bureau in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Walnut Grove Church, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the National Board of Trade, for the merchant-marine shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, against the Little and Gilbert bills for immunity to labor organizations in disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of the mayor and city council of Newport, R. I., for an increase in the United States artillery forces—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of citizens of Chadron, Nebr., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Rose Haynes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edwin R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for an appropriation to improve the Coney Island channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Intermunicipal Research Commission, for bill H. R. 17511, relative to protection of the unemployed who seek work through employment agencies—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of S. P. Onderdonk et al., for relief of the Indians in northern California and legislation for relief of the Indians of southern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Generals Raum, Crawford, and Birney, for bill S. 2162, to create a volunteer retired list of surviving generals of volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Josephine Honor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of women of Chicago, against conditions existing in the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Rebecca A. Cole—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Washington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Hezekiah James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. M. H. Major et al., of Saline County, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Richard B. Rankin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Council Bluffs, Iowa, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Woodbine, for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of L. P. Onderdonk et al., for relief of the Indians of northern and southern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of H. C. Hartwell et al., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEEMS: Petition of Pride of Maynard Council, No. 17, Daughters of Liberty, of Maynard, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *April 19, 1906.*

The Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, offered the following prayer:

My soul thirsteth for God—for the living God. When shall I come and appear before God? O my God, my soul is cast down within me. Therefore will I remember Thee! Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise Him who is the health of my countenance and my God.

Let us pray.

Father, we have thanked Thee for the blessings of the past; we have asked Thy help in every way in the duties of the day. Now we come to Thee in sorrow and in calamity to ask Thee to give us the same strength, the same blessedness, and to show that in all partial evil Thy universal good shall prevail. Tell us what this is, that Thou art the living God with us always. We are weak, but Thou art strong; we know nothing, but Thou knowest everything; we are in darkness, but Thou art in the light.

O Father, come to us as a father to his children. Be with those who are in the greatest sorrow and trial. Strengthen us all by Thy infinite strength, that we may know Thee and enter into Thy service and go about Thy business; that in joy or in sorrow, in gladness or in weakness, we may know that we are the living children of a living God. So, not in vain for us that Thou hast spoken to us, and though we do not see Thee with the eye, that Thou art willing to write Thy laws upon our hearts. Father, we ask it in Christ Jesus.

Our Father who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is done in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, Thine is the power, Thine is the glory, forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, out of the regular order of business I desire to introduce a joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. R. 48) authorizing the Secretary of War to use rations and quartermaster's supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the region devastated by earthquake and fire in the State of California, and making an appropriation to relieve the sufferers by said disaster, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the most terrible disaster which has ever taken place on this continent has occurred in the State of California, in which one-half of the city of San Francisco has been practically destroyed by earthquake and fire, and many towns and cities along the coast have suffered from similar devastation; and

Whereas in all of the afflicted localities there has been wrought such ruin as has resulted in great loss of life and the serious injury of thousands of people; and

Whereas the destruction of dwelling houses has rendered homeless 100,000 of the inhabitants of San Francisco alone; and

Whereas there is most urgent need of means to bury the dead, care for the injured, and shelter and feed the homeless; and

Whereas the local administrations will for some time be unable to cope with the situation and extend such aid and assistance as is immediately necessary: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $500,000, or such part thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by and under the direction of the Secretary of War in the purchase and distribution of quartermaster's and commissary stores to such injured and destitute persons as may require assistance in the district devastated by earthquake and fire. And the Secretary of War is authorized to use the steamers and other boats and vessels belonging to or now employed by the Government upon San Francisco Bay or adjacent waters in the transportation and distribution of supplies furnished by the United States or individuals to and among such destitute and suffering people, and he may employ such other means of transportation as he may deem necessary to carry the purpose of this joint resolution into effect.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution just read?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that the joint resolution be immediately transmitted to the House.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be immediately transmitted, as requested by the Senator from California.

Mr. HALE. Has there come from the House a small deficiency bill providing for the sending home of the bodies of the officers and seamen who were killed on board the *Kearsarge?*

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that no such bill has come to the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Whenever it does come I desire to have it put on its passage without a reference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Maine will be noted.

FISHING IN ALASKAN WATERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 267) to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

prohibit aliens from fishing in the waters of Alaska, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That it shall be unlawful for any person not a citizen of the United States, or who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and is a bona fide resident therein, or for any company, corporation, or association not organized or authorized to transact business under the laws of the United States or under the laws of any State, Territory, or district thereof, or for any person not a native of Alaska, to catch or kill, or attempt to catch or kill, except with rod, spear, or gaff, any fish of any kind or species whatsoever in any of the waters of Alaska under the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall prevent those lawfully taking fish in the said waters from selling the same, fresh or cured, in Alaska or in Alaskan waters, to any alien person, company, or vessel then being lawfully in said waters: *And provided further,* That nothing contained in this act shall prevent any person, firm, corporation, or association lawfully entitled to fish in the waters of Alaska from employing as laborers any aliens who can now be lawfully employed under the existing laws of the United States, either at stated wages or by piecework, or both, in connection with Alaskan fisheries, canneries, salteries, etc.

SEC. 2. That every person, company, corporation, or association found guilty of a violation of any provision of this act or of any regulation made thereunder shall, for each offense, be fined not less than $100 nor more than $500, which fine shall be a lien against any vessel or other property of the offending party or which was used in the commission of such unlawful act. Every vessel used or employed in violation of any provision of this act or of any regulation made thereunder shall be liable to a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $500, and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any court having jurisdiction of the offense.

SEC. 3. That the violation of any provision of this act or of any regulation made thereunder may be prosecuted in any United States district court of Alaska, California, Oregon, or Washington.

SEC. 4. That the collector of customs of the district of Alaska is hereby authorized to search and seize every foreign vessel and arrest every person violating any provision of this act or any regulation made thereunder, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall have power to authorize officers of the Navy and of the Revenue-Cutter Service and agents of the Department of Commerce and Labor to likewise make such searches, seizures and arrests. If any foreign vessel shall be found within the waters to which this act applies, having on board fresh or cured fish and apparatus or implement suitable for killing or taking fish, it shall be presumed that the vessel and apparatus were used in violation of this act until it is otherwise sufficiently proved. And every vessel, its tackle, apparatus, or implements so seized shall be given into the custody of the United States marshal of either of the districts mentioned in section 3 of this act, and shall be held by him subject to the proceedings provided for in section 2 of this act. The facts in connection with such seizure shall be at once reported to the United States district attorney for the district to which the vessel so seized shall be taken, whose duty it shall be to institute the proper proceedings.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall have power to make rules and regulations not inconsistent with law to carry into effect the provisions of this act. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to enforce the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations made thereunder, and for that purpose he may employ, through the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Navy, the vessels of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service and of the Navy: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as affecting any existing treaty or convention between the United States and any foreign power.

Mr. FULTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. NELSON. I wish the Senator would let it lie over for the day, so that I can examine it.

Mr. FULTON. Certainly. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. FULTON subsequently said: A few minutes ago there was laid before the Senate certain amendments of the House to Senate bill 267, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] asked that it might go over. He has looked into the bill and finds no objection to the same. I ask now that my motion to concur in the amendments of the House be considered.

Mr. HOPKINS. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon what are the amendments of the House?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the amendment had better be printed. I do not like this manner of legislating, where some one consents to agreeing to an amendment without having it read or without any knowledge of it. I ask that it may be printed.

Mr. FULTON. The amendment has been read. But I have no objection to letting it go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let it be printed, so that we will know something about how to legislate on the subject.

Mr. HOPKINS. The reason why I asked the question was that the bill was originally reported from my committee.

Mr. FULTON. The amendment made by the House was designed to permit the employment of Chinese laborers in canneries. The bill is designed to exclude Japanese, although they are not named, but they have been going into Alaskan waters with their vessels and engaging in fishing there. It is designed to prevent that abuse.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senator has no objection to the amendment going over until to-morrow morning?

Mr. FULTON. Certainly not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Michael C. Drennan *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Adelaide R. Shaw, widow of Samuel F. Shaw, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Antonio A. Lynch, Margaret Lynch, Charlotte L. Carmoody, Josephine L. Ridgeway, Jane L. Canby, children of Dominick Lynch, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Josiah D. Aiken *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Kate R. Emmerich and Parthenia E. Altemus, sisters of Charles F. Emmerich, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Samuel Cross *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Mary S. Clark, widow of Frank H. Clark, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of William G. Sprostan, brother of John G. Sprostan, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Mary S. Franklin, widow of Augustus S. Franklin, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Edward D. Marchant, son of Cornelius M. Marchant, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Marcus D. Hyde *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Louisa I. Laine, widow of Richard W. Laine, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Hannah M. Coon, widow (remarried) of Edward B. Brigham, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

H. R. 14591. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River in or near the city of Clarksville, State of Tennessee;

H. R. 14592. An act to authorize the construction of two bridges across the Cumberland River at or near Nashville, Tenn.; and

H. R. 17135. An act providing that the State of Montana be permitted to relinquish to the United States certain lands heretofore selected and select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11565. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Brinker;

H. R. 14184. An act to extend the irrigation act to the State of Texas;

H. R. 16133. An act to simplify the issue of enrollments and licenses of vessels of the United States;

H. R. 17757. An act extending to the subport of Spokane, in the State of Washington, the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement; and

H. R. 18334. An act making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for bringing home remains of officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who die abroad.

The message further returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 4952) making an appropriation for the improvement of the mouth of the Columbia River.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

H. R. 229. An act providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins, and the distribution and redemption of said coins;

H. R. 11976. An act for the relief of the Compañía de los Ferrocarriles de Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13103. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 17987. An act making an appropriation for the improvement of the mouth of the Columbia River.

BRINGING HOME OF REMAINS OF OFFICERS AND MEN OF NAVY.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the bill making an appropriation to supply a deficiency be laid before the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 18334) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for bringing home remains of officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who die abroad was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

That to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for "bringing home the remains of officers and men, Navy and Marine Corps, who die abroad," on account of the fiscal year 1906, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,000.

Mr. HALE. I do not think there is any need of a reference in this case. I ask that the bill be put upon its passage.

There being no objection, the bill was read and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Council of Jewish Women of New York City, N. Y., and a petition of the State Consumers' League of New York, praying for an investigation into the industrial conditions of women and children in the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BACON presented a petition from sundry citizens of Greensboro, Ga., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against the Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the T Square Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the pending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the congregation of Trinity Lutheran Church and of the Ministerial Association, of Milton, in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for extension of time in the interstate transportation of live stock; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Sorosis Club, of Langhorne, Pa., praying for a scientific investigation into the industrial condition of the women of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Rhode Island Historical Society, of Providence, R. I., praying that an appropriation be made for the repair of the old frigate *Constitution* and its assignment to duty as a training ship; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN presented a petition of Local Union 1128, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Roanoke, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 4135) for the relief of the legal representatives of S. A. Buckner; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McLAURIN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10152) granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park and cemetery purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 544) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Great Falls, Mont., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4956) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Versailles, in the State of Kentucky, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, asked to be discharged from their further consideration, and that they be referred to the Committee on the Library; which was agreed to:

A bill (S. 5739) providing for the acceptance by the United States Government of the Old Flag House, tendered by the American Flag House and Betsy Ross Association; and

A bill (S. 5694) providing for the appointment of a national advisory board on civic art.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 15513) to declare and enforce the forfeiture provided by section 4 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1875, entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16954) providing for the reappraisement of certain suburban lots in the town site of Port Angeles, Wash., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1274) authorizing a public building at Washington, N. C., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2139) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Anton Ernst, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLAY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14508) permitting the building of dams across the north and south branches of Rock River, adjacent to Vandruffs Island and Carrs Island, and across the cut-off between said islands, in Rock Island County, Ill., in aid of navigation and for the development of water power, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. BULKELEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3862) to correct the military record of Lora E. Reed, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4089) to place David Robertson, sergeant, first class, Hospital Corps, on the retired list of the United States Army, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5639) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Jaun, P. R., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

REMOVAL OF DERELICTS.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce to report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5683) to provide for the removal of derelicts and other floating dan-

gers to navigation, and I submit a report thereon. The committee instructed me to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

I wish to say just one word in relation to it. It has the approval of the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Commerce and Labor. A bill similar to it was reported from the Committee on Commerce in the last Congress and passed the Senate. It was reported favorably in the House, but no action was taken there. Also, a bill of the same kind was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs and passed the Senate, but received no action in the House.

This bill was presented only ten days ago, and I presume that I have received a hundred resolutions and requests from boards of trade, chambers of commerce, boards of underwriters, and ship associations, from Maine to New Orleans, urging the immediate passage of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to have constructed a steam vessel specially fitted for and adapted to service at sea in bad weather, for the purpose of blowing up or otherwise destroying or towing into port wrecks, derelicts, and other floating dangers to navigation, the vessel to be operated and maintained by the Revenue-Cutter Service under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Section 2 appropriates $250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of the act.

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

Mr. FRYE. I ask that the report and the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5863) to provide for the removal of derelicts and other floating dangers to navigation, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it pass without amendment.

The bill has the approval of the Treasury Department, as will appear by the appended letter of the Secretary, inclosing a draft of the bill and giving the reasons for its enactment.

The necessity for such legislation was pointed out by the Washington International Marine Conference of 1889. Efforts to secure an international agreement for the marking and destruction of these menaces to navigation have failed, and, naturally, because derelicts are chiefly American wooden schooners, lumber laden. Efforts to secure the removal or destruction of derelicts have been prosecuted in a desultory fashion, largely because jurisdiction has not been lodged in either of the three Departments of the Government which might well claim it, namely, the Treasury, Commerce and Labor, and Navy Departments.

In the Fifty-eighth Congress a bill was reported from this committee, appropriating $175,000 for the construction of a steam vessel to be used for this purpose, under the direction of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and authorizing the detail by the President, from time to time, of any public vessel for the removal or destruction of derelicts. That bill passed the Senate and was favorably reported to the House by its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but failed to receive consideration in that body.

In the same Congress a bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, providing for the construction of a derelict destroyer at a cost not exceeding $300,000, to be operated under the direction of the Navy Department. This bill likewise passed the Senate and was referred in the House to the same Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it lay without action.

The above-mentioned bills had the approval of the Departments of Commerce and Labor and the Navy, respectively; and the present measure, being recommended by the Treasury Department, it will be seen that three of the Executive Departments have approved of the construction of such a vessel as the bill contemplates, but, naturally perhaps, each has heretofore sought for itself the supervision of the work. It is not understood by this committee that the Department of Commerce and Labor now urges such a claim; and the Revenue-Cutter Service seems to be peculiarly adapted to this responsibility, having had large experience in the succoring of vessels in all kinds of weather.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 12, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE,
Chairman Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

SIR: I transmit herewith a bill to provide for the removal of derelicts and other floating dangers to navigation, with the request that you will introduce the same in the Senate of the United States, as I believe the measure is in accordance with the commercial interests of the country.

This bill provides for the construction of a steam vessel for the purpose of destroying or towing into port derelicts and other floating dangers to navigation, such vessel to be operated by the Revenue-Cutter Service, and to be specially fitted for this duty under all conditions of wind and sea.

It is a fact well recognized by those who are familiar with the navigation of vessels at sea that there is no greater danger to commerce than the presence of derelicts in the paths of navigation. These derelicts are chiefly wooden sailing vessels, laden with lumber, which have been abandoned at sea. They are practically unsinkable, and are a constant menace to all vessels passing in their vicinity. On the Atlantic coast of the United States they are carried, through the influence of the Gulf Stream, to the northward along the coast, directly in the track of the large coasting fleet, and finally are borne to the eastward in the paths of the trans-Atlantic liners, so that by the influence of this current the derelicts are constantly in waters where they constitute an ever-present danger to shipping. A derelict is a constant menace and obstruction to commerce until it is destroyed or is finally broken to pieces by the wind and sea.

