions during the last year under conditions identical with that of General Miles? And, again, if this was such a flagrant abuse of their position, did they not originally in their reported bill provide for that condition of things that they undertook to provide for in this amendment, which the chairman, without consulting his committee, springs upon us?

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] says that these higher officers in our country are conducting themselves in an unseemly way in going about and begging positions of the governors of the different States. I think the gentleman is drawing exclusively upon his imagination. It happens to be within my special personal knowledge that, so far as the request made by Governor Douglas that General Miles should be detailed to Massachusetts is concerned, it came from Governor Douglas himself, and General Miles was importuned day after day before he was willing to accept the position. Governor Douglas naturally looked to him because, in the first place, he was a native of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and secondly, the highest military title in the gift of the American people had been conferred upon General Miles, and our Democratic governor was bound the people of Massachusetts should have the best the country afforded, and of all men high in rank General Miles was best adapted to the position that Governor Douglas wanted him to fill.

I want to say also that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] said that these high-titled officers were antiquated men, that they were past usefulness, and that they were not proper men to be detailed to the different States in order to have charge of the State militia, which, by the way, is a part of the National Guard; but all this is somewhat in contradistinction to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] said when treating upon this subject. He stated, in substance, that these high-titled officers were proper men to be detailed to the different States to perform the duties there assigned to them, but that the States ought to pay the compensation which they would naturally require. It did not occur to the gentleman from Massachusetts that General Miles or any of these other eight men who have been detailed in different States were past usefulness. The detailing of General Miles to take charge of the State militia was fitting and proper. Now, the people of Massachusetts are fond of General Miles and will resent any insult to him, and this amendment is directed to him and would never have been offered had he not accepted the call from Governor Douglas.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Massachusetts will believe that this is a thrust and an insult to General Miles, not the first one either that has been imposed, and if you desire to make Massachusetts solidly Democratic vote this amendment, and we will not only reelect Governor Douglas, but the whole Democratic ticket from top to bottom. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's informal amendment will be withdrawn. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I move to amend by striking out the words "above the grade of major" where they appear in the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out, after the word "Army," the words "above the grade of major."

Mr. HULL. How will it then read?

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That no retired officer of the Army shall, when assigned to active duty with the organized militia of the several States and Territories, receive from the United States any pay or allowance additional to his pay as a retired officer.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if economy is the object sought, then the amendment I propose to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has that virtue. If discrimination is sought to be avoided, the amendment to the amendment produces that result. If it is desired to place the burden upon the States which are to select retired officers of the Army for State service, they can do so from the lower grades equally efficient, or it places upon them the burden of paying the officers of high grade if they are selected as such officers. The purpose of this amendment to the amendment is to provide that no officer that has been detailed to a State government shall receive any pay from the United States Treasury except that of their retired pay, placing upon the State selecting the burden of paying such sums as they, in their wisdom or unwisdom, may choose to pay, measured by the rank of the officer selected. Surely under this amendment we avoid all appearances of unjust discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 92, noes 92.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers will take their places——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Tellers were not ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Ohio that the Chair prefers to order tellers on this vote. The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. ROBINSON, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HULL, will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 100, noes 100.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was put.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in doubt; there was so much confusion. The Chair would prefer to order tellers on this vote. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] take their places as tellers?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] will take their places as tellers.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to have the committee advised as to what they are voting upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 106, noes 71.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of enlisted men, $95,148.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, page 15, add:

"*Provided*, That so much of any and all statutes of the United States as authorizes the maintenance of the Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry be, and the same is hereby, repealed, to take effect the 1st day of July, 1905."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves the point of order.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say to the economists of this House, on both sides of the Chamber, that if this amendment is supported they will do some very effective work in the way of money saving. It is simply intended to abolish what is known as the "Porto Rican Provisional Regiment," a branch of the Army which received special attention in the report of the Secretary of War two years ago, when Mr. Root said that there was no longer any reason for continuing it in the service. He stated, what everybody knows to be true, that the conditions in that island are such that an ordinary police force can do all the duty which this regiment performs, and leave to the Regular Army of the United States the protection of the seacoasts of that island.