The Pilot Chart for April, 1906, shows the existence on the Atlantic coast of the United States of ten derelicts and seven buoys adrift, all of danger to vessels that may encounter them while running at high speed at night or in thick weather.

The removal of these dangers is a duty that devolves naturally upon the Government, and can only be efficiently performed by a vessel specially fitted for and adapted to such service.

The proposed vessel will be always available to proceed promptly to the destruction of any floating wreck that may be reported. The nature of her construction, which will enable her to keep the sea at all times, and the provision that will be made for efficient towing will make her also an important factor in rendering aid to shipping in distress—a work in which the Revenue-Cutter Service is already engaged and with which it is entirely familiar.

The interests of commerce emphatically call for the removal of these floating obstructions in the paths of navigation, and I believe the passage of this bill in providing a vessel for this special purpose, under the control of the Revenue-Cutter Service, which is charged particularly with rendering aid to commerce, will be an important safeguard looking to the preservation of human life and property at sea.

The sum proposed to be appropriated, $250,000, should be sufficient for the construction and equipment of a vessel well adapted to this work.

Respectfully, L. M. SHAW, *Secretary.*

MISSISSIPPI RIVER DAM IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. NELSON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5357) permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River above the village of Monticello, Wright County, Minn., to report it favorably without amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

SHIPPING IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on the Philippines I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 18025) to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes, and I am instructed by the committee to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It merely postpones the operation of the coastwise law.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to inquire if the bill permits enrolled vessels of the United States to engage in trade between our ports and Philippine ports. In other words, does it put the Philippine Islands within our domestic trade?

Mr. LODGE. No. The purpose of the act is to postpone the application of the coastwise law until April 11, 1909.

Mr. MALLORY. I understand that.

Mr. LODGE. That is all there is in the act which is new. The rest is a mere reenactment of existing law.

Mr. MALLORY. From the language of the act I am inclined to think that after 1909 domestic coastwise vessels will be enabled to go into that trade.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, after April 11, 1909, on which date the Spanish treaty limitation expires, the trade will be confined to coastwise vessels of American registry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PENROSE. I do not desire to obstruct the bill, but I should like to have an opportunity to look into it. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to permit it to go over until tomorrow. I object to its consideration at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the bill will lie over.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 5766) providing a method whereby persons may be admitted to become citizens of the Philippine Islands, and extending the naturalization laws of the United States to citizens of the Philippine Islands on the same conditions as are applicable to aliens; which was read twice by its title, and, together with the accompanying memoranda and letters from the War Department, which were ordered to be printed, referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 5767) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Welch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 5768) for the relief of Mary E. Collier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 5769) to declare the true intent and meaning of parts of the act entitled "An act in relation to testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission," and so forth, approved February 11, 1893, and an act entitled "An act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor," approved February 14, 1903, and an act entitled "An act to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States," approved February 19, 1903, and an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 5770) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to add to the segregation of coal and asphalt lands in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5771) granting a pension to Mary E. Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduce a bill (S. 5772) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Harris; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. KNOX submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12987) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CARTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $350 for the preparation of a table of contents and index to the final report of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted the following amendments intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which were ordered to lie on the table, and be printed:

An amendment relative to the sale for town-site purposes by any Indian allottee of any portion of the lands allotted to him;

An amendment authorizing the issuance of a fee-simple patent to Demas Eastman, a Santee Sioux allottee; and

An amendment authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee simple to the widow and heirs of Charley Adass for land in the Olympia land district, State of Washington.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming submitted an amendment providing that section 15 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," shall not take effect until the date of the dissolution of the tribal governments of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole tribes, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment providing that the pay and allowances for civil engineers and assistant civil engineers shall be the same as are and may be provided by or in pursuance of law for naval constructors and assistant naval constructors, and also that the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks shall be selected from the members of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy having not less than seven years of active service, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—ALFRED M'PHERRAN.

On motion of Mr. PENROSE, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Alfred McPherran, accompanying Senate bill S. 527, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, copies of the same to be left in the files, as provided by clause 2 of Rule XXX.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—FRANCES E. TAYLOR.

On motion of Mr. PENROSE, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Frances E. Taylor, accompanying Senate bill S. 4853, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, copies of the same to be left in the files, as provided by clause 2 of Rule XXX.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 14184. An act to extend the irrigation act to the State of Texas was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation.

H. R. 17757. An act extending to the subport of Spokane, in the State of Washington, the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 11565. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Brinker was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS IN CALIFORNIA.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 140) providing relief to the sufferers in California was read twice by its title.

Mr. PERKINS. Inasmuch as the Senate has passed an appropriate joint resolution making an appropriation of a definite sum, I think this joint resolution may temporarily lie upon the table until we know the action to be taken by the House upon the Senate joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

PRACTICE OF PHARMACY AND SALE OF POISONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8997) regulating the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the House of Representatives, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. BURKETT, and Mr. MARTIN the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLMENTS AND LICENSES OF VESSELS.

The bill (H. R. 16133) to simplify the issue of enrollments and licenses of vessels of the United States was read the first time by its title.

Mr. FRYE. That bill is exactly the same in effect and in words as the one which passed the Senate a considerable time ago. I ask that it may be put upon its passage.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

That under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed from time to time to consolidate into one document in the case of any vessel of the United States of 20 net register tons or over, the form of enrollment prescribed by section 4319 of the Revised Statutes and the form of license prescribed by section 4321 of the Revised Statutes, and such consolidated form shall hereafter be issued to a vessel of the United States in lieu of the separate enrollment and license, now prescribed by law, and shall be deemed sufficient compliance with the requirements of laws relating to the subject.

SEC. 2. That section 4325 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read:

"SEC. 4325. The license granted to any vessel shall be presented for renewal by endorsement to the collector of customs of the district in which the vessel then may be within three days after the expiration of the time for which it was granted, or, if she be absent at that time, within three days from her first arrival within a district. In case of change of build, ownership, district, trade, or arrival under temporary papers in the district where she belongs the license shall be surrendered. If the master shall fail to deliver the license he shall be liable to a penalty of $10, which shall not be mitigated."

SEC. 3. That this act shall not be construed to amend any law now in force concerning the compensation of officers of the customs for service connected with the enrollment and license of vessels.

SEC. 4. That this act shall take effect on and after January 1, 1907.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. FRYE. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 4886, a bill of a similar nature, was passed, and I move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine enters a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 4886 was passed, and moves that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (S. 4952) making an appropriation for the improvement of the mouth of the Columbia River, returned from the House of Representatives at the request of the Senate.

Mr. FULTON. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on Senate bill 4250, in reference to the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, etc.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4250) to further enlarge the powers and authority of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service and to impose further duties thereon.

Mr. MORGAN. The House of Representatives has stricken out all of the Senate bill except the enacting clause, and has sent us a bill which is a substitute for that. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives and ask for a conference with the House.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I should like that matter to lie on the table and be printed. It is not a case where the other body has amended and changed certain features, but has substituted an entirely new bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; an entirely new bill.

Mr. HALE. I do not want the matter to go to conference until it has been printed and Senators can see what the new bill is.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I ask that the bill may be printed and laid on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be printed and laid on the table, in the absence of objection.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12987) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise to correct a statement which appears in the Washington Post of this morning. In its account of a conference held by Democratic Senators yesterday it says, among other things:

> The principal differences in the conference were precipitated by a speech made by Senator BAILEY, that his court feature provided for a limited review. Exception was taken by his colleague, Senator CULBERSON, who declared that it was a broad review, and from this point the discussion passed to the several pending amendments to prevent restraining orders being issued to interfere with rates established by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. President, of course I understand how inexcusable it would be for any Senator to abuse the patience and consume the time of the Senate in correcting the numerous and unavoidable mistakes which are made by even the most intelligent and conscientious reporters; but this seems to be rather an exceptional case, because as this paper is printed here at the seat of government, and as it is generally so careful and accurate, editors throughout the country might well be misled into accepting this statement as true, while in fact it does not bear a resemblance to the truth.

In the conference of yesterday I carefully avoided complicating the question of prohibiting preliminary injunction with any other question, and I did that so that we might have the sense of the Senators who had assembled there upon that separate and independent question. There are differences enough among Democratic Senators without misrepresenting and exaggerating them.

While I am on my feet, I desire to say a word, and only a word, about the court provision in the amendment which I had the honor to offer to the bill. When that entire amendment was at first submitted, the principal, and in fact I might say the only attack upon it was directed against the proviso which prohibited the courts from suspending the orders of the Commission by interlocutory or preliminary injunction. When that attack was made, and was answered, at least to the satisfaction of all Democratic Senators with three or four exceptions, then its critics began to assert that its court provision was altogether too broad.

How any man could have reached that conclusion I am unable to understand; and I am confident that any man who understands the English language can be made to see that it is the narrowest one which has been proposed, or even suggested, that would stand the test of a judicial scrutiny under the Constitution. Certainly I endeavored to make it as narrow as it could be made without making it unconstitutional, and if any Senator in this body will propose an amendment or a substitute that narrows it without invalidating it, I pledge him my support in his effort to have it adopted.

It is my opinion that the Commission is better qualified than any court to judge and to decide what are just and reasonable railroad rates, and in accordance with that opinion my purpose has been to commit as much power to the Commission and as little power to the court as is consistent with the requirement of the Constitution.

I think, Mr. President, this much ought to be said in answer, not only to this, but to many other misstatements which have been published about the proceedings of that conference.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I want to correct another error which came into history in regard to the transaction of the conference, and I want to say further that there was no excuse for any of these errors, because half a dozen or more correspondents came into my committee room after the conference adjourned and I gave out an accurate and a more or less circumstantial statement of what had transpired.

The error to which I wish to allude and correct is that in some of the newspaper reports which I have seen it has been declared that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] took advantage of the temporary absence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and moved to adjourn the caucus. That does the Senator from Maryland a grave injustice, because he is incapable of taking advantage of anybody. When the poll was had, which I took myself by going around and checking off the sentiment or the position of every Senator present, we had accomplished all that we had ever undertaken; and that was, to find out just how Senators stood on that proviso at the end of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina if he has any objection to putting in the RECORD the official report of this conference?

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from South Carolina will inform the Senator from Rhode Island that at the proper time, when a vote on that amendment comes before the Senate, that will go into the RECORD in the official proceedings.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator said he had informed a limited number of newspaper correspondents of what was done.

Mr. TILLMAN. Everybody who asked for it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think, certainly, the Senate ought to be treated with an equal amount of sincerity, and that the Senator should state to the Senate just what occurred.

Mr. BAILEY. With the permission of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], I wish to say that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] does not appear to need that enlightenment, because within the last week he volunteered to us the information that we could only have twenty-five votes on this side of the Chamber for this amendment, and he appears to have known what he was talking about.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think very likely he did, Mr. President, and I will state to the Senator that I believe my information on that subject was accurate, and I think the result will show it. But that is a little aside from what we now have in hand; which is to get this matter of what took place at this conference before the Senate and before the country in an authentic way.

Mr. TILLMAN. Why does the Senator from Rhode Island want it before the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. Because I should like to know what took place, as we have two Senators here disclaiming one report.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was disclaiming a newspaper statement, not a report.

Mr. ALDRICH. If there is any official report—the Senator has already said that he gave out to a certain number of newspaper correspondents a correct statement—I think we ought to have the benefit of that information.

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that this division among the Democrats is the first crumb of comfort the Senator from Rhode Island has had since this bill came before the Senate, and he ought not to be denied the full enjoyment of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that is true. I have been in the Senate for quite a number of years, and there always have been on that side and on this such differences; but I think it is quite fair, so long as this disclaimer has taken place, that we should be advised of the accuracy as to the statement made through the newspapers.

Mr. BAILEY. The only trouble with the Senator from Rhode Island and his party associates is that they dare not go into caucus because, if they did, they would have to get a fireproof curtain to prevent a disaster if they should talk in such a caucus as they do in private conversation. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the fact that we have had no conference, and that conferences are not necessary, on this side, shows that the condition is not quite so radical and not quite so spectral as is suggested to me.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Rhode Island will know in full time how the Democrats in the Senate will vote on this question. He need not fret; he can possess his soul in patience;

but I think I can assure him that he will not be very well pleased at the outcome when the vote is taken. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the matter to which I wanted to get the attention of the Senate does not refer to the rate bill, but refers to a brief colloquy which I had the day before yesterday with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] in regard to the John R. Walsh bank failure in Chicago. It will be remembered that in the resolution which I had the honor to introduce among other subjects for investigation was the failure of the Walsh bank and the action of the associated banks of Chicago in assuming the liabilities of the Walsh bank, guaranteeing full payment of all the debts and taking charge of all the properties, including, as I have found out since, three railroads. The subject seemed to me one eminently proper for the Committee on Finance to examine into and to determine whether or no the law had been broken. In the colloquy I asked the Senator from Illinois whether or not the grand jury had indicted Mr. Walsh. He said most positively, "No," but he acted with some disingenuousness, if I may say it with due respect, because he did not go on to give the Senate the full benefit of his information. I have since discovered that while the Senator was entirely correct technically in stating that Walsh had not been indicted by the grand jury, this is the condition of affairs; and that is what I had in mind when I asked the question. In other words, Mr. Walsh has been arrested upon the report of bank examiners; he is out under bond; and in the meantime he has had five separate and distinct postponements of the inquiry instituted by the district attorney in reference to Walsh's criminality; and I wish to have read here the news service of the Chicago Record-Herald, which is not a "muck raker," showing what is considered to be correct information in the city of Chicago itself in reference to this Walsh banking business. I ask that the Secretary read the paragraph through which a blue pencil has been run.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

John R. Walsh, whose arrest on March 9 on the charge of violating the Federal banking laws while he was president of the Chicago National Bank caused a sensation in the financial world, was given a fifth postponement of his preliminary hearing yesterday morning before United States Commissioner Mark A. Foote. The case was continued to May 3. District Attorney Morrison stated that the continuance had been granted so that all the evidence might be presented to the next Federal grand jury, which will convene May 15, regardless of whether, in the meantime, any hearings were held before the commissioner.

The unusual delay in the case, the remarkable courtesies extended to Mr. Walsh in the Federal building, and the ready acquiescence of the Government officials in postponements of the hearing combined to lend color to the report that the ex-banker had powerful political influences behind him at Washington.

"PULL" WITH SENATORS?

His "pull," according to general understanding, reached to United States Senators and some of the most prominent officials in touch with the Department of Justice. It was even rumored on the street that Mr. Walsh never would be brought to trial on the charge that he had made a false report of the condition of his banks a few days prior to the crash.

The motion for a continuance was made yesterday by Assistant District Attorney Childs. Hitherto the requests for postponement have been made by Mr. Walsh's attorneys, and have met with no opposition from the Government. This time Mr. Childs, in explanation of his motion for a continuance, stated that Mr. Walsh's lawyers had filed a detailed answer to the charges in the complaint. The answer, or statement, is said to be a denial of the charge that the funds of the bank had been juggled, and a showing in support of the claim that all the memorandum notes involved in the failure of the Walsh banks were covered by valid securities.

INQUIRY TO BE SECRET.

The probability of witnesses disappearing before this statement from Walsh can be thoroughly examined was a topic of discussion yesterday among lawyers, after it had been announced by Mr. Childs that it would require several weeks of work by experts to determine its accuracy. This examination, which will be made in the district attorney's office behind closed doors, may determine the whole case, and even keep it out of the grand jury room, it is claimed by some of Walsh's friends.

* * * * * * *

RECORD OF CONTINUANCES.

Mr. Walsh's case is now in the hands of Mr. Morrison, as a matter of fact, although it seems to be before Commissioner Foote. The record of the case since the day of the banker's arrest is as follows:

March 19.—Continuance granted to March 19 on the argument of Walsh's lawyers that they had not had time to prepare for a hearing; no objection by the attorney for the Government.

March 19.—Continuance granted on the ground that Mr. Walsh's lawyer, W. T. Abbott, was out of the city on legal business.

March 27.—Attorney Abbott was granted another continuance after pleading that he had been out of the city and had not had time to prepare a defense; case set for April 6.

April 6.—Continuance asked on the ground that the defense was not ready for the hearing, and date set for April 16 without opposition on the part of the Government.

April 16.—Continuance granted on the motion of Assistant District Attorney Childs until May 3, with the stipulation that a further continuance of ten days might be granted at that time if the examination of the books was not completed on that date.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have here another clipping from the Chicago Daily News of April 17, in which appears, under the head of "Other Phases of the Situation," the following:

It was also reported to-day:

That the clearing-house banks faced a deficit, as predicted by financiers quoted in the Daily News February 13.

That the trunk lines contemplating purchase of the Walsh lines had pooled their interests to keep the bid on the Walsh roads to the lowest possible figure.

That a legal obstacle preventing the Lake Shore from bidding because the Indiana Southern parallels it tended to aid the alleged pool.

That stringency in the money market also made it difficult to secure bids.

The most sensational development of the day was the statement that the directors and stockholders of the bank might prove to be the owners of the railroads instead of Walsh personally, as had been supposed. It has not heretofore been hinted that the written defense contained such an assertion, which is equivalent to charges that the bank directors committed illegal acts. A bank may not own real estate under the statutes.

Farther down I find the following:

STATUS OF THE WALSH ASSETS.

The assets of John R. Walsh are entirely contingent upon what the railroads will bring. At first the bankers in charge of the assets asked $27,500,000 for the Indiana Southern, the Chicago and Southern, and the Illinois Southern. This price was reduced subsequently to $25,000,000. The railroads have made no bids up to date. At $25,000,000 it would be possible, it is figured, to pay off the obligations incurred with the clearing-house banks, give the stockholders in the Chicago National bank book value ($284 a share) for their holdings, and leave Walsh personally $1,000,000. At a valuation of $21,000,000 the clearing-house banks would get out whole, but nothing would be left to Walsh or the stockholders.

Here is rather an interesting subject:

PRACTICALLY ON HIS OWN BONDS.

It was discovered to-day that John R. Walsh is practically on his own bonds in the criminal charges preferred against him. The Illinois Surety Company, which he organized with Fred M. Blount, in which he is a director and in which Senator ALBERT J. HOPKINS is vice-president, went the financier's bail to the extent of $50,000. The company is known as the "bonding trust" in the Federal building, and is given the "inside track" on every possible occasion.

In another paper, the Chicago Examiner, I find the statement made that—

It is known by this newspaper that Senator CULLOM and JOSEPH CANNON, Speaker of the House of Representatives, have made repeated calls on the President of the United States in behalf of Mr. Walsh. Mr. Walsh's newspaper all along has essayed to represent the Federal Administration. Three years ago it switched from an alleged Democratic sheet to a howling apologist for the Republicans. The cause of this change was because Walsh sought then, as he seeks now, to control Government contracts for his Bedford quarries. In that he has succeeded splendidly. Few other quarrymen now have the courage to bid against him. They know it were futile to get a building's stone away from him.

It will be remembered that ALBERT J. HOPKINS, the junior Illinois Senator, was in Chicago on the day of the failure of the Chicago National Bank. He was among the first to make a friendly call on Walsh. Then came Secretary Shaw. He, too, visited the dethroned king of Monroe street. Subsequently Comptroller Ridgely was here. Then eminent Chicago financiers went to Washington. And they saw the President, too.

Now, these continued delays in preparing the case for the grand jury and the charge, that is more or less directly made, that there is an effort being put forth by political influences to have this man go scot-free, without facing a jury and going through a trial, just as District Attorney Jerome wanted to let this man Perkins—I believe it is, in New York, go without a trial—appears to be going on in Chicago. In other words, we have reached that pass in this country that if a man steals a ham or a pair of shoes he is hustled off immediately to the police court, tried the next morning, and sent to prison. But if a man owns five millions, why, they dodge around and notify him that they will be glad to call around with a warrant at his office at such time as may be convenient to see him about whether he shall go to court or not; and if he is worth twenty-five millions, or in possession of it, they practically do nothing.

I think it is time for the Committee on Finance to investigate some of these matters in Chicago, and if these are falsehoods, prove it. The country is interested in having the big thieves punished just as much as it is in having the little thieves punished. If a lawbreaker who is in the millionaire class has to be treated with such deference and consideration as this, while, as I said, a poor fellow puts on his stripes and goes to breaking stone, we ought to have the country know why it is done.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] does not controvert any statement that I made the other day respecting the condition of the so-called "Walsh bank," or the attitude of the Chicago banks through the clearing house, or the assets of the companies, or as to the question as to whether Mr. Walsh was indicted or not. Not one of my statements is controverted. The Senator has picked up now some statements from the newspapers and attempts a new attack upon me. My first answer to him is this: That I find that both he and the leader on the Democratic side this morning have challenged the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that these reports in the newspapers are absolutely unreliable, and that they want the Senate to understand that those statements must not be taken so far as they are concerned. Now,

that line of argument will apply equally when you come to a question that affects the interests of the city of Chicago or the great banking interests there, or the two Senators from that State.

I am unable, Mr. President, to understand the motive that can prompt the Senator from South Carolina, morning after morning here, like a modern Don Quixote, to get astride his steed and bring some question into the Senate that has no relation to the legislation before this body or before Congress for the simple purpose of exploiting himself, attracting the attention of the galleries, and getting a little attention through the newspapers of the country. I can not understand, Mr. President, why it is that a man living in the section that he does, representing the constituency that we know he represents, should so concern himself as to whether the law in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, is obeyed. I intimated to him the other day that the 2,000,000 people living within the limits of that splendid city are quite capable of taking care of themselves, and when he spoke about the action of the clearing-house committee of the banks of Chicago I challenged his attention as to what provision of the law had been violated by that association of bankers. He was unable to reply. He simply had a hazy notion about something that he supposed would enable him to say something sensational upon this floor and again get applause from the galleries.

When I called his attention to the facts as to the character of the assets and that the associated banks were furnishing quick assets, he seemed to know as little about banking proceedings as he evidently did about law and legal procedure when he questioned me about the indictment of Mr. Walsh.

Now, I think it is about time, Mr. President, that the country should know something about who this modern reformer is, this man that is seeking to pillory every other locality as dishonest, and every other man before the public as a dishonest man and a violator of the law. I think it is about time that the Senate and the country should know something about him. Who is he, and where does he come from? He comes from the State of South Carolina—a State I find, Mr. President, with a white population of 557,000 and with a colored population of 782,000. It is known the country over that the Senator owes his seat in this body to the suppression of the colored vote in that State. It is known here, and it is known, I say, in every section of our common country, that the majority of the people of that State, by the manipulations of the Senator from South Carolina and the men who associate with him in that State, have been deprived of their rights, civil and political, that have been guaranteed to them under the Constitution of our common country.

Mr. President, the Senator himself, in a speech in this body on the 24th day of February, 1900, made this statement in the Senate:

> I know nothing about other States, but I acknowledge openly and boldly in the sight of God that we did our level best to keep every negro in our State from voting.

Does the Senator deny that he made that statement in the open Senate?

Mr. TILLMAN. Why should I deny it, when I put it in the RECORD and am ready to repeat it?

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the Senator talk about people violating the law of Illinois or the national banks there not living up to it, when he admits that he has helped to deny to the majority of the people of his State one of the most sacred rights of an American citizen—the privilege of going to the polls and voting and the privilege of selecting the men who shall represent them in the State legislature, in the various county offices, and in the Senate of the United States? Does anybody believe that if the seven hundred and some odd thousand colored men in the State of South Carolina had the political rights that are guaranteed to the colored men of Illinois and to all the people of every State, that the Senator would be here upon this floor denouncing Mr. Walsh, of Chicago, or the national banks of that city for their splendid financiering the other day? Does anybody believe that?

Now, I want to call his attention to some other things, Mr. President. A year or more ago he was making some speeches over the country. The question came up about some lynchings that were had in some of the Northern States, where colored men had been deprived in a most savage manner, not only of their liberty, but of their lives, where those colored men had been placed at the stake and burned. That is a blot upon the civilization of our country. Did the Senator then reprobate such conduct as that? Did he want to see the laws of our country obeyed? Did he insist that the courts should be the ones to determine the punishment which should be inflicted upon the violators of the law? Not at all. He advocated mob law. He advocated the taking of the lives of those people.

Now, inasmuch as he has quoted from the Chicago papers relating to this matter, I will quote——

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HOPKINS. I will quote what is put in quotations here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will save the Senator the trouble, if he will give me leave, to repeat it here a hundred times.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senator from South Carolina can have his time. I quote from one of the Chicago papers he has been reading here this morning. This is the language quoted that the Senator used in speaking of some of the lynchings:

> That seems to be the only practical way until the amendment of the Constitution granting the negroes suffrage has been repealed. We have shot 'em and hanged 'em and burned 'em in South Carolina—

He bows his head to that. My God, Mr. President, think of a man in the Senate of the United States who can bow approval to the fact that a human being is placed at a stake and burned alive in the twentieth century of our civilization! Think of a man, Mr. President, think of a Senator who for a moment can give his approval to such barbarous and atrocious conduct as that, and, as is suggested to me, then talk about the law being enforced if there should be an infraction of the smallest kind against the national-bank law of the United States.

How is a little money of a national bank, Mr. President, to be compared with the life of an American citizen? How is the violation of the law by one national bank to be compared with a condition in any section of our common country where men, without any opportunity to show their innocence, are taken by a mob and placed upon a pile of fire and burned? That is one of the things to which the Senator here to-day gives his approval.

> We have shot 'em and hanged 'em and burned 'em in South Carolina until they almost know their proper place now, although the desire to vote, whether or not they know what they are voting for or against, frequently causes trouble.

Mr. President, I have said this much because I have grown tired of the Senator from South Carolina getting up morning after morning and insisting that people in this section of the country are violating the law, or that this class of American citizens are violating the law, and that he is the man above all men to whom it has been given to see that the law in all sections of our common country is obeyed. When all the people of South Carolina shall enjoy the rights and privileges granted to them under our Constitution, when we may say upon this floor that the courts are open to protect the rights of all, great and small, rich and poor, in South Carolina, as they are in Illinois, then I will listen with some patience to a criticism of me and my people and with the manner in which the law is administered in Chicago. But until that time, Mr. President, I protest against such a Senator as that claiming that the law is not properly and fully administered in the city in which I live.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have never been in court except as a spectator, but I have noticed that it is a common practice among old lawyers, when they have a very poor case, to raise Cain with the attorney on the other side. They indulge in all manner of abuse and inject other questions into the controversy.

I should like to ask the Senator, as he would not let me interrupt him a moment ago, if the statement that I just read from the Chicago paper is false? Is he the vice-president of the surety company which is on John R. Walsh's bond?

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, what has that to do with the subject?

Mr. TILLMAN. Answer "yes" or "no," please.

Mr. HOPKINS. I might just as well ask as to whether the Senator sleeps with a nightcap. It would be just as pertinent.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is dodging now. He is dodging and quibbling.

Mr. HOPKINS. I decline to answer a question that has no bearing upon this subject.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course, I take that as a confession that the Senator is the vice-president of that surety company; and that is proof positive of the other allegations here that he is exerting his official power to endeavor to suppress the indictment and call off the myrmidons of the law in prosecuting Walsh for breaking the law.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TILLMAN. Always. I have great respect for the Senator.

Mr. CULLOM. I think I heard read from one of those papers a statement that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who happens to be an Illinoisan, and myself were frequently at the White House in behalf of Mr. Walsh since he has been arrested. I want to say to the Senator and to the country that I have not been to the President in behalf of Mr. Walsh at any time, I have never said a word to him on the subject, and have never seen Mr. Walsh since this happened.

Mr. TILLMAN. I expected as much, and was sorry that the Senator's name was in the paper; but I did not want to misquote it, and therefore I had to read it along with the statement in regard to the junior Senator from Illinois. Will he be equally frank now, and tell us whether he has been around anywhere trying to get this indictment stopped? [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will inform the occupants of the galleries that under the rules of the Senate they must avoid all manifestations of approval or disapproval.

Mr. HOPKINS. I can be as explicit as my colleague [Mr. CULLOM]. I have seen nobody to use any influence in Mr. Walsh's behalf, and I have not seen Mr. Walsh since the day of the failure, or so-called failure, till this day. I have had no communication with him directly or indirectly, and have had nothing to do with it whatever. This statement simply emphasizes the absolutely unreliable character of the stuff that the Senator is morning after morning sending out to the people of the country by having it read at the Secretary's desk or reading it himself.

There is one other thing, while I am upon my feet, that I want to call to the attention of the Senate to show the character and fairness of this so-called "reformer," who is undertaking to take me to task for something that he alleges that I may have done. He has suggested that I am trying to evade the issue. I am doing nothing of the kind. I called attention to the fact that every statement that I made the other day has not been disputed by him or by anybody representing any of the newspapers of the city of Chicago.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HOPKINS. One moment, if the Senator will allow me. I want to show another thing while I am upon the floor. The Senator the other day asked me as to whether an indictment had been found against Mr. Walsh—this was the question: "Has Mr. Walsh been indicted by the grand jury for anything or not?" I stated that he had not. Now, the Senator this morning undertakes to say that I was not entirely frank in that, and to take me to task upon a question of that kind. Let us see what kind of fairness emanates from the Senator from South Carolina; let us see how he wants the RECORD to appear. I have here the stenographic notes, taken by the Reporter here, which were presented to the Senator. The question that was put to me was this: "Has Mr. Walsh been indicted by the grand jury for anything or not?" My answer was, "No, sir." When the Senator came to revise his remarks, he changed that question, and made it entirely different, so as to put me in exactly the position that he now seeks to put me in his argument this morning. He changed the word "for" to "or," and he eliminated the words "or not" and put in "like that;" so that the question as it appeared in the RECORD reads:

Has Mr. Walsh been indicted by the grand jury, or anything like that?

Evidently, Mr. President, preparing by the RECORD at some future time to show that I had not been entirely frank. Is that the kind of fairness that emanates from the Senator from South Carolina? Does he think that was dealing squarely and fairly with me, after the debate was over and the notes had been prepared containing that statement, to change the character of the question, without calling my attention to the answer, and putting me in the position of denying that an indictment had been found "or anything like that?"

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, will the Senator send the notes here and let me see how many interpolations he made?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir. I will send them to you, and you will find that every interpolation that I made was something that did not touch a question that the Senator had asked, and was simply to develop the thought that I had expressed in the debate here. He can read every one of them, if he wants to, and he will not find one that changes a sentiment or that puts him in a false attitude, as he undertook to put me.

Mr. TILLMAN. I submit to Senators whether or not the change I made made any substantial difference in the sense or in the character of the inquiry.

Mr. HOPKINS. Why did you make it, then?

Mr. TILLMAN. Because I wanted to make my thought clear, just as you tried to make your thoughts clear.

Mr. HOPKINS. No, sir; you tried to put me in a position so that my answer would seem to be an evasion. That is what you tried to do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. HOPKINS. That is the effect of it, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is shying from spooks. There are enough actual rascalities here not to touch on any of these side issues.

Mr. HOPKINS. There are enough actual rascalities, aye, enough, Mr. President; there are enough crimes in South Carolina to take the entire time of the Senator——

Mr. TILLMAN. Whenever the Senator wants to discuss the race question, I am ready to meet him in Chicago or anywhere else; and it is not seemly, in my judgment, for him to try to drag in here a condition that has nothing whatever to do with this matter.

Mr. HOPKINS. I do not think it is seemly for the Senator to make an assault here on the banks of the city of Chicago, that every business man from the Atlantic to the Pacific will praise for their splendid conduct in financing the situation in that crisis.