Mr. Chairman, no reason worthy of the consideration of this House for a moment has ever been offered why this Porto Rican provisional regiment should be continued, and if it were not a fact that there are officers in that regiment for whom gentlemen are solicitous and whom they desire to maintain on the pay rolls the regiment would have been abolished two years ago. The reports of the Secretary of War since then have been silent upon that Porto Rican regiment. They have neither recommended its continuance nor its discontinuance. They have failed to recommend its continuance, I apprehend, because there is no reason that can be urged why it should be continued. They have not recommended its discontinuance because, as I apprehend, they thought they would run against that powerful influence which made this Congress override the specific and well-founded recommendations of Secretary Root in 1902.

Mr. Chairman, recognizing the fact that the point of order made by the chairman of the committee will probably be sustained by the Chair, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, composed of two battalions of four companies each.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 13 and 14, on page 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, strike out lines 13 and 14:
"For Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, composed of two battalions of four companies each."

Mr. CLARK. I take it there is no point of order that will lie against that amendment.

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, two years ago we practically took action to abolish the regiment in Porto Rico. I believed then and believe now that there was no reason for its continuance, so far as the necessities of the Government were concerned. The House voted to discontinue it. It went to the Senate and there the action of the House was reversed. We were in conference on the matter, and after some two weeks or more it was decided to let it go for four years. The House agreed to that. They authorized the President to commission the officers for four years. That time, under the law, will not expire for two years yet, and I am not in favor of abolishing it at this time, for the reason that they had a right to expect the regiment to be continued for the four years authorized by Congress. Of course it is claimed from a sentimental standpoint that it is of great benefit to the people of Porto Rico to have two battalions of troops. In my judgment, that benefit could be had just as well by enlisting them and making them a part of the Regular Army; but, as I said before, on account of the action of Congress, ratified by both Houses and approved by the President, by which these officers are commissioned for four years and the troops enlisted for the same time, I am not in favor of reversing that action. There is no point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is to strike out lines 13 and 14, on page 15, which run in this wise: "For Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, composed of two battalions of four companies each," which means that that regiment will be disbanded if my amendment is adopted. The House just went on record in favor of economy. I voted with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] on that proposition to save somewhere from thirty thousand to one hundred thousand dollars a year. This proposition saves a million dollars a year.

I never intend to vote in this House against any proposition that looks to a reasonable economy. I do not care a straw whether Democrats or Republicans are to be made the beneficiaries of these superfluous salaries and expenditures. In any event we have no right to squander the public money. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] admits that there is no use for this regiment. The Secretary of War [Mr. Root] recommended that it be abolished. I have still another objection to it. I object to the establishment in this country and in these dependencies of the United States of a kind of Sepoy troops. I am opposed to any Filipino being in the Army of the United States, or any Porto Rican or any Hawaiian being in that Army. If we are to have a standing army in the United States at all, I want it to be composed of American citizens. There is no sense in any other proposition. The truth about the whole thing is that the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] ought to have been fastened onto this bill. The United States Army ought to be cut down by one-half; and when I say that, I trust I am as patriotic as any other man on this floor.

We never have depended on the Regular Army to do our fighting; we never will depend on the Regular Army to do our fighting. The men that have enabled the United States to conquer in every war that has ever been waged were just such men as we are here to-day. They are men who have no desire to be soldiers, but in the time of stress and trouble will become soldiers through patriotic motives, and then when the war is over and the fighting is finished, instead of wanting to stay in the Army, they will get out of the Army as quick as they can and mingle again in the walks of civil life and become good citizens.

Now, I want to recapitulate this. The Secretary of War said there was no use for this regiment. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House says there is no use for it. My amendment saves a million dollars a year. You gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that displayed your spirit of economy a while ago by saving a paltry $30,000—and I voted with you—come and show your real spirit of economy now by walking up and saving a million dollars. You can not justify yourselves on the other vote if you do not vote for this. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with my colleague or the gentleman from Texas, and I fear not with the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, if I caught properly the tenor of his remarks. I believe that this Porto Rican regiment, if we are going to hold Porto Rico, is eminently a proper thing to maintain. The gentleman can say what he pleases about sepoys, but if you are going to hold foreign possessions you want the natives of those islands in the ranks of your Army. If you would have an India you must enlist your sepoys. If you are going to maintain your possessions in Porto Rico, if it is to be worth anything as a naval base, you have got to build up there a loyal sentiment that in time of war is your support, and there is no better way to build it up than by having the men of that country enlist in the ranks of your Army. If you are going to hold the Philippines, if you are going to have behind you a sentiment that will maintain your naval station and make it a fortress against a foreign foe, you have got to have these men drilled in the ranks of your Army. Therefore I say if you are going to cut out a battalion to save money, cut it out in the United States; it will be better if you are going to occupy these places than to cut it out in the Philippines and Porto Rico.