Mr. TILLMAN. Those banks have broken the law, I think.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senator admits upon this floor that he has broken the law.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not done anything of the kind.

Mr. HOPKINS. You admit that you have kept the colored men in South Carolina from exercising the political rights that are guaranteed to them under the Constitution of our common country.

Mr. TILLMAN. Just as your party have refused to give to the Filipinos and these other colored people that you have annexed a recognition here under the Constitution. Hypocrisy is too much abroad in the land on that side in regard to the colored people for you to dare to get up here and speak that way about the South.

Mr. HOPKINS. But, Mr. President, the hypocrisy is in attempting to nullify the amendments of the Constitution of the United States and denying to a majority of the people of his State their political rights, and then to glory in burning them at the stake.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have never gloried in it. I have simply said—and I acknowledge that I said it—that whenever a white woman is ravished we sometimes burn the brutes who perpetrate such crimes; and if the white men of the North are too pusillanimous to protect their wives and daughters from such doings, God have mercy on them.

Mr. HOPKINS. I am speaking of the vote, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. Ah, yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. When he speaks of the people of the North, I want to say that the people of the North are law-abiding people, and if a crime is committed the criminal is punished and sent to the penitentiary or executed, as he ought to be in South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. What about the Springfield, Ohio, occurrence the other week?

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senator from Ohio can speak for that.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. FORAKER. There was something that occurred in Springfield, Ohio, that we all very much regret, but the machinery of the law was immediately put into operation to arrest every man who violated the law in connection with it, and the majesty of the law was vindicated. But what occurred at Springfield, Ohio, had its counterpart, I notice, at Springfield, Mo., the other day, and I rejoice in the fact that at the head of the government of the State of Missouri is a man in the person of Governor Folk, who did not hesitate to put into operation, in a most unqualified way, the machinery of the law to punish the perpetrators of those great crimes that were there committed. I wish the Senator could say so much as to violations of a similar character in his own State.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the conditions in Ohio were the same as they are with us with an absolute majority of 235,000 more negroes than there are white people in the State, if your civilization were in jeopardy and in danger of being obliterated, as the effort was made in the reconstruction days to obliterate ours, your people in Ohio would do just as bad or worse than we ever thought of doing.

Mr. FORAKER. I ought to add one other thing, that no Senator from the State of Missouri, or from any other State in this Union in which such crimes have been committed, has stood up here to justify or to defend any such crimes, except only the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. FORAKER. I want to say it to the country—for it will go to the country, because I think it is due to the Senators who represent the States of the South—that they have all alike, save only the Senator from South Carolina, stood here to denounce in the most unqualified terms such crimes as those.

I would not refer to this if the Senator did not compel me to do so by referring to my State and by referring to a circumstance that we greatly regret and as to which we have done all we could do to prevent and punish those responsible for it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to let the Senator from Illinois get off that lightly. He can not run off behind Springfield, Ohio, to dodge the issue.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senator from Illinois is not running from the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to get back to the national bank business. I want to ask the Senator whether or not it is lawful for the associated banks to own these $27,000,000 worth of railroads?

Mr. HOPKINS. The question, Mr. President, I want to know is whether the Senator thinks it is lawful, as he says, "to shoot them"——

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. HOPKINS. And hang them and burn them in South Carolina until they are afraid to go to the polls to vote.

Mr. ALDRICH. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his question of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that there is no question pending before the Senate. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has given notice of a speech which he is ready to deliver.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is before the Senate. It was laid before the Senate at the request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. TILLMAN. And the Senator from South Carolina took the floor in his own right, not with anybody's consent, and the Senator from South Carolina will sit down when he gets ready, unless the Chair or the Senate orders him to.

Mr. ALDRICH. It seems to me that this discussion is not only technically not in order, but that it is entirely out of order, and that the Senator from Wisconsin ought to be permitted to proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to give the Senator from Wisconsin an opportunity to go on just as soon as I can, and I am willing to let the matter rest right now. I simply asked the Senator from Illinois whether it was lawful for these associated banks to own this twenty-seven million and a half dollars' worth of railroads and be hawking them about the markets trying to sell them in order to get back something which they had guaranteed to Walsh's creditors.

Mr. HOPKINS. If the Senator from South Carolina were familiar with business affairs as they are conducted all over the country, if he knew anything about the banking business, and he knew anything about the office of the clearing house, he never would ask that question. There is not a Senator upon this floor that knows anything about the office of a clearing house but that will say that that was an entirely legitimate act upon the part of the Chicago banks and that no law regarding the national banks has been violated. That is my answer to the Senator upon that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Why did you not make that answer first, instead of talking about the law in regard to negroes in South Carolina?

Mr. President, all I wanted to do was to have the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and his committee, if it will, institute an examination to ascertain whether or not the national banking law has been violated; whether the transaction in regard to the clearing house assuming Walsh's debts and acting as receiver for his estate had in any way violated the law. That was all. But the Senator from Illinois got very angry and read me lecture yesterday and repeats it to-day; and when he can not meet the issue of the statements made in the Chicago newspapers he rushes off into a tirade against the suppression of the negro vote in the South and brings up some utterances of mine, in which I declared—and I repeat them here—that whenever a white woman is ravished in the country where there are nearly two negroes to one white woman, if we did not destroy the brute as soon as we got a chance our wives and daughters could not live there.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, it will not do for the Senator to get off on the sentiment of wife and daughter. He made the statement that I read to him, that they shot and burned negroes in the South to keep them from voting.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is entirely off. I deny it absolutely. We never burned any negro for that purpose.

Mr. HOPKINS. You so state in the article that I read here.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not use those words. I have never been chary about repeating what I have said right on this floor.

Mr. HOPKINS. Have you ever attempted to have white men punished for killing colored men who sought to exercise the political rights that you enjoy in South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. Whenever a man has been shot down in South Carolina at the polls there has been some form of trial, the same as in Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes; just the form, and that is all there was to it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine will please state it.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Chair will maintain order here, as prescribed by the rules. The Senate, I think, is very tired of this, not debate, but wrangling back and forth between two Senators. I ask the Chair to enforce the rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator's point of order is well taken. The Chair will see that hereafter Senators address the Chair and obtain the consent of the Chair before proceeding to address the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in this connection I will ask that paragraph 1 of Rule XIX be read to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read paragraph 1 of Rule XIX.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I trust it will be enforced.

The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XIX.

1. When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; and no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me to be a pretty good time, after the reading of that rule, for me to address the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE addressed the Senate. After having spoken for two hours and a half,

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin has been speaking for a considerable time, and no doubt he is fatigued. Therefore I think it would be more pleasant to him to defer the completion of his speech until to-morrow. If that is agreeable, I should like to have the unfinished business laid aside for the remainder of the day without losing its place.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am only partly through, Mr. President, and I should like to have the opportunity to go on tomorrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The notice of the Senator from Wisconsin will be entered, and, in the absence of objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside.

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE's speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.]

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS IN CALIFORNIA.

During the delivery of Mr. LA FOLLETTE's speech.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 48) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue rations and quartermaster's supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the region devastated by earthquake and fire in the State of California, and making an appropriation to relieve the sufferers by said disaster, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate joint resolution No. 48.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 48) authorizing the Secretary of War to use rations and quartermaster's supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the region devastated by earthquake and fire in the State of California, and making an appropriation to relieve the sufferers by said disaster; which were, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to procure, in open market or otherwise, subsistence and quartermaster's supplies in addition to such supplies belonging to the military establishment, and available, and issue the same to such destitute persons

as have been rendered homeless or are in needy circumstances as a result of the earthquake which occurred April 18 and the attending conflagration, and in executing this joint resolution the Secretary of War is directed to cooperate with the authorities of the State of California and the mayors of the cities of San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, Alameda, and such other cities on the Pacific coast as may have sustained damages.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce and Labor are hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary of War in extending relief and assistance to stricken people herein referred to, to the extent of the use of the naval vessels, revenue cutters, and other vessels, and Government supplies under their control on the Pacific coast.

Be it further resolved, That to enable the Secretary of War to execute the provisions of this joint resolution there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000, to be expended under the direction and in the discretion of the Secretary of War.

Strike out the preamble.

Amend the title so as to read: "A joint resolution for the relief of sufferers from earthquake and conflagration on the Pacific coast."

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

After Mr. LA FOLLETTE had yielded the floor,

RIGHT OF APPEAL IN CRIMINAL CASES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I submit herewith a letter of the Attorney-General, inclosing a statement of the proceedings by the United States against the individuals and corporations commonly known as the "beef packers," and commenting upon the decision of District Judge Humphrey. The result has been a miscarriage of justice. It clearly appears from the letter of the Attorney-General that no criticism whatever attaches to Commissioner Garfield. What he did was in strict accordance with the law and in pursuance of a duty imposed on him by Congress, which could not be avoided; and, of course, Congress in passing the Martin resolution could not possibly have foreseen the decision of Judge Humphrey.

But this interpretation by Judge Humphrey of the will of the Congress, as expressed in legislation, is such as to make that will absolutely abortive. Unfortunately there is grave doubt whether the Government has the right of appeal from this decision of the district judge. The case well illustrates the desirability of conferring upon the Government the same right of appeal in criminal cases, on questions of law, which the defendant now has, in all cases where the defendant had not been put in jeopardy by a trial upon the merits of the charge made against him. The laws of many of the States, and the law of the District of Columbia, recently enacted by the Congress, give the Government the right of appeal. A general law of the character indicated should certainly be enacted.

Furthermore, it is very desirable to enact a law declaring the true construction of the existing legislation, so far as it affects immunity. I can hardly believe that the ruling of Judge Humphrey will be followed by other judges; but if it should be followed, the result would be either completely to nullify very much, and possibly the major part, of the good to be obtained from the interstate-commerce law and from the law creating the Bureau of Corporations in the Department of Commerce and Labor; or else frequently to obstruct an appeal to the criminal laws by the Department of Justice. There seems to be no good reason why the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce and Labor, and the Interstate Commerce Commission each should not, for the common good, proceed within its own powers without undue interference with the functions of the other. It is, of course, necessary, under the Constitution and the laws, that persons who give testimony or produce evidence as witnesses should receive immunity from prosecution. It has hitherto been supposed that the immunity conferred by existing laws was only upon persons who, being subpœnaed, had given testimony or produced evidence as witnesses relating to any offense with which they were, or might be, charged. But Judge Humphrey's decision is, in effect, that, if either the Commissioner of Corporations does his duty, or the Interstate Commerce Commission does its, by making the investigations which they by law are required to make, though they issue no subpœna and receive no testimony or evidence, within the proper meaning of those words, the very fact of the investigation may of itself operate to prevent the prosecution of any offender for any offense which has been developed in even the most indirect manner during the course of the investigation, or even for any offense which may have been detected by investigations conducted by the Department of Justice entirely independently of the labors of the Interstate Commerce Commission or of the Commissioner of Corporations—the only condition of immunity being that the offender should have given, or directed to be given, information which related to the subject out of which the offense has grown.

In offenses of this kind it is at the best hard enough to execute justice upon offenders. Our system of criminal jurisprudence has descended to us from a period when the danger was lest the accused should not have his rights adequately preserved, and it is admirably framed to meet this danger. But at present the danger is just the reverse—that is, the danger nowadays is not that the innocent man will be convicted of crime, but that the guilty man will go scot-free. This is especially the case where the crime is one of greed and cunning perpetrated by a man of great wealth in the course of those business operations where the code of conduct is at variance not merely with the code of humanity and morality, but with the code as established in the law of the land. It is much easier, but much less effective, to proceed against a corporation than to proceed against the individuals in that corporation who are themselves responsible for the wrongdoing. Very naturally outside persons, who have no knowledge of the facts and no responsibility for the success of the proceedings, are apt to clamor for action against the individuals. The Department of Justice has, most wisely, invariably refused thus to proceed against individuals, unless it was convinced both that they were in fact guilty and that there was at least a reasonable chance of establishing this fact of their guilt. These beef-packing cases offered one of the very few instances where there was not only the moral certainty that the accused men were guilty, but what seemed, and now seems, sufficient legal evidence of the fact.

But in obedience to the explicit order of the Congress the Commissioner of Corporations had investigated the beef-packing business. The counsel for the beef packers explicitly admitted that there was no claim that any promise of immunity had been given by Mr. Garfield, as shown by the following colloquy during the argument of the Attorney-General:

"Mr. MOODY. * * * I dismiss almost with a word the claim that Mr. Garfield promised immunity. Whether there is any evidence of such a promise or not I do not know and I do not care.

"Mr. MILLER (the counsel for the beef packers). There is no claim of it.

"Mr. MOODY. Then I was mistaken, and I will not even say that word."

But Judge Humphrey holds that if the Commissioner of Corporations (and therefore if the Interstate Commerce Commission) in the course of any investigations prescribed by Congress asks any questions of a person not called as a witness, or asks any questions of an officer of a corporation not called as a witness, with regard to the action of the corporation on a subject out of which prosecutions may subsequently arise, then the fact of such questions having been asked operates as a bar to the prosecution of that person or of that officer of the corporation for his own misdeeds. Such interpretation of the law comes measurably near making the law a farce; and I therefore recommend that the Congress pass a declaratory act stating its real intention.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 18, 1906.*

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

Mr. CLAPP. I understand the objection to it is withdrawn, and so I should like to call up House concurrent resolution No. 29, which passed the House last Monday. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 16, 1906.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 5976, "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," the Clerk be directed to restore to the bill the part proposed to be stricken out in the amendment of the Senate No. 26 and to insert the following: On page 9, line 3, after the word "retaining," the words "tribal educational officers, subject to dismissal by the Secretary of the Interior," and restore to the bill the part proposed to be stricken out in the amendment of the Senate No. 27, and to insert in said amendment the following: On page 11, line 8, after the word "five," the words "and all such taxes levied and collected after the 31st day of December, 1905, shall be refunded."

After the word "shall," on page 11, line 16, insert "willfully and fraudulently."

After the word "punished," on page 11, line 21, insert "by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out in the amendment of the Senate No. 41 insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Interior shall take possession of all buildings now or heretofore used for governmental, school, and other tribal purposes, together with the furniture therein and the land appertaining thereto, and appraise and sell the same at such time and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and deposit the proceeds, less expenses incident to the appraisement and sale, in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the respective tribes: *Provided.*"

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. R. 48) for the relief of the sufferers from earthquake and conflagration on the Pacific coast; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 20, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19, 1906.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick C. Harper, of Washington, to be collector of customs for the district of Puget Sound, in the State of Washington, to succeed Clarence W. Ide, whose term of office will expire by limitation June 12, 1906.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Harry F. Nichols, of Ellensburg, Wash., to be receiver of public moneys at North Yakima, Wash., vice Miles Cannon, whose term will expire May 8, 1906.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

Frank E. Gillette, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma. A reappointment, his term expiring May 12, 1906.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Corps of Engineers.

Capt. E. Eveleth Winslow, Corps of Engineers, to be major from April 2, 1906, vice Roessler, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward M. Adams, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from April 2, 1906, vice Winslow, promoted.

Second Lieut. John J. Kingman, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from April 2, 1906, vice Adams, promoted.

ASSISTANT SURGEON IN THE NAVY.

James P. Haynes, a citizen of Kentucky, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 16th day of April, 1906, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Boatswain Dennis J. O'Connell, to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 30th day of January, 1906, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

John L. Keister to be postmaster at Morenci, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona, in place of Harry S. Van Gorder, removed.

ARKANSAS.

Benjamin J. Rosewater to be postmaster at Eureka Springs, in the county of Carroll and State of Arkansas, in place of Benjamin J. Rosewater. Incumbent's commission expires June 4, 1906.

CALIFORNIA.

George B. Hayden to be postmaster at Upland, in the county of San Bernardino and State of California, in place of George B. Hayden. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1906.

M. R. Stansbury to be postmaster at Pacific Grove, in the county of Monterey and State of California, in place of Charles G. Chamberlain. Incumbent's commission expires May 13, 1906.