Now, a word about the Porto Rico regiment. You have there a regiment of native troops, officered by United States citizens, who have been there ever since we took possession of the island, who speak the language, who are acquainted with the manners and customs of the people, and who, I am informed, are commissioned for four years anyhow, even if you strike out this clause. These officers have brought this regiment up to a high state of efficiency, so much so that in the target practice, in competition with the regulars, they won several of the first prizes, and rank among the leaders.

The regiment has been complimented for its efficiency by all who have inspected it, and the proposition now is to strike out this regiment, not for the purpose of reducing the forces particularly, because you could strike one out somewhere else, but because it is not a part of the regular establishment. It does not save a million dollars, as my friend said. If I am properly informed, it saves about a hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HULL. About $146,000.

Mr. CLARK. How many men are there in the regiment?

Mr. COWHERD. I do not know.

Mr. HULL. There are eight companies, making 400 or 500 men.

Mr. SLAYDEN. There are 520.

Mr. CLARK. I want to say that the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. MARSH], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, stated on the floor of this House on cross-examination a year or two ago that it cost a thousand dollars a year, on an average, to maintain a private soldier of the Regular Army in the United States, and the figures of this appropriation bill carry it out.

Mr. COWHERD. I think that was in relation to the Philippine service.

Mr. CLARK. No; it was in relation to the service in this country. He said that it cost $2,000 in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. COWHERD. I base my statement on information from a gentleman well versed in military affairs, but that does not make any difference. If they are not needed, whether it saves $50,000 or $1,000,000, it ought to be saved. The point I make is that if you want to make it simply a matter of saving, decrease the forces in the United States, cut it out in this country; but if you are going to hold these possessions in foreign lands—if you are going to keep them as a part of the United States—I ask you is there any better way to keep them than by building up a spirit of loyalty by men serving under the flag? Will you be any better off down there by discharging the men that have built up this regiment and who are acquainted with the language, manners, and customs of the people, and detailing army officers to take their place who can not speak the language and do not know anything about the people? Which is better, to have the constabulary duties performed by natives or by Americans who will treat the native with that contempt the Anglo-Saxon always shows to those he considers of an inferior race? I am opposed to the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL and Mr. SLAYDEN rose.

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

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is always very difficult for me to resist the eloquence and the logical arguments of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD], and he pleads so persuasively and with such tremendous force that I am almost inclined to think that Kansas City may have contributed a warrior to that regiment.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] that Kansas City has contributed a gentleman, who was a captain in that regiment, and from whom I gathered the information that I have had the pleasure of laying before the House [applause]—information, I want to say, which the gentleman did not see fit to furnish to the committee.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's suggestion that, in order to develop a spirit of patriotism, it is necessary to maintain this regiment, which Secretary Root described as a peculiar and separate organization, and which he declared to be unnecessary, I want to submit that in that same able report he stated—and no man on the floor of this House will question the propriety of the suggestion—that the people of Porto Rico should have the privilege of enlisting in the Army of the United States, and certainly they will there have an opportunity of developing a more purely American and less insular type of patriotism.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman, as a matter of practical affairs, if he thinks that the Porto Ricans would leave their country and come to the United States to enlist in the service of the United States to any large extent?

Mr. SLAYDEN. As a matter of fact, I am told, Mr. Chairman, that they would enlist in the Army of the United States. They would not have to come here for that purpose, because we would send recruiting officers to the island.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] should prevail, would it not be true that the only effect of it would be that, at least for the present, these regiments would not be paid; that they would have to, under their enlistment, remain in the service just the same to the end thereof, although they would not get any pay for it? Is not that the fact?

Mr. CLARK. Now, will the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] allow me to ask him a question? [Laughter.] Does not the gentleman think, really, that if this Congress concluded it wanted to get rid of that regiment that it has ingenuity enough to find some way to muster those fellows out?

Mr. NORRIS. It might do it; but it would have to repeal a law under which they have enlisted.