John N. Turrentine to be postmaster at Escondido, in the county of San Diego and State of California, in place of John N. Turrentine. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1906.

COLORADO.

Robert Wilkinson to be postmaster at Central City, in the county of Gilpin and State of Colorado, in place of James A. Gilmour. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1906.

GEORGIA.

Frederich D. Dismuke, jr., to be postmaster at Thomasville, in the county of Thomas and State of Georgia, in place of Frederich D. Dismuke, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1906.

ILLINOIS.

John H. Creager to be postmaster at West Chicago, in the county of Dupage and State of Illinois, in place of John H. Creager. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1906.

Francis M. Love to be postmaster at Lewistown, in the county of Fulton and State of Illinois, in place of Francis M. Love. Incumbent's commission expired March 26, 1906.

William P. Richards to be postmaster at Jerseyville, in the county of Jersey and State of Illinois, in place of Joseph W. Becker. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1906.

IOWA.

Charles C. Bender to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Clay and State of Iowa, in place of Charles C. Bender. Incumbent's commission expires June 24, 1906.

C. B. Dean to be postmaster at Wall Lake, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa, in place of John H. D. Gray, resigned.

R. A. Hasselquist to be postmaster at Chariton, in the county of Lucas and State of Iowa, in place of Laban F. Maple. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1906.

MAINE.

William O. Fuller, jr., to be postmaster at Rockland, in the county of Knox and State of Maine, in place of William O. Fuller, jr. Incumbent's commission expires May 9, 1906.

William G. Hubbard to be postmaster at Wiscasset, in the county of Lincoln and State of Maine, in place of Isaac A. Macurda. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1906.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Louis S. Cox to be postmaster at Lawrence, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in place of Byron Truell. Incumbent's commission expires June 30, 1906.

Louis C. Hyde to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in place of Louis C. Hyde. Incumbent's commission expires June 30, 1906.

MICHIGAN.

Charles H. Boody to be postmaster at Hart, in the county of Oceana and State of Michigan, in place of Charles H. Boody. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1906.

Nannie Faucett to be postmaster at Laurium, in the county of Houghton and State of Michigan, in place of Robert C. Faucett, deceased.

Clinton L. Kester to be postmaster at Marcellus, in the county of Cass and State of Michigan, in place of Clinton L. Kester. Incumbent's commission expires June 6, 1906.

MINNESOTA.

Claude Atkinson to be postmaster at Hibbing, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota, in place of Stephen R. Kirby. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1906.

Jacob Gish to be postmaster at Le Sueur, in the county of Le Sueur and State of Minnesota, in place of Michael W. Grimes. Incumbent's commission expires April 30, 1906.

James M. King to be postmaster at White Bear Lake, in the county of Ramsey and State of Minnesota, in place of James M. King. Incumbent's commission expires June 30, 1906.

MISSISSIPPI.

Jasper Warren Collins to be postmaster at Ellisville, in the county of Jones and State of Mississippi, in place of John H. Cook, resigned.

MISSOURI.

William P. Giessing to be postmaster at Desloge, in the county of St. Francois and State of Missouri, in place of William P. Giessing. Incumbent's commission expires May 8, 1906.

MONTANA.

James R. White to be postmaster at Kalispell, in the county of Flathead and State of Montana, in place of James R. White. Incumbent's commission expires April 26, 1906.

NEBRASKA.

C. K. Cooper to be postmaster at Humboldt, in the county of Richardson and State of Nebraska, in place of Orange L. Bantz. Incumbent's commission expires June 12, 1906.

NEW JERSEY.

Alexander C. Yard to be postmaster at Trenton, in the county of Mercer and State of New Jersey, in place of Alexander C. Yard. Incumbent's commission expires April 22, 1906.

NEW YORK.

Edwin P. Bouton to be postmaster at Trumansburg, in the county of Tompkins and State of New York, in place of Edwin P. Bouton. Incumbent's commission expires May 14, 1906.

John W. Bowron to be postmaster at Rouses Point, in the county of Clinton and State of New York, in place of Michael Halligan, deceased.

Frank B. Dodge to be postmaster at Mount Morris, in the county of Livingston and State of New York, in place of Frank B. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expires April 22, 1906.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Ellery C. Arnold to be postmaster at Larimore, in the county of Grand Forks and State of North Dakota, in place of Ellery C. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expires May 19, 1906.

OHIO.

George H. Clark to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Stark and State of Ohio, in place of George B. Frease. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1906.

Edward L. Davis to be postmaster at Garrettsville, in the county of Portage and State of Ohio, in place of Cassius M. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1906.

OKLAHOMA.

Thomas F. Addington to be postmaster at Yukon, in the county of Canadian and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Thomas F. Addington. Incumbent's commission expires June 10, 1906.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Allen P. Dickey to be postmaster at Waynesburg, in the county of Greene and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Allen P. Dickey. Incumbent's commission expires June 28, 1906.

David Russell to be postmaster at Renovo, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Alexander Y. Jones, deceased.

TEXAS.

Thomas Breen to be postmaster at Mineola, in the county of Wood and State of Texas, in place of Thomas Breen. Incumbent's commission expires June 27, 1906.

Morriss Mills to be postmaster at Somerville, in the county of Burleson and State of Texas. Office became Presidential April 1, 1906.

Abram M. Morrison to be postmaster at Ennis, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas, in place of Abram M. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expires June 27, 1906.

George E. Sapp to be postmaster at Pecos, in the county of Reeves and State of Texas, in place of George E. Sapp. Incumbent's commission expires June 11, 1906.

Thomas D. Ward to be postmaster at Corpus Christi, in the county of Nueces and State of Texas, in place of Thomas D. Ward. Incumbent's commission expires June 27, 1906.

VIRGINIA.

Charles A. Lacy to be postmaster at Houston, in the county of Halifax and State of Virginia. Office became Presidential April 1, 1906.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Harrison A. Darnall to be postmaster at Buckhannon, in the county of Upshur and State of West Virginia, in place of Harrison A. Darnell. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1906.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 19, 1906.

W. A. Nichols to be receiver of public moneys at North Yakima, Wash.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19, 1906.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Clarence G. Smithers, of Virginia, to be collector of customs for the district of Cherrystone, in the State of Virginia.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Perry M. Lytle, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

MARSHAL.

William H. Darrough, of Indian Territory, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indian Territory.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Maj. Gen. Henry C. Corbin, adjutant-general, to be lieutenant-general from April 15, 1906.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. William G. Meade, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 31, 1906.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 17th day of March, 1906:

James W. G. Walker.
Andrew C. Cunningham.
Harry H. Rousseau.
Fred Thompson.
Alfred C. Lewerenz.
Lyle F. Bellinger.
Reuben E. Bakenhus.
George A. McKay.
Ernest H. Brownell.
Ernest R. Gayler.
Paul L. Reed.
Frederick R. Harris.
Archibald L. Parsons.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Maj. Laurence H. Moses to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of March, 1904.

Maj. Wendell C. Neville to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of June, 1904.

Second Lieut. Davis B. Wills to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of July, 1904.

Second Lieut. Edward S. Yates to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December, 1904.

Second Lieut. Harry O. Smith to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of December, 1904.

Capt. Thomas C. Treadwell to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 9th day of December, 1904.

Second Lieut. Albert Hamilton to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 9th day of December, 1904.

Capt. Dion Williams to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of February, 1905.

First Lieut. Harry R. Lay to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of February, 1905.

Second Lieut. William P. Upshur to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of February, 1905.

Second Lieut. Lovick P. Pinkston to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March, 1905.

Capt. Edward R. Lowndes to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of March, 1905.

First Lieut. Charles B. Taylor to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of March, 1905.

Second Lieut. Arthur P. Crist to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of March, 1905.

Capt. John T. Myers to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April, 1905.

First Lieut. John W. Wadleigh to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April, 1905.

Second Lieut. Edward W. Banker to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April, 1905.

First Lieut. William R. Coyle to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of August, 1905.

Second Lieut. William E. Parker to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of August, 1905.

First Lieut. William C. Harllee to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of August, 1905.

Second Lieut. William M. Small to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of August, 1905.

Capt. Albertus W. Catlin to be a major in the Marine Corps.

First Lieut. Richard S. Hooker to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February, 1906.

Second Lieut. Maurice V. Campbell to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of February, 1906.

Second Lieut. Epaminondas L. Bigler to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of March, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Mary E. Bell to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

ILLINOIS.

George W. Baber to be postmaster at Paris, in the county of Edgar and State of Illinois.

Chester B. Claybaugh to be postmaster at Toulon, in the county of Stark and State of Illinois.

George J. Price to be postmaster at Flora, in the county of Clay and State of Illinois.

Alonzo C. Sluss to be postmaster at Tuscola, in the county of Douglas and State of Illinois.

KANSAS.

George T. Boon to be postmaster at Chetopa, in the county of Labette and State of Kansas.

Ewing Herbert to be postmaster at Hiawatha, in the county of Brown and State of Kansas.

John A. Hartley to be postmaster at Cheney, in the county of Sedgwick and State of Kansas.

William A. Moriston to be postmaster at Bonner Springs, in the county of Wyandotte and State of Kansas.

KENTUCKY.

Asa Bodkin to be postmaster at Bardwell, in the county of Carlisle and State of Kentucky.

Berry T. Conway to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Marion and State of Kentucky.

A. Downs to be postmaster at Murray, in the county of Calloway and State of Kentucky.

Frank M. Fisher to be postmaster at Paducah, in the county of McCracken and State of Kentucky.

William H. Harrison to be postmaster at Flemingsburg, in the county of Fleming and State of Kentucky.

Daniel D. Hurst to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Breathitt and State of Kentucky.

William T. West to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Garrard and State of Kentucky.

MAINE.

Newton H. Fogg to be postmaster at Sanford, in the county of York and State of Maine.

Reuel W. Norton to be postmaster at Kennebunk Port, in the county of York and State of Maine.

Willis W. Wait to be postmaster at Dixfield, in the county of Oxford and State of Maine.

MARYLAND.

George M. Evans to be postmaster at Elkton, in the county of Cecil and State of Maryland.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Thomas A. Hills to be postmaster at Leominster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

James Buckley to be postmaster at Petoskey, in the county of Emmet and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Peter J. Schwartz, to be postmaster at Shakopee, in the county of Scott and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

John C. Rickey to be postmaster at Clarence, in the county of Shelby and State of Missouri.

MONTANA.

Thomas W. McKenzie to be postmaster at Havre, in the county of Chouteau and State of Montana.

NEBRASKA.

Howard C. Miller to be postmaster at Grand Island, in the county of Hall and State of Nebraska.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Simeon M. Estes to be postmaster at Meredith, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire.

Eugene Lane to be postmaster at Suncook, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

NEW JERSEY.

George C. Reed to be postmaster at Park Ridge, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Benjamin F. Magnin to be postmaster at Darby, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania.

VERMONT.

Frederick G. Ellison to be postmaster at Springfield, in the County of Windsor and State of Vermont.

VIRGINIA.

W. Griffin to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Roanoke and State of Virginia.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Lester G. Toney to be postmaster at Northfork, in the county of McDowell and State of West Virginia.

WISCONSIN.

Warner S. Carr to be postmaster at Lake Nebagamon, in the county of Douglas and State of Wisconsin.

Arthur E. Dudley to be postmaster at Neillsville, in the county of Clark and State of Wisconsin.

A. C. Vanderwater Elston to be postmaster at Muscoda, in the county of Grant and State of Wisconsin.

WYOMING.

Otis Rife to be postmaster at Kemmerer, in the county of Uinta and State of Wyoming.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 19, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., as follows:

Our Father in heaven, Thou grace divine, encircling all, help us with unshaken faith in Thine eternal love to interpret whatever comes to us in life as but a means to the proper end in the working out of Thy purposes. We thank Thee for that deep and tender sympathy which goes out to those who suffer affliction and sorrow, whether it be the community or the individual, and which binds us closer together as a people and as families in the ties of affection. Be with all, O God, who suffer everywhere and comfort them as Thou alone can, and help us to help each other, and so be with us all now in this great calamity and always in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. M. R. PATTERSON of Tennessee, appeared at the bar of the House, and qualified by taking the oath of office.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on the Territories was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2948) to amend section 1 of the act approved March 3, 1905, providing for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of Arizona, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KAHN, indefinitely, on account of the disaster at San Francisco.

MOVEMENTS OF VESSELS IN ST. MARYS RIVER.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4925) to amend the act approved March 6, 1896, relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved March 6, 1896, entitled "An act relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River" be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to adopt and prescribe suitable rules and regulations governing the movements and anchorage of vessels and rafts in St. Marys River from Point Iroquois, on Lake Superior, to Point Detour, on Lake Huron, and for the purpose of enforcing the observance of such regulations the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to detail one or more revenue cutters for duty under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor on said river."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act of March 6, 1896, aforesaid, be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That in the event of the violation of any such regulations or rules of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor by the owners, master, or person in charge of such vessel, such owners, masters, or person in charge shall be liable to a penalty of $200: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor may remit said fine on such terms as he may prescribe: *Provided also*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to amend or repeal the act entitled 'An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal,' approved February 8, 1895."

With the following amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the words "under the direction" and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon the request."

Line 12 strike out the word "of" and insert the words "not exceeding."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO BANKRUPTCY ACT.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4478) to amend section 64 of the bankruptcy act, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause 4 of subdivision B of section 64 of said act is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Fourth. Wages due to workmen, clerks, traveling or city salesmen, or servants which have been earned within three months before the date of commencement of proceedings, not to exceed $300 to each claimant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to know something in regard to this bill. Does it make the wages due all employees, including traveling salesmen, preferred claims against the bankrupt's estate?

Mr. ESCH. It simply includes traveling and city salesmen among those people who are entitled to preference. This bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and was unanimously reported a year ago. It has the support of the entire Traveling Men's Association of the United States and of the Credit Men's Association.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the bankruptcy act ought to be amended in many particulars, and I have not been able to catch from what the gentleman said or from the reading of the bill what the purport of it is. I think it ought to be amended in a great many particulars. The chief way that we ought to amend it is to wipe it off the statute books and repeal it altogether. If I had time I would draft a substitute amendment now to this bill, so as to repeal the bankruptcy law in toto. That is what I want to vote for. I do not think that I shall object to the consideration of this bill. I reserved the right to object to it in order to find out what it provides, and I would ask unanimous consent to have it read again, so that I can hear what are its provisions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will again report the bill.

There was no objection; and the Clerk again reported the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the

bill, if the bankruptcy law is to remain in force, I am in favor of the bill that the gentleman has called up. I think it is a wise provision which ought not to have been omitted from the original bill. I shall not object, but shall support it. I shall vote for it, because this is the only way we can relieve the bankruptcy law, as it now exists, from the present provisions, which exclude this class of creditors from having a preferred claim upon the bankrupt's estate, as they should have. I think wages due the city and traveling salesmen should have preference in distribution of a bankrupt's estate. More than that, I think this House ought to have an opportunity to vote upon the proposition to repeal the bankruptcy law, because, in my judgment and in the judgment of a great many people, it has answered the purpose for which it was enacted. I shall not object, but will gladly support the measure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

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

NEBRASKA TERRITORIAL MILITIA.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5018) to give a true military status to the Nebraska Territorial Militia.