Mr. CLARK. Well, we might do that.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the gentleman's motion to a great extent, but I submit this proposition to him and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], that if the motion prevails it simply cuts off the money these men would get by virtue of this appropriation, and at least the private soldiers in that regiment could not and would not be allowed to resign like an officer would, and the result would be that they would have to remain in the service without any pay, unless they were afterwards paid by virtue of some other legislation.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that the gentleman is satisfied with the reply made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that somehow or other, in some way, this Government would find a means of getting the men out of the service. I want to say to him, and I ask my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to listen to this for a moment, because he has been led into an error as to the expense of this organization. These men do not get the same pay that the soldiers do in this country. Each Porto Rican soldier has $156 a year.

Mr. CLARK. But it does not change the principle of the thing, does it?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Not at all; and I think that the regiment ought to be abolished, and there are none of the reasons or alleged reasons which have been offered for its continuance that have not been fully answered by Mr. Root while he was Secretary of War.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it the idea of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] that if the motion proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] should prevail, that that would do away with and abolish this regiment in Porto Rico?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was not able to hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman desires to abolish this regiment. I am in favor of that myself, I think, but would the motion of the gentleman from Missouri accomplish that aim?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, there are so many entertaining conversations and interruptions going on round about here that I have still been unable to hear the question of the gentleman from Nebraska, and I will ask him to submit it to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], who is very much closer to him and who can hear him.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] will cease conversation himself, I will try and make him hear. As I understand it, your object is to abolish the regiment in Porto Rico?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think it should be done.

Mr. NORRIS. I have asked you the question, If the motion of the gentleman from Missouri should prevail, would that abolish the regiment? Is it not a fact it would not do anything of the kind?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Well, if it does not, sir, we will have a supplementary act of legislation that will complete the good work.

Mr. NORRIS. That might be, but you make these fellows serve without pay.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, a very few words on this proposition. It is getting late, and I should like for this to go in the RECORD.

Mr. BAKER. I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. HULL. I am not going to conclude debate; it is nearly 5 o'clock, and Members want to go home, and we will take it up the next day and the gentleman will be recognized the first one and have more time for what he desires to say. Mr. Chairman, as to the cost of the regiment, I would say the Porto Rican regiment consists of eight companies, two battalions, and there are eight captains, not mounted, at $1,800 each; one captain, mounted (assistant surgeon), at $2,000; one first lieutenant, mounted (assistant surgeon), at $1,600; two first lieutenants, mounted (battalion adjutants), at $1,600 each; eight first lieutenants, not mounted, at $1,500 each; eight second lieutenants, not mounted, at $1,400 each; or a total of $44,000, with $6,500 additional pay. The enlisted men of the two battalions amount in gross to $95,148, so that the amount saved is not so great.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Do these enlisted soldiers of the Porto Rican regiment receive the same pay as our men?

Mr. HULL. They get a hundred and fifty-six dollars a year. They do not get an increase of pay for reenlistment that is provided for our home men.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. How much do they get a month?

Mr. HULL. They get $13 a month, the same pay as our men, only our men when they reenlist get a dollar a month extra pay up to $18 a month, some of them. Now, Mr. Chairman, I fully indorse all that is said by my friend from Missouri in regard to the desirability of having the enlistment of Porto Ricans in the Army of the United States. I sympathized with that when I did what I could to incorporate them in the Army

of the United States, but what I did not believe was necessary was to have a separate organization, where they were set apart from the rest of the Army of the United States.

What he says is true as to the officers. They have done great service there in drilling, organizing, equipping, and developing the Porto Rican troops. Some of them are too old to go in the Regular Army. Those that are not past the age have the same right to enter the Regular Army that any volunteer soldier has to-day. My objection to continuing it for four years was that in four years' time these men would have an additional claim upon the Government for another extension; but Congress has determined that question and provided that they should be commissioned for four years and these two battalions continued for four years, and in pursuance of the law the Committee on Military Affairs has appropriated here just what the law provides for, and I submit to the Committee of the Whole House that it is not the proper way to reach this question by striking out the pay without abolishing and repealing the law that provided for the continuation of these men.

I fully agree with the gentleman from Missouri that holding the Philippine Islands—holding Porto Rico—we ought to develop the highest sense of patriotism in those islands. There is no better school of patriotism than the uniform of the United States soldier serving under the flag of the Republic [applause], and no act of mine, no vote of mine, will ever be given that will deprive these people of the right to enlist in the Army and serve under our flag. But it should be done in the regular way as soon as the present law expires.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can conclude this to-night, and I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to, and accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOUTELL, 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. 17473, the army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

GEORGE W. SAULPAW.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 1513) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George W. Saulpaw," with a Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

Mr. HASKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, is this matter to come up without unanimous consent? Is this in regular order?

The SPEAKER. This is from the Speaker's table, and I suppose that is the regular order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Has this been to a committee of the House, this amendment of the Senate? What committee does it come from, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. HASKINS. It comes from the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. The bill carries no appropriation.

Mr. BARTLETT. It says $7,000.

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposed the bill carried no appropriation, but the Chair is wrong. The Chair on examining the bill finds that the Senate amendment carries the same provision that the House bill carries, and it seems to be merely a verbal amendment. Then, even if it changed the amount, the Chair is advised, under the ruling heretofore made, that it would not have to go to the Committee of the Whole. It is a new matter that comes by the way of Senate amendment that carries appropriation or makes a charge upon the Treasury that goes to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not desire to make any point of order. I desire to prevent any precedents established by this bill if it ought not to be considered now.

The SPEAKER. The recollection of the Chair is, and he is fortified in that recollection by the best authority of which the Chair is aware, that this is in line with the precedents.

Mr. MADDOX. I would like to ask the gentleman when this bill passed the House?

Mr. HASKINS. It passed the House last February and passed the Senate by simply a verbal amendment.

Mr. MADDOX. I was thinking that we had had no day here for war claims.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. HASKINS] to concur in the Senate amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

On motion of Mr. HASKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 2510. An act for the construction of a steam revenue cutter adapted to service in the waters of Albemarle and Pamlico sounds, North Carolina; and

H. R. 15317. An act to build a bridge across the Ouachita River, Arkansas.

JOHN HENRY LOFLAND, EARL WORDEN CHAFFEE, AND JOSEPH DRUMMOND LITTLE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and was ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In the fall of 1903 John Henry Lofland, Earl Worden Chaffee, and Joseph Drummond Little, then members of the first or highest class at the Naval Academy, severally committed acts for which they were charged with the offense of hazing, were tried by court-martial, and were dismissed from the academy and from the naval service.

In a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, March 21, 1904, the Secretary of the Navy, after reviewing the facts upon which action in the cases of these midshipmen was based, states that "if discretion in the infliction of punishment had been vested either in the court-martial or the Department a lighter punishment than dismissal from the service might have been inflicted," and concludes that Congress is the proper authority to determine in cases of this character whether exception should be made to the operation of the statute.

The Committee on Naval Affairs (H. R. No. 2454, 58th Cong., 2d sess.), upon consideration of the Department's report unanimously concludes that "under all the circumstances no detriment will be done the service" by sanctioning the appointment of these midshipmen to the naval service under appropriate conditions and restrictions.

Upon review of the facts in this case I concur generally in the conclusions of the Secretary of the Navy and the Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to the character of the offenses committed by these midshipmen. Their acts were in plain violation of the letter of the statute, but the case presented is not an aggravated one, and I believe that their severance from the Academy, their reduction to the foot of the class of which they were members, and their entry into the naval service without formal graduation will be adequate punishment.

The draft of a bill granting authority for the appointment of these midshipmen to the Navy, under conditions and restrictions believed to be sufficient to guard the interests of the service, is inclosed for the consideration of the Congress.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1905.*

BRIDGE ACROSS OUACHITA RIVER, CALDWELL, LA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following Senate resolution:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 11, 1905.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 6019) to authorize the parish of Caldwell, La., to construct a bridge across Ouachita River.

Attest:

CHARLES G. BENNETT, *Secretary.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill.

There was no objection.

REPRINT OF REPORT IN SWAYNE IMPEACHMENT CASE.

Mr. OLMSTED. I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of Reports Nos. 1905, 3021, and 3477, being reports in the Swayne impeachment case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] asks unanimous consent for a reprint of Reports Nos. 1905, 3021, and 3477, being reports in the Swayne impeachment case. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GOULD P. AUSTIN.