Whereas the governor and lawfully constituted authorities of the Territory of Nebraska did, on the 11th day of August, in the year of 1864, ask for and authorize the enlistment of volunteers to defend "the frontier" against hostile Indians and the common enemy; and

Whereas by proclamation duly issued of that date said call for volunteers was, at the suggestion of the authorities at Washington, based on the fact that the Government of the United States was engaged in war with the so-called "Southern Confederacy," and did not have sufficient troops for the common defense of our frontier, and that for such reasons said call for volunteers on behalf of the Territory of Nebraska was issued; and

Whereas said military organization, known as the "First Nebraska Volunteer Militia," consisting of Companies A, B, C, and D, and a battery of artillery, was enrolled and duly enlisted to serve four months unless sooner discharged; and

Whereas said military organization did serve the General Government from August, 1864, until January, 1865, rendering military service where and when required upon our public frontier in Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas under the direction and control of the military authority of the United States exclusively; and

Whereas said troops have never been officially recognized as regular volunteers of the United States of America of the war of the rebellion, but have been denied such recognition: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the military organization known as Companies A, B, C, and D, and the battery of artillery thereof of the First Nebraska Volunteer Militia be, and the same is hereby, recognized as a regular volunteer organization of the United States of the war of the rebellion, and that the officers and privates thereof, including the widows and dependent children of such soldiers, are entitled to all the benefits of the pension laws as other regular volunteer organizations of the war of the rebellion.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

That all after the title of the bill be stricken out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That officers and enlisted men of military organizations which were furnished by any State or Territory under call made therefor by the President and the governor, and which rendered actual military service under the command of officers of the United States and in connection with the regular organized military forces of the United States, shall be entitled to certificates that they have rendered such service covering only the period that said organizations were in actual service; and that the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue certificates of such service, upon due application and satisfactory proof of identity, for all honorably discharged members of the said organizations: *Provided*, That no person shall receive any pay, pension, bounty, or other allowances by reason of the passage of this act."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this bill ought to be considered in this way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was going to reserve the right to object to ask some questions.

PRESENTATION OF BELL TO SITE AND RELIC SOCIETY, GERMANTOWN, PA.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 7.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 7) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to present the bell of the late U. S. sloop of war Germantown to the Site and Relic Society, of Germantown, Pa.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to present to the Site and Relic Society, of Germantown, Pa., the bell of the U. S. sloop of war Germantown, which vessel was destroyed by the United States authorities at the Norfolk Navy-Yard in 1861, and the bell of which was recovered about a year ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to answer the gentleman's question if I could hear him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say I ask the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, reserving the right to object, and would ask him to yield me about three minutes to make a statement.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I will be very glad to do it. Three minutes' time, did you say?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Mr. Speaker, in that three minutes yielded me I desire to say I shall not object to the consideration of this particular bill, but there are nearly two millions of people out in Oklahoma and the Indian Territory begging for admission into the sisterhood of States; that there are tens, perhaps hundreds, of thousands of white children in the Indian Territory without public school facilities——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, is there any question before the House?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have time yielded me.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask if the gentleman is in order?

The SPEAKER. And yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no time to yield, except in the nature of unanimous consent.

Mr. PAYNE. Therefore how could he yield for a speech?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yielded so there might be no objection to the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not see how the House should be compelled to listen to a speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent, if it is necessary, to finish this statement; it will not be over a minute or two.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to finish the statement he is making. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I object, Mr. Speaker, to all of these requests—to each and every one of them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects. Is there objection now to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not object.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object unless the gentleman from Mississippi can have two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I ask the gentleman from Kentucky to withdraw his objection.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I withdraw my objection.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Was that the bill I asked to be considered which was just passed?

The SPEAKER. That is the bill the gentleman called up. The Chair does not know what the gentleman intended to do.

On motion of Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FORT BRADY MILITARY RESERVATION AT SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that portion of the military reservation known as Fort Brady, in the city (late village) of Sault Ste. Marie, in the State of Michigan, bounded on the north by that part of Water street adjacent to the Government park, on the east by Brady street, on the south by Portage avenue, and on the west by Bingham avenue, be, and the same is hereby, reserved from sale under the authority of the act of Congress authorizing the sale of Old Fort Brady, approved July 8, 1886, and that the same be set apart for a site for a public building at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I now ask unanimous consent for two minutes within which to complete a statement that I began to make to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. I hope the gentleman will reserve that.

RESERVATION AT HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8976) to change the line of the reservation at Hot Springs, Ark., and of Reserve avenue, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the last objection, I demand the regular order.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18198—the District of Columbia appropriation bill. And pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time for general debate be divided equally between the two sides, to be controlled for the minority by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and for the majority by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill be divided equally and one-half of it controlled by himself and one-half of it controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18198—the District of Columbia appropriation bill—with Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I will now, whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] wills or not, complete the statement which I have started to make to the House.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to call attention to how easy it is to comply with the rules of the House?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, the gentleman can call my attention to all sorts of improbable suggestions and impossible things.

Now, Mr. Chairman, hundreds of thousands—tens of thousands, at any rate—of children are deprived of public school facilities in the Indian Territory. Nearly a million of people are asking to be admitted into the sisterhood of States. The Senate of the United States has passed a bill admitting Oklahoma and Indian Territory as a State into the Union. A perfectly puerile procedure of conference is now going on. Upon last Saturday, when the conferees were to have met, they did not meet, and the excuse for not having met was that some of them were not there. Now, I desire to give notice to the House that there will be from this time on no business done by unanimous consent [applause], and that no business of any sort will be done by this House except under the rules, or a rule, until the conferees upon the statehood bill report to this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very clear and comprehensive statement in reference to this bill made yesterday afternoon by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], I feel that it is wholly unnecessary for me to make a detailed statement about it at this time. In fact, any attempt to do so would merely result in a repetition of many statements already so well made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I desire, however, to again direct the attention of the committee to the fact that the bill carries an appropriation amounting approximately, in round numbers, to $9,131,000. This is about $573,000 less than was carried in the District appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1906. It is also $2,300,000 less than the estimates submitted to the committee by the District Commissioners.

In this connection I desire to further call the attention of the committee to the fact that, whereas we have appropriated much less than was called for in the estimates, yet I assure you that your committee has exercised the greatest care to see that no department of the municipality has been given a less sum than is necessary for the proper and efficient discharge of the duties imposed upon that particular department. For myself and for the committee I invite the most careful scrutiny of the provisions of this bill. I go further. The Appropriation Committee will welcome any fair criticism of this measure as a whole or in its details, with a view of improving it, for I assure you that the committee, in the preparation of this bill, had only a single purpose in view, and that was to bring before the House the best bill that it could prepare. And in this connection, gentlemen, I desire to congratulate the House—yes, I desire to congratulate the city and the Government upon the fact that we have the very able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts as the chairman of the subcommittee chargeable with the responsibility of this bill's preparation. He has brought to the consideration of the bill a zeal, an energy, an intelligence, and an honesty of purpose that have resulted, in my opinion, in one of the cleanest, fairest, and most evenly balanced District appropriation bills that has been brought before the Congress for many years. For this he is entitled to our highest commendation.

As I said, I do not care to make a detailed statement about the provisions of the bill, because to do so would only be to repeat what has been so well said by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. But, Mr. Chairman, while the subcommittee was engaged in preparing the various items that constitute the measure, a few thoughts occurred to me, which I have jotted down and upon which I desire to submit some observations, though I candidly state to you that what I will say is not exactly pertinent to the subject-matter under consideration.

No other city in all the United States is governed as this city is. Here, for reasons unnecessary to give, but which are apparently satisfactory to them, the people have voluntarily surrendered the right of suffrage, or rather, to more accurately describe the situation, the people have acquiesced without opposition in their own disfranchisement.

The experience of Washington City during the period when universal suffrage obtained here, when her people enjoyed without limitation the right of self-government, has not been forgotten. In fact, the property owners, the taxpayers, have such a lively recollection of those halcyon days that one never hears from one of them a murmur of complaint that the city is now governed by a Board of Commissioners in whose selection they have absolutely no voice.

When one remembers Washington as she was governed or when one thinks of Philadelphia as she is now governed, or rather was, until recently, when her mayor, a reformed Republican, commenced giving the people a more honest administration of city affairs, he can not fail to be impressed, in fact, must admit, that there are some advantages in municipal government by a Board of Commissioners. When one thinks of the saturnalia of vice and crime, the universality of loot and graft, the continuous and uninterrupted practices of thieving and boodling to which the unfortunate people and taxpayers of the City of Brotherly Love were so long the victims, then, indeed, can one see the advantage of and begin to appreciate the form of government for a municipality which obtains in our capital city.

The time was that whenever the thought of municipal government was suggested there naturally arose in the mind visions of extravagance and graft, high taxes, and even increasing bonded indebtedness.

Under the system of government which obtains here, which has also been adopted (with its principal objectionable feature eliminated—the appointment of the Commissioners) by two of the leading cities of Texas, these conditions are to a remarkable degree reversed. Because of the successful government of these cities under this plan I unhesitatingly state that other municipalities might very materially profit by the adoption of the best features of this form of municipal government which has proven so advantageous to them. Whatever complaint may be directed against the government of this city—and I do not say there is not some basis for complaint—it can not be truthfully charged that the one great evil which has proven a curse to so many of our cities has any foothold here.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BURLESON. With pleasure.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas to say that there are now cities in Texas governed on the same plan as the District of Columbia and the city of Washington?

Mr. BURLESON. In Texas we have two cities, the city of Galveston and the city of Houston, now governed by boards of commissioners. There the boards of commissioners are elected by the people; and the experience of these cities in Texas under this form of municipal government is what directed my attention to the advantages of this system, to which I am now endeavoring to direct the attention of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the method proven satisfactory to those cities?

Mr. BURLESON. It has resulted in the complete elimination of graft, if graft could be said to exist in a Democratic city. This system of municipal government in Texas resulted in the reduction of city taxes; it has resulted in the reduction of bonded indebtedness, and it has resulted in a more general improvement of streets and other improvements than was ever known before in the history of either of those cities.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The very genial relations existing between the gentleman from Texas and myself prevent me from referring to any Democratic cities concerning which there has been something said about graft within the last two or three years.

Mr. BURLESON. I appreciate the great kindness and forbearance of the gentleman, and in further response to his query

I will state that only on the 3d day of this month the proper authorities of the largest city in Texas submitted the issue to the people—the qualified voters—whether they would abandon the present system of municipal government and adopt the commission form of governing the city, and at the election held for this purpose the people approved by a vote of over four to one, as I now recollect it, the commission form of government for the municipality.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. For about twenty years, I think it is, we have had the same kind of government in Nashville, and I never heard of any graft. The people have ratified it time and again; they have changed the charter, but not the system. We do not have many holes in the streets in the heart of the city either.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman for the benefit of that information. I am inclined to believe that government by a board of commissioners is the best form of municipal government ever devised, and am confident that before the lapse of twenty-five years the principal cities in the United States will substantially adopt this system or plan for their government.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I will yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I have been interested in the gentleman's remarks on city government. Do I understand from the gentleman that these two cities in Texas are governed by commissioners elected by the people by a popular vote of the people?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes; in Texas cities because of our constitution the board of commissioners are all elected at the same time, and every two years. They should be elected at different times, one commissioner every year, and probably it would be best to elect three commissioners with a tenure of office for three years. Originally, or the first time the commission form of government for a municipality was adopted in Texas, was at Galveston, immediately after the great flood which devastated that city in 1900, and the law as it passed our legislature required that they should be appointed by the governor. The superior court of Texas held that the provision authorizing the appointment of the commissioners by the governor was unconstitutional because of the wording of our organic law, but the same men that the governor had appointed were after this decision elected by the people with practically no opposition.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Are they vested with the absolute and entire power of the government of the city?

Mr. BURLESON. With the full powers that are vested in a mayor and common council of the ordinary municipality.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And board of aldermen.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is that any better form of government than where the mayor is elected by the people with absolute power? If it is, I would like to have the gentleman explain why a government by commissioners elected by a popular vote, who are subject to the influence of popular clamor, would be better than a government by a mayor who is also elected by popular vote.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman means whether a concentrated responsibility is better than a divided responsibility?

Mr. DRISCOLL. No; I believe in a concentrated responsibility and therefore concentrated power. I want to know why commissioners can do better than a mayor, where both are elected by the people and are subject to those influences which seem to count for much with officials who are looking for reelection at short intervals.

Mr. BURLESON. For the reason that there is a division of responsibility. One man might not be able to discharge all the duties imposed upon him in the conduct of affairs of the municipality, but when you distribute the responsibility among three or five persons or commissioners they can then properly discharge the various functions imposed upon them.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. They act by majority?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes; in all matters of importance or in all matters except matters of routine.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Isn't it true that where you have four or five members with divided power and responsibility it tends to poorer government than where you have one vested with full power and held to strict accountability?

Mr. BURLESON. I do not think the experiment has ever been made in the government of a city by one commissioner. We have three in Washington, five in Houston, and three in Galveston.

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

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is there not a great difference between the government of these cities in Texas and the government here? For instance, in Texas these commissioners are responsible to the people who elect them, while in this city it is governed by a commission that is not responsible to the residents of the city, and is also governed to a large extent by Congress, that is largely indifferent to the wishes or the desires of the people of the community.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct, but as I said, an objectionable feature of this form of municipal government is the appointment of the Commissioners. In Texas we have eliminated that objectionable feature, and there the commissioners are accountable only to the people. They are not supervised by any legislative body, as is the case here.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is what I was about to state about Nashville. We elect the mayor, who has some appointing power and we elect three commissioners, one for two years, one for four years, and one for six years. It has done wonders for Nashville. It is satisfactory to the people, and the responsibility is divided just enough, with three commissioners and with the city council elected and with the mayor elected.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am very much interested in this question of municipal government, for the reason that several years ago I was appointed by the governor of our State one of five commissioners to draft a uniform charter for cities of the second class, including all the large municipalities except New York and Buffalo. We gave to the subject a large amount of time and study. We visited all the cities which the new charter was intended to cover, and listened to addresses on all phases of municipal government delivered by city officials and many public-spirited and well-informed citizens. It was the consensus of opinion of practically all the men who addressed our commission that the old charters then in force in nearly all those cities could be improved. According to those charters, boards of aldermen had large powers, executive as well as legislative. In some there were boards of fire commissioners, police commissioners, water commissioners, and commissioners of charity, and other boards discharging certain municipal functions, some of them intended to be bipartisan.

As a result of those hearings and our study of municipal government in this country and in Europe, we drafted a uniform charter, conferring upon the mayor very large powers and holding him responsible for results. It was our notion that where there are boards of three or five or a larger number of members there is a tendency to shift responsibility, whereas where a single individual is clothed with full power and held accountable for results the voters at the next election may know whom they should elect or defeat. The same plan, conferring power and responsibility, was carried out in the organization of the several departments of the cities, except as to the board of education, which was made to consist of several members.

This charter was afterwards adopted by the legislature of our State substantially as submitted by the commission, and is now the law for the government of those cities. It has not brought about all the reforms and good things hoped for it. Great power in the hands of an able and wise mayor produces very good results. But great power in the hands of a foolish or corrupt mayor is apt to result in very bad and very extravagant administration. In actual practice since the adoption of that uniform charter, with its large powers for good or ill, able and honest executives have given satisfactory government, while inefficient and dishonest executives have brought about results exactly the reverse.

According to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], the cities of Houston and Galveston, in his State, are governed by five and three commissioners, respectively, who are clothed with very large powers. Take the case of Houston, with five commissioners, and assuming that human nature is the same as it is in other States and cities and that those gentlemen are looking for reelection at the expiration of their several terms, it would seem that there would be a tendency to shirk or shift responsibility for doing things, which, although right, may at the time be unpopular with the masses of the electors.

Notwithstanding the gentleman's commendation of the city of Washington and his reference to the cities of Houston and Galveston, I am not convinced that a board of commissioners at the head of an ordinary city government would be apt to secure more economical or more efficient government than a single individual, especially if he is the right man.

It is generally conceded that municipal governments throughout the British Isles and the continent of Europe are far in advance of ours in most respects. Yet in those countries boards of commissioners, either elected or appointed, are not placed at the head of their city affairs. Generally very large powers are conferred on their mayors, or chief executive officers under what-

ever name, and by that method they are solving the very perplexing problem of modern city government more successfully than are we.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, responding further to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL], I will say that the commission should not be elected at the same time. If the commission consists of three, one should be elected each year, two of the commissioners being at all times beyond the reach of any clamor that might be directed toward controlling their action in any particular matter which might fasten the attention of the people.