By unanimous consent leave was granted to Mr. H. L. MAYNARD to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of H. R. 9886, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, granting Gould P. Austin, of Phoebus, Va., permission to erect a building upon the Government reservation at Fortress Monroe, Va., no adverse report having been made thereon.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUNFLOWER RIVER IN MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of bill H. R. 16992.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman form Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of bill H. R. 16992, a bill to authorize the county of Sunflower to construct a bridge across the Sunflower River, Mississippi.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question or two for informa-

tion, reserving the right to object. Has this bill been considered and favorably reported by the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It has.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does it contain the usual specifications and has it received the approval of the Secretary of War?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Very well, I have no objection.

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

On motion of Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HULL. I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of final survey of connecting waters between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, including Hay Lake channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a report from the Director of the Census as to the ginning of cotton in certain States—to the Committee on the Census, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a communication in relation to an invitation to the International Prison Congress to hold its eighth session in the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting a plan for the removal of the remains of Pierre Charles L'Enfant—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmiting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Horace P. Williams against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Fannie Pemberton against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Amelia*, Timothy Hall, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the ship *Jane*, James Barron, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New York, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14626) to quiet titles to land in the city of Mobile, State of Alabama, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3484); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16567) to authorize the Decatur Transportation and Manufacturing Company, a corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the city of Decatur, Ala., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3479); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13772) to amend section 858 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3483); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15324) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Winger, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3480); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16387) grantsame an increase of pension to Sarah F. Mathison, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3481); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5601) granting an increase of pension to John Sutherland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3482); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 266) granting a pension to Emma S. Harney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3485); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1207) granting an increase of pension to James D. Stewart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3486); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2850) granting an increase of pension to Sallie J. Calkins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3487); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3453) granting an increase of pension to David Whitney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3488); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same commitee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3935) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cornelia Hays Ross, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3489); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4169) granting a pension to Galena Jouett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3490); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5472) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Weems, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3491); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5496) granting an increase of pension to Jesse L. Sanders, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3492); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5572) granting an increase of pension to Alafair Chastain, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3493); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5574) granting an increase of pension to Colon Thomas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3494); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5661) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Bush, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3495); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5746) granting an increase of pension to

Anne Jones, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3496); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5758) granting an increase of pension to Sallie B. Weber, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3497); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Eva M. Kingsbury, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3498); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AMES, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4194) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neilan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3499); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7014) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Boyd, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3500); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9405) granting a pension to Andrew Long, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3501); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9906) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Dunn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3502); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10027) granting a pension to Green W. Hodge, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3503); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13332) granting a pension to Honora Sullivan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3504); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13377) granting an increase of pension to Albert R. Straub, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3505); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13546) granting an increase of pension to Joel J. Addison, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3506); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13547) granting an increase of pension to Lewis J. Parr, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3507); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14444) granting an increase of pension to William A. Stovall, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3508); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15197) granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Griffith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3509); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15308) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Prewett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3510); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15892) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Field, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3511); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16109) granting a pension to Alice T. Groesbeck, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3512); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16171) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Tarver, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3513); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16172) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Warren, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3514); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16311) granting an increase of pension to Morris Del Dowane, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3515); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOGG, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16578) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Vifquain, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3516); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16579) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Vanatta, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3517); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16668) granting an increase of pension to Emile H. Brie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3518); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16748) granting a pension to Frona J. Wooten, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3519); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16842) granting an increase of pension to Lydia P. Kelly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3520); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16904) granting a pension to Louis Sherard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3521); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16953) granting an increase of pension to John Ryan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3522); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17139) granting an increase of pension to George W. Jennings, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3523); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17162) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Dukes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3524); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9519) for the relief of John H. Frick—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 17530) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Patterson, deceased—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 10691) granting an incraese of pension to J. W. Hilyard—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under caluse 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 17575) to permit the con-

struction of a dam across the Illinois River at or near Ottawa, Ill.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 17576) to grant to Oden's Battery of Artillery, Arkansas State Guards, the right to use and occupy lots 3, 4, and 5, block 94, Hot Springs, for an armory site—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 17577) authorizing the Lindsey Lumber Company, a corporation of Escambia County, Ala., to construct a bridge across Conecuh River at or near the town of Pollard, in said county and State—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 17578) further to define the duties and powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 17579) to create a new division of the western judicial district of Louisiana, and to provide for terms of court at Lake Charles, La., and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 17580) validating certain conveyances of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company and the Northern Pacific Railway Company—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17581) to provide for the improvement of the harbor at Nome, Alaska—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RIDER: A bill (H. R. 17582) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, and providing for the appointment of probation officers—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SOUTHALL: A bill (H. R. 17583) to macadamize road from Petersburg to the Federal cemetery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 17584) providing for compulsory education in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17585) authorizing the extension of Rhode Island avenue NE.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 17586) to increase the limit of cost of the public building in Lebanon, Lebanon County, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 17587) regulating pilots—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 17588) to provide for furnishing the highest court of each State copies of the Supreme Court Reports hereafter published in exchange for the reports of the highest State courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 17589) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts, to permit and regulate the movement of cattle and other live stock therefrom, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 17599) providing for the appointment of an assistant judge-advocate-general in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A resolution (H. Res. 418) to pay Silas Davidson $25—to the Committee on Accounts.

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. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 17590) for the relief of the Church of Our Redeemer, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 17591) for the relief of the estate of John Ivey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17592) for the relief of the estate of William H. Hugley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17593) for the relief of the estate of John G. Snell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 17594) granting a pension to Maggie Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 17595) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Hogan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 17596) granting an increase of pension to William Davis Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 17597) granting an increase of pension to Levi Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 17598) granting a pension to Kate M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 17600) granting an increase of pension to David H. Quigg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17601) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17602) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17603) for the relief of Harry C. Holmes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 17604) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Cramer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 17605) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Scott—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 17606) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Stuckey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 17607) granting a pension to Elizabeth Barnum—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 17608) granting an increase of pension to James H. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 17609) granting a pension to F. F. Frisby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 17610) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Hamilton, Samuel H. Mains, and Levi Mains, jr., heirs of Levi Mains—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17611) granting an increase of pension to James Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17612) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17613) granting an increase of pension to John A. Curry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17614) granting a pension to Leonard Fields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17615) granting a pension to Mrs. A. H. Maddox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17616) granting a pension to Dehla Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17617) granting a pension to M. T. Mobley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17618) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Hafhill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17619) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Pugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 17620) granting an increase of pension to John W. Roache—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 17621) granting an increase of pension to George H. Barrows—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 17622) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17623) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hagerty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17624) for the relief of Aimee H. Keller—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17625) granting an increase of pension to Siotha Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17626) granting a pension to Thomas Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 17627) granting an increase of pension to Michael D. Kernan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 17628) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Clarksville, Johnson County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 17629) granting a pension to Rachael C. Golden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 17630) granting an increase of pension to H. W. Perkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17631) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17632) granting a pension to James H. Thomas—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 17633) granting a pension to Harriet N. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17634) granting a pension to Lucetta Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 17635) granting a pension to John Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 17636) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Rardin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 17637) granting a pension to Bernard J. Boldermann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17638) granting a pension to Andrew Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 17639) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Junken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17640) granting an increase of pension to John Dineen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 17641) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Schmidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17642) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17643) granting a pension to George Gould—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. ACHESON: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Alexander Caldwell, of Beaver County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Mrs. J. F. Sutherland et al., favoring legislation prohibiting intoxicating liquors in Indian territories—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of Carriage Builders' National Association, increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of General Lyon Post, No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring bill to place Major-General Osterhaus on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of St. Louis, favoring legislation against trust combinations in restraint of trade—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: Papers to accompany bill for relief of David W. Davison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Papers to accompany bill for relief of heirs of William H. Hugley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of John G. Snell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry merchants of Pittsburg, favoring passage of the Hearst bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of cigar and stogie makers of Pittsburg, against reduction of tariff on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition against religious legislation for the District of Columbia, by citizens of Grandy, Minn.