Mr. DRISCOLL. How long were they elected for?

Mr. BURLESON. In Texas, as I have stated, for two years; but it would be a better plan to elect for three years, one to be elected each year. But to resume, whatever complaint may be directed against the government of this city—and I do not say there is not some basis for complaint—it can not truthfully be charged that the one great evil which has proven a curse to so many of our cities has any foothold here whatever.

It can be confidently asserted that the affairs of Washington, as administered by the Board of Commissioners, are entirely free of boodling and graft. There may be some unnecessary expenditures made in the conduct of city affairs, there may be some extravagance here, and for this the Commissioners are not always responsible, for frequently it is the fault of Congress; but boodling and grafting, which have so frequently resulted in the wicked waste of the public money in so many of our larger cities, is not to be found here.

Another matter brought to my attention during the preparation of this bill is the probable beneficial results from the ownership by a municipality of certain public utilities which, from their nature, are monopolies. The city of Washington and the Government own and operate the system or plant which furnishes the inhabitants of this city with their water.

The service is in every way satisfactory, and the people living here when the new filtration plant is completed will be furnished the best water accessible at a rate as low as it is reasonable for them to expect.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Where will they get the water?

Mr. BURLESON. From the Great Falls of the Potomac River. The experience of the principal cities of Great Britain has conclusively demonstrated that it is to the general benefit, as well as the financial interest, of the people to own and operate certain public utilities.

The principal objection that has been urged in this country against municipal ownership and operation of these utilities has been that they could not be successfully managed or economically operated because of the resultant effect of the extravagance and corruption which follows the struggle of different factions or parties to control the city. I am free to admit that the dangers of graft in Philadelphia are so menacing that it would not be well to undertake municipal ownership in that city.

In New York and Chicago, under their present system of municipal government, with factions and parties engaged in a fierce struggle, at frequent intervals, to control, it would be nothing short of the sheerest nonsense to contend for one moment that it would be wise for those cities to take over the great and expensive transportation and lighting utilities now controlled and operated by private corporations, with the idea that the city could manage them with equal efficiency. On the contrary, Washington, under her present system of government, is the best situated city in the Republic to make an intelligent trial of municipal ownership, with a view of thoroughly testing the advantages and disadvantages of this much-discussed policy. In Washington, as I have pointed out, we are free of the very dangers which beset nearly all other cities, and which make a trial of municipal ownership with them wholly inexpedient. I merely offer the suggestion. Might it not be a wise thing to give serious thought to municipal control and operation of the gas and electric-light plants, the street railways, and the telephone service within this city?

To take them over at what it would actually cost to construct their physical properties—and of course nothing beyond this should be paid, for, as I understand it, no consideration has ever been paid the city or Government for their franchises—might and probably would enable the inhabitants of this city to have and enjoy cheaper and better lights, cheaper and better telephone service, and not only a very much cheaper street-railway service, but what is infinitely more desired and needed, a more convenient and efficient service.

I realize that the policy of municipal ownership, regardless of where or under what circumstances it may be undertaken, is not altogether free from objections, or, I might say, danger. To my mind one of the principal objections, if not dangers, following municipal ownership is the encouragement of the idea on the part of the people that they are to look to the Government for services and benefits which they should provide for themselves. I do not believe the Government should undertake any work that an individual could do or accomplish as well. The Government has its proper functions to perform, and should, in my opinon, be closely confined to the exercise of those functions.

I do not think it ever should obtrude itself into the affairs of the people when it can possibly be avoided. This may be rather an old-fashioned idea, but I can not forget that the Government has nothing to give, absolutely nothing, except that which it has already taken from the people. It is true that one of our great parties has persistently taught that it is the duty of the Government, by acts of legislation, to aid one class of our people in their business, even if it is at the expense of all other classes. Many intelligent and honest people believe that to be right, but I have never yet reached the point where I could appreciate the beauties of the doctrine of a protective tariff. It is true that under the operation of this system millions of dollars have been legislated out of the pockets of the great mass of the consuming public into the coffers of a favored few, and that great trusts and combinations have been brought into existence which now oppress the people and are driving many of them to the acceptance of policies socialistic in character in order to escape the ills they suffer, but I live in hope that an opportunity may be afforded at an early date to call a halt on this, to my mind, dangerous policy before we are thrust into the vortex of socialism itself in our efforts to find a remedy for the evil consequences of this vicious policy—a remedy which is no remedy at all, but simply a greater danger. To avoid this, I know, is the desire of every patriotic Republican as well as Democrat.

Another matter to which I now desire to ask your attention is a feature of the public school service which is provided in this bill, and in order that I may not be misunderstood I will state now that I am an advocate of and a firm believer in the public school system. I am a patron of the public schools, and am anxious to do all I can to promote their efficiency, and in this conection I will state that I share in the desire, which seems to be very general this session, that some measure will pass this body before it adjourns for the session which will provide an adequate compensation for the public school teachers. But this is not the matter to which I ask attention.

There are carried in this bill some items the wisdom of which I seriously doubt. Of course we all know that tuition in the public school in our home cities as well as here is absolutely free. Free tuition is what the term "public school" conveys to the minds of most of us. We go many steps beyond that in this city. Not only is tuition free here, but a beneficent Government furnishes free text-books, free pens and ink, free pencils and pads, and everything else of this character they use. More than this, as a part of the free school system here, we have a sewing school. I do not say that it is not a wise thing to conduct a sewing school as a part of the public school system, and it is not against this that I complain. Of course provision is made for a director or teacher for this sewing school, but at the same time a beneficent Government provides the thread and the needle and the cloth that is to be used by the pupils when they are engaged there in learning the art of sewing. More than this, as a part of the free school system here—and I do not say it is not the proper thing that it should constitute a part of it—we have a cooking school. Provision is made for a teacher, or director, for this cooking school, but at the same time the ever good Government provides the fruits and the vegetables, the meats, and condiments that the pupils attending this school experiment with in learning the art of cooking.

Furthermore, in this bill they now propose to take a further step. It is proposed to actually equip the playgrounds in connection with the public schools, to furnish the children the hot balls and the footballs and acting poles that they are to use in their games, leaving for the children to provide for themselves, or to have their parents furnish them, nothing, absolutely nothing, that the Government could furnish except food and raiment, and, I presume, that will follow in good time. Now, gentlemen, what I desire to invite your attention to is the all-important query, Where are the children, in so far as the public free school system is concerned, to learn the all-important lesson of self-reliance? Are we not, in this step which we are taking, and in some we have already taken, planting the seed in the minds of the youth of this country that is to germinate and grow, ultimately to blossom and finally to fructify into socialism full blown? Will not these classes of youths who are now being brought up by this system finally come to believe

that they can look to the Government for anything and everything, and that they are to depend upon themselves for nothing?

Our forefathers were not brought up under this system, and no one can say that they have not made brighter the pages of history by reason of the fact that they were not so brought up. Their chief characteristic was self-reliance. They learned this lesson not only at home, but they learned it in the schools, which they frequently provided for themselves. They never knew the meaning of free text-books. In this day and generation if a musical instrument is needed for these schools they appeal to a beneficent government for it. In days gone by school entertainments were given—other means were adopted whereby the children and the teachers relied upon themselves to provide these things that they thought were necessary, and especially was this done if what was needed was required for their pleasure. Now that practice has been brought to an end. They look to the Government for everything that the Government will consent to furnish them. Now, I submit to you the query: If Washington is made the model city of the United States with reference to her public schools, as she should be, and also in all other matters—if other cities of our country, following the example here set, should adopt this policy of doing everything for the children and expect the children to do nothing for themselves, what effect will it ultimately have upon the character of the American people? Will those who come after us have the same spirit of self-reliance which characterized our ancestors, and which, in my opinion, was the one trait that enabled them to succeed where weaklings and dependents would surely have failed? [Loud applause.]

Mr. DRISCOLL. May I ask a question before the gentleman resumes his seat?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I have had that matter of municipal government in my mind, and I would like to ask how long the system of governing those two cities in Texas by commissioners has been in vogue? How many years?

Mr. BURLESON. It has been in vogue in Galveston since the date of the disastrous storm, which I think was in September, 1900, and it has proven eminently satisfactory. And it was because of the success of the system as demonstrated in Galveston that it was finally adopted at Houston. The great success in the conduct of city affairs since the adoption of the system by Houston recently induced the city of Dallas to adopt the plan. The next legislature will be asked to so amend her charter as to provide for her government by a board of commissioners.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Does your modern election law, putting a tax on the right to vote, help it out?

Mr. BURLESON. We have no tax upon the right to vote. We have a capitation tax, a law which requires every elector, in order to qualify himself to vote, to pay it at a fixed time, this tax to go toward the support of the free schools in our State.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And does it tend to carry out the idea of government by the commissioners and make it more economical and possibly more honest.

Mr. BURLESON. I think our election laws carefully safeguard the purity of the ballot, and I have no doubt that the constitutional amendment requiring the capitation tax has raised the standard of our suffragists, and of course this results in more honest elections, and honest elections conduce to honest and economical government.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How much is your poll tax?

Mr. BURLESON. One dollar and seventy-five cents, I think.

Mr. DRISCOLL. It is $2.75 in those cities, is it not?

Mr. BURLESON. Probably so; I am not certain that the city levies a poll tax.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 48. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to use rations and quartermaster's supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the region devastated by earthquake and fire in the State of California, and making an appropriation to relieve the sufferers by said disaster.

FRANKLIN MEMORIAL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will substitute the name of Representative STAFFORD, of Wisconsin, as a member of the Franklin Memorial Committee on the part of the House, in lieu of the name of Representative STEVENS, of Minnesota, who declines the service.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] such time as he desires.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the only excuse that I have for making any talk at all in connection with this bill during the general debate is that perhaps what I may have to say will furnish a source of information on many subjects relative to the conduct of the local government which may be wanted by gentlemen, Members of this House, in their own neighborhoods. And whether I am right in the judgment I have formed will remain to be determined by those who may be seeking information on the question of local government.

This city is different from any other on the American continent, and therefore in some respects must be treated on a different basis.

Many people wonder why the Federal Government is called upon to pay one-half the expense incurred in the maintenance of the government of the District of Columbia. But when it is understood that the Federal Government owns more than one-half of the property within the District, and that this property is not subject to local taxation, and when it is further understood that the expense incident to the management of the city on account of its being the capital of the nation would be a burden which the local taxpayers could not well afford to bear, one can readily see why the burden of maintenance of the local government should be equally divided.

Mr. SIMS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question: You say that one-half of the property in the District——

Mr. MADDEN. One-half of the area.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman does not mean within the District, but within the city?

Mr. MADDEN. One-half within the city.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would like to ascertain from the gentleman where he gets those figures to the effect that one-half of the area is owned by the United States?

Mr. MADDEN. I get the figures from a very careful study of the District, or rather that part of the District within the city limits, and figuring out just what is embraced within the public parks and within the circles, streets, and the squares, and that occupied by public reservations, and all that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would like to ask the gentleman if he includes in that the surface of the streets?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. You include in that the surface of the streets?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly, for the title to the streets is in the Federal Government.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would like to ask the gentleman further if he thinks that is a benefit to the United States, to own the naked fee to the streets?

Mr. MADDEN. It should be, because while the streets are necessary for the travel of the people at large and for the people of the city particularly, they are at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of providing means of transportation, and thereby facilitating the transportation of the people, and at the same time yielding a revenue to the District.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. To whom is the ownership of the streets the greatest benefit—the Government or the residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. MADDEN. The ownership of the streets, generally speaking, is beneficial to the people of the world. They are not given to the exclusive use of any people of any community, of any city, or of any country, and the citizen, no matter from whence he hails, is entitled to the same rights as the citizen residing upon the streets.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is not that so with reference to every city of the United States?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is it not true with reference to every city of the United States that the streets are dedicated to the public use and the inhabitants of the city more particularly?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no; they are for the use of the people of the world—for the use of anybody who wants to use them.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is it not true that the streets of the city as they are improved along the private property, that that improvement and the expense of it is usually maintained, if not in whole, at least a large proportion, by the property owner?

Mr. MADDEN. In most cities of this country I think the practice is to levy special assessments on the abutting property for the first improvement of the streets.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is that so in this city?

Mr. MADDEN. No. The Government and the District together pay for the entire improvement.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And the private owner does not pay anything, does he?

Mr. MADDEN. The private owner pays nothing direct, but he pays his taxes into the general fund. Now, I think that is susceptible of an explanation, and unless explained it may be susceptible of a misconception. First, if a man owns a lot on a street not yet improved, on which he has paid taxes for twenty or twenty-five years into the general fund for the improvement of streets in other divisions of the city, a fair assumption is that when the time comes for the improvement of his property that he has paid infinitely more for the street improvement than he would have been compelled to pay if he were to get it by special assessment.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I understand the gentleman to say that private property pays no part of the improvement of the streets, and never did?

Mr. MADDEN. I say that now, but I have explained at the same time that while they pay no part of it direct, they do pay continuously into the general fund, from which fund the cost of all street improvements is paid.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The general taxes pay for running the city.

Mr. MADDEN. For running the city and improving the streets and for doing everything that pertains to the municipality.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Which is about 15 mills on the dollar, I understand.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; about that; less than that; 10 mills.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And it is the cheapest municipality of any city in the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. I think you are right.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And when the Government appropriates the money to macadamize or asphalt a street and put down the sidewalks or construct sewers, you do not think the private ownership ought to pay one dollar, do you, because they have previously paid a mill and a half on the dollar to run the police, schools, and ought to be exempt?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think you understand my position in this case. My position is that if you have paid for twenty years into a fund out of which the street is improved on which I own a lot, that you have paid enough money into that fund during the twenty years to have more than paid for the improvement which you get when it comes your turn to participate in the benefits secured from improvements in front of your property.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is the case with Chicago and other cities.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is quite a different case in Chicago. In Chicago, unfortunately, the owner of the property is obliged, under the laws of Illinois, to pay the first cost of the first improvement and to pay the second cost of the second improvement and to pay the hundredth cost of the hundredth improvement, if that becomes necessary. The city itself, under the laws, pays no part of any improvement on any street within the city. It is not paid out of the general taxes, as it is here.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman think they ought to remodel the tax system of Chicago?

Mr. MADDEN. We would like to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the gentleman stated that the Government of the United States owned more than one-half of the real estate of the District, including the streets and parks?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. What proportion of the value does the United States own? That would be a fair basis.

Mr. MADDEN. I would not undertake to say that, because that would be a question to be answered by some expert with larger experience as to the values here than I have.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think the assessors make it that the Government owns a little more than half, at their valuation.

Mr. MADDEN. But I have the figures here showing the policy pursued in the assessment of property, the value, the area, and all that, which I think will be useful to Members.

Mr. SIMS. I regret to interrupt the gentleman, but I want to ask him a question.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not interrupt me.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman seems to be prepared to give information. I notice that Commissioner Macfarland refers to the fact that the streets are owned by the Government, as one of the reasons why the Government should pay half the burdens of the city. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that street areas are an untaxed asset everywhere—that they produce no revenue?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, certainly, but in most cases where streets are opened up at any time the title does not go to the municipality. The title still remains in the owner of the abutting property, so that in case the street should ever be closed, the property would revert back to the owner of the abutting property.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think there is a difference of method in different cities. In some cities the municipality acquires an easement. In other cities it acquires the fee. That is the practice in the District of Columbia; but the practical result, when the municipality comes to pay for what it takes, whether it acquires an easement in the property for street purposes, or whether it acquires the fee of the property with the easement in the abutting property to use the acquired property of the streets, the municipality pays the same in either case.

Mr. MADDEN. In the long run, yes.

Mr. SIMS. Here is what I want to bring out, right in that connection: The argument, then, that the Government should share the burden of the city, based upon the fact of street and park ownership, has no real foundation in justice. What does the gentleman think of that?