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Cambridge, Minn., against legislation in regard to Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of K. P. Ripley, of Marnesbury, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of A. L. Whittaker, of Numfield, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Thomas E. Talbett, of North Brigham, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Samuel Morgan, of Roundtop, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the secretary of Sebring Grange, of Sebring, Pa., against the repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. I. Fick, of Morris, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. E. Hart, of Nauvoo, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. E. Brian, of Nauvoo, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of R. S. Brown, of Morris, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Silas J. Mattison, of Tioga, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. R. Maisser, against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. L. Connelly, of Mainesburg, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of D. L. Myers, of Linden, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of L. W. Spinner, of Genesee, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Thomas Coulston, of Genesee, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John Hat, of Kinney, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. G. Whitney, of Tioga, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of David Wurster, of Linden, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. M. Cathrell, of Tioga, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. F. Harer, of Linden, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of R. F. Buck, of Westfield, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. E. Thomas, of Nelson, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. P. Updyke, of Jackson Summit, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of William Chapman, against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. B. Jones, of Roundtop, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Philander Backus, of Wellsboro, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. C. Scott, of Westfield, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. W. Mescho, of Westfield, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Giles Thomas, of Westfield, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rufus R. Owlitt, of Middlebury Center, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Tioga County Center Grange, of East Charleston, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. B. Smith, of Somers Lane, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Perry Phillips, of Hughesville, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles E. Graham, of Lawrenceville, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of R. E. Graves, of Genesee, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Nauvoo Grange, against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lamar Grange, of Saloma, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Grange, of Wellsboro, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Sullivan Grange, of Tioga County, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Pomona Grange, of Clinton County, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRESSER: Papers to accompany bill for relief of William Larkin, of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Cramer, of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring a law reducing duties on products from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Receivers and Shippers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring national legislation regulating rates of transportation as embodied in Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Charles Stoughton et al., concerning Harlem Kills Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of H. W. Buckbee, of Rockford, Ill., favoring Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Skandia Furniture Company, of Rockford, Ill., favoring bill H. R. 6273—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Humane Association, concerning protection of range cattle—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the United Confederate Veterans, asking appropriate legislation favoring care and preservation of the graves of Confederate dead in northern cemeteries—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Gloucester, Mass., favoring a constitutional amendment abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Ozenas Shipman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Joseph B. Scott—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Papers to accompany bill for relief of J. W. Hely, of Ohio—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: Petition of soldiers in support of bill H. R. 17514, granting increase pension to John H. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Ida Eubank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEARST: Petition of business men of Spencer, Iowa, urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of business men of Plattsmouth, Nebr., urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Illinois, urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Blanchester, Ohio, urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Neoga, Ill., urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lincoln Commercial Club, of Lincoln, Nebr., urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of merchants et al. of St. Louis, urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Alexis, Ill., urging passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry business firms of New York, urging enactment of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of Old Soldiers' Republican Club, of Evansville, Ind., favoring the Crumpacker bill—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Rexford Bolt Works, of Rockford, Ill., favoring the Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Petition of commercial organizations of San Francisco, urging adoption of pneumatic-tube service for mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LILLEY: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 16126) for relief of Leroy Noble—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 17428—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Camp No. 192, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Palmyra, Pa., favoring enactment of laws restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of the Hunter Company et al., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petition of B. R. Thomas et al., favoring legislation to improve navigation of the Tennessee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Mrs. G. M. Wolfe et al., of Montgomery County, Md., for a constitutional amendment abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts: Petition of G. Fred Hammond and others, for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of the Massachusetts Sunday School Association, for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Newton, Mass., for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Baptist Church of Hyde Park, Mass., for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Norwood Business Association and Board of Trade, for passage of bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Leonard A. Jones et al., relative to statistics concerning marriage and divorce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 22 citizens of New Bedford, Mass., against bill H. R. 4859—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REID: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 17544, granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Fisk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 12104, for relief of Lagrange College—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Colorado beet-sugar manufacturers, against reduction of duties on raw or refined sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Mound, Ill., relating to an amendment of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Petition of the Hartford Commercial Club, favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Papers to accompany bill for relief of William A. Crum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Papers to accompany bill for relief of William Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of Abraham Stine, of Rinard, Ill.—to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 12, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

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.

STATUE OF FRANCES E. WILLARD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS) laid before the Senate a communication from the governor of the State of Illinois, requesting that a date be fixed for the acceptance by Congress of the statue of Frances E. Willard; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

MINT AT DENVER, COLO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Mint amending that portion of his estimate of December 14, 1904, relative to the wages of workmen at the mint at Denver, Colo., for the fiscal year 1905, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL PRISON CONGRESS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter from Hon. Samuel J. Barrows, Commissioner for the United States on the International Prison Commission, relative to the passage of a resolution by Congress authorizing the President to extend to the International Prison Congress an invitation to hold the Eighth International Prison Congress in the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF REMAINS OF MAJOR L'ENFANT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting certain information relative to the removal of the remains of Major l'Enfant; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

ELECTORAL VOTES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice-President for the State of Wisconsin; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to be filed.