Mr. MADDEN. My point is that, inasmuch as the Federal Government property is not taxable at all, and inasmuch as the city of Washington is the seat of government of the United States, and as the representatives of foreign governments live here and have their legations here, necessarily the character of improvements is much more expensive than they would be ordinarily where nothing was expected except to meet the needs of the people of the municipality itself.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But does not the owner of property in the District get an enhanced value to his property by reason of the location here of the Federal Government and the residences of the foreign ambassadors and the character of municipal government that must necessarily be maintained here?

Mr. MADDEN. I think quite likely that is true at the present time, but I was going to show just the difficulties they were obliged to overcome.

Mr. JOHNSON. Before the gentleman goes to another branch of the discussion, he states that the Government of the United States owns the fee in the streets?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. As a matter of fact and as a matter of practice, does not the District of Columbia get the benefit of the franchise tax that is collected from the railroads for using those streets?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Now, the gentleman has figured into the area of the property that the Government owns—the public parks, upon which a vast amount of money is expended. Is it not true that the more beautiful the public parks are made the more they enhance the value of the private property surrounding them?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, undoubtedly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And is it not true, as a matter of fact, that no matter how beautiful the parks of a city are they are of not one dollar's benefit to the Government?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not agree to that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Except as a matter of sentiment.

Mr. MADDEN. The whole thing, then, must be a question of sentiment. Early in the history of the world the people of Athens controlled the greatest commercial city in the world, but when they became rich and powerful they began to conceive the idea that beauty was the thing that was needed to attract the people of the world, who were in search of pleasure and beauty. Commercialism is not the only attractive thing, and here in the nation's capital it should be secondary to beauty.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And as the great poet says, "Where wealth accumulates, men decay."

Mr. MADDEN. I haven't reached that state of progress yet which enables me to understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is it not true that the real estate owners are anxious that the Government should purchase outlying property and build up parks in order to enhance the value of their property, and as soon as that is done they cry that the Government has withdrawn so much taxable property from the city that they ought to continue to pay one-half of the expenses?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; there is a constant and systematic effort to induce the Government to buy properties. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And then they raise the cry that

the Government owns so much property that they ought to pay one-half of the expenses.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me that there is controversy between two contending forces that have a desire to establish a permanent aristocracy in certain sections of the city to which unfortunate individuals like us are not to be admitted.

Mr. SIMS. I want to bid the gentleman good-by with one more question.

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. The complaint seems to be that because the Government owns the streets that it thereby deprives the city of an asset out of which it could realize something.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I do not agree to that.

Mr. SIMS. And I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that we ought to help maintain the large streets, but whenever it is stated that the Government owns one-half of the property and that the ownership in the streets is a taxable asset, I can not agree to that.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, what I want to get at is this: When Washington secured the land now embraced within the District for the location of a site for the nation's capital, one-half of the entire area was given by the then owners without compensation.

It was with great difficulty that the public improvements needed to accommodate the business of the Federal Government were made.

Lack of funds compelled the Government to borrow from the States of Maryland and Virginia on the credit of the Commissioners of the District $200,000, and land was sold to raise an additional sum with which to meet the obligations incurred for that purpose.

During the early history of the District the Federal Government bore no part of the expense of the maintenance of the local government or of the improvements, except to add to its buildings from time to time and make such improvements as were absolutely necessary in and around its reservations.

The improvement of the streets and the maintenance of the municipal service was charged to the cities of Washington, Georgetown, and Alexandria, and to the county.

In 1846 Alexandria withdrew and induced Virginia to take back what it had given, thus forcing those who remained to bear the whole charge of maintenance.

The Federal Government at that time was poor, and it was not certain that the capital was going to remain here. Efforts were constantly being made to get it moved, and it was not until 1865 that talk of removing the capital was suspended.

In 1835 there was a report made to the Senate by one of its committees calling attention to the neglect of the national capital by the Federal Government, and recommending that it should pay one-half of the expense incurred in its maintenance.

No action was taken on the report, or at least no results followed.

It was not until 1871 that Congress authorized a board of public works and a Territorial form of government for the improvement of streets and avenues.

That was done at the expense of the people who lived here, although Congress assumed one-half of the bonded debt and later guaranteed the bonds.

The vast cost of the development and improvement of the streets and avenues impressed Congress, and for the first time showed what a gigantic task it was, and those in power agreed that it would not be just to continue to force the local citizens to create a city, such as the nation's capital ought to be, unaided.

In 1878 the law under which the present system of maintenance was enacted, and since then one-half of the expense incurred for all public improvements has been paid by the Federal Government and the other one-half by the people of the District.

The city is now conducted by a Board of three Commissioners, appointed by the President.

Their jurisdiction extends over the entire 70 square miles of territory. Their functions in many respects are those of mayors, commissioners of public works, heads of departments, members of city councils, county commissioners, and governors of States.

The District contains a population of about 325,000, 64,000 of whom live outside the city of Washington in fifteen or twenty towns and villages.

In taking into account the expense of maintaining the District, it would not be fair to compare it with any other city, for here is located the seat of government of the country, calling for many extraordinary expenses not usually required in an ordinary city.

The maintenance of the militia is required under the organic law of the District, which is a function usually performed by the State in other Commonwealths.

The care of the indigent sick and poor is a burden imposed upon counties in other sections of the country.

The care of the insane and the expense incident thereto, while chargeable against the District, is a State function elsewhere, while the local improvements here are upon a much broader scale than those usually made by other municipalities, so that in making comparisons of the expense incurred for the maintenance of the District government it must be borne in mind that we are appropriating not only for the city, but for the county and the State as well.

A general résumé of the methods of taxation in the District is contained in the addenda to the report of the assessors of the District of Columbia for the year ended June 30, 1902, marked "Exhibit A," et seq.

No property except that of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the property owned by foreign governments for legation purposes is exempt from assessments for improvements.

The method of levying assessments for water mains and sewers will be found in Public Document No. 140, marked "Exhibit B."

An act of Congress approved April 28, 1904, describes the method of imposing and collecting personal taxes of various kinds and is more fully described in public document No. 247, marked "Exhibit C." Public Document No. 88 describes the method of levying taxes for the opening of minor streets and alleys, and is marked "Exhibit D."

The act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, provides that real property in the District of Columbia shall be assessed at not less than two-thirds of the true value.

One and one-half per cent per annum on both personal and real property is the basis upon which the tax is levied.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1905, and ending June 30, 1906, the total assessed valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia subject to taxation was $239,461,985, divided as follows:

City	$189,728,863
County	49,733,122

The tax of 1½ per cent on this basis is for the city $2,845,932.95, and for the county $745,996.83, or a total of $3,591,929.78.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1904, and ending June 30, 1905, the total assessed valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia subject to taxation was $217,608,296, that for the city being $176,864,785 and for the county $40,743,511, and the tax, based on 1½ per cent per annum, on that valuation for the city amounted to $2,652,971.78 and for the county $611,152.66, or a total of $3,264,124.44.

To secure the total valuation of real property in the District of Columbia, that exempt from taxation should be added to the above figures.

These valuations are to be found in Senate Document No. 181, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, marked "Exhibit E," being "Schedule of nontaxable real estate in the District of Columbia compiled from the records of the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia."

The total assessed valuation of the personal property for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1905, and ending June 30, 1906, is $26,575,819.66, the personal tax amounting for the year in question to $666,247.20.

It will be observed that this is more than 1½ per cent of the basis of the assessed valuation, the reason being that while tangible personal property is assessed at 1½ per cent, the receipts of various kinds of corporations are assessed at other rates.

Special assessments are levied for the purpose of reimbursing the municipality for all or a part of the moneys expended for municipal improvements—i. e., paving alleys, laying sidewalks, setting curb, laying water mains, constructing sewers, making connections with sewers and water mains, etc., as shown in Exhibit A.

During the year 1905 assessments were levied for special improvements for the amount of $181,044.70. The amount levied for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, can not be ascertained.

The cost of cleaning paved streets by hand averages $4.15 per mile.

The cost of cleaning paved streets by machine averages $3.75 per mile.

This cost is based on the average width of the street as 38 feet between the curb lines.

The amount expended for cleaning streets by hand for the fiscal year 1905 was $80,108.24, for machine cleaning $54,361.18.

The paved streets are cleaned by hand daily, and on an average of three times a week by machine.

The unpaved streets are cleaned about once in ten days.

The area of paved streets cleaned by hand per day is equivalent to 76.2 miles, and the area cleaned by machine averages 58.3 miles per day in winter and 71.8 per day in summer.

The unpaved streets are cleaned by contract, the amount expended for that purpose being $64 per day, the total cost for the fiscal year 1905 being $15,892.99.

The city maintains a police force of 1 major and superintendent, $4,000; 1 captain and assistant superintendent, $1,800; 4 captains, each, $1,500; 11 lieutenants, each, $1,320; 40 sergeants, each, $1,140; 265 privates of class 2, each, $1,080; 370 privates of class 1, each, $900.

The work of the department in detail, the area covered, and the population served is best described in the report of the superintendent, marked "Exhibit F."

The District of Columbia has a total indebtedness of $14,291,380.14, and consists of $11,408,000 District of Columbia 3.65 per cent registered bonds and $643,350 of District of Columbia 3.65 per cent coupon bonds. The unfunded debt is $2,240,030, being for advances made by the United States pursuant to law from appropriations chargeable to the revenues of the District of Columbia in excess of the revenues thereof to June 30, 1905.

The funded debt of the District was incurred under prior forms of government and matures in 1924.

The unfunded debt arose from extraordinary expenditures for projects of public improvements authorized by appropriations made by Congress, such as the sewage-disposal system, the filtration plant, site and construction of the municipal building, elimination of grade crossings in connection with the construction of the new Union Station, the Connecticut Avenue Bridge across Rock Creek, the Highway Bridge across the Potomac River and approaches, the bridge across Anacostia River, the Sixteenth Street Bridge across Piney Branch, and the purchase of site for a municipal hospital.

The total appropriations which have been made on account of the permanent public improvements above indicated aggregate $14,396,925, to meet which temporary advances from the Treasury of the United States have been made to the District of Columbia to enable it to meet the amount it was required to pay in excess of the ordinary revenues of the District, upon which the District pays the Federal Government interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum.

It is provided in the act approved March 3, 1905, and other acts that the unfunded debt of the District must be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the revenues of the District of Columbia within five years, beginning July 1, 1906.

The city has 419 miles of paved streets; 136.06 miles being sheet asphalt, 24.75 asphalt block, 0.92 vitrified block, 25.99 granite, 9.68 cobblestone, and 121.58 macadam.

Experience has shown that sheet asphalt requires no considerable repairs until after the tenth year of its life and that the ordinary life of such pavements is about eighteen years, although much of this class of pavement lasts thirty years before resurfacing is necessary.

Much necessarily depends upon the traffic, and very heavily traveled pavements and a pavement that receives practically no travel at all go to pieces quite rapidly.

Asphalt block has a life of practically fifteen years without repairs, and many of the streets of the city paved with asphalt blocks were paved twenty years ago and are still in good condition.

Granite block has the longest life and requires little or no repairs, if subject only to the average use, but is not desirable for anything but heavily traveled streets.

Macadam streets are principally used outside the city limits, and require more constant attention and more extensive repairs, but they meet every purpose required in the outlying sections of the city.

The cost for laying asphalt pavements in the city during the past year was $1.46 per square yard. During the year 1905 it was $1.57 per square yard. This includes the construction of a 6-inch concrete base, 1½ inches binder course, and 1½ inches top course after compression.

The cost per linear foot for curb, which is of granite, averages about $1.05.

The city requires a guaranty of five years from the contractor who puts down asphalt pavements; that is to say, he is required to keep it in repair during that time.

At present there are 2,200,000 square yards of asphalt pavement not under guaranty; the guarantee period having expired.

The amount for patching asphalt pavements averages about $60,000 per annum and costs, when the whole area is taken into consideration, about 7.2 cents per square yard.

The amount spent in resurfacing sheet asphalt pavements is about $100,000 per year, giving a resurfaced area of about 60,000 square yards.

If this cost is spread over the total area not under guaranty, it gives an average cost of square yard on the total yardage of about 4.5 cents per square yard.

The total cost of repairs (patching and resurfacing) distributed over the entire yardage of sheet asphalt pavements will therefore average 7.2 cents per square yard.

The total revenues collected from the saloons within the District is $459,032.90. The charge being $800 per annum for barrooms and $300 per annum for wholesale liquor license.

The aggregate amount received from insurance license is $81,021.77, and from licenses of all other kinds $107,629.83, making a total of $188,651.60.

The city pays for street lighting $295,400 per annum. The price heretofore paid for flat-frame burners for street lighting was $20 per lamp. Fifteen dollars is considered a high price for this service, and the committee reduced the compensation to that figure.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What are the prices in other cities of similar size to that of the city of Washington?

Mr. MADDEN. Why, the ordinary price is about one-half of the price they sell the gas to the private consumer for. Here the open-flame burner, which is mentioned in this statement of mine, burns 5 feet of gas per hour. They burn on an average 4,000 hours per annum. Four thousand multiplied by five gives us 20,000 feet of gas. That means a dollar per thousand to the city, whereas it ought not to be more than half that, but the committee has recommended a reduction from $20 to $15 as a starter for a reform.

There are 6,507 of these lamps, which, at $5 each, makes a saving to the people of the District of $32,535.

There are 952 Welsbach lamps, for which the city was paying $25 per light, and the committee believed that $20 was all that should be paid for that kind of service, and therefore has reduced the figures.

There are 989 arc lights, for which the city was paying $85 per lamp, and that has been reduced to $80, thus making a saving on the street lighting in the aggregate of $42,240.

The strange thing to me is that where the Welsbach light is furnished an outside company has bid on the lighting. This company has no gas, but is obliged to buy it from the company which owns the gas plant, whereas I am of the opinion that the company which is granted the privilege of manufacturing and furnishing gas to the municipality ought to be obliged to furnish gas direct to the municipality in any form which it may be required, and at reasonable prices.

The flat-flame burners, which consume 5 feet of gas per hour, are used on an average four thousand hours per annum. This would make 20,000 feet of gas burned in each lamp per annum, thus indicating that the gas company charges the District $1 per thousand.

Now, $1 per 1,000 feet of gas to the municipality is an outrageous price. One bill only is needed to be made out to the municipality once a month, whereas to receive the same amount of revenue from the private consumer the gas company would be obliged to make out 40,000. The cost of the printing of the bills would amount to something, and the clerical force required to make them out and keep the records would amount to something more; but aside from all that, the Government that breathes the breath of life into the corporation, that gives it the power to manufacture and furnish the commodity, that enables its stockholders to grow rich from the profits which it earns, ought, it would seem to me, to indicate to some one the necessity of requiring some concession from the gas company to the municipality from which the gas company secures its privileges.

My own judgment is that not more than half of this price should be charged for the street lighting, although the price fixed by the committee amounts to 75 cents.

The new methods of manufacturing gas admit of its production for a much less price than was possible when the gas company was first organized, and the price paid now by private consumers should be reduced, in my judgment, to at least 85 cents.

One of the strange things hard to understand is that up to the present time no attempt has been made to compel the street-railway companies of the District to sprinkle that part of the street occupied by their tracks.

The inconvenience caused to the public on account of the dust made by the operation of the cars would seem to call for some radical change in the method of operating, and your committee has recommended that all the street-car companies be obliged in the future to operate sprinkling cars to relieve the unpleasant conditions heretofore existing.

Ah, but I have heard some gentlemen say that this is an onerous burden placed upon the street-car companies, that are already overtaxed, that they pay 4 per cent on their gross receipts

into the coffers of the treasury of the District, and I want to say in reply to that this: That the street-car companies pay the 4 per cent I am willing to admit, and that thus far it has reached to about $72,000 per annum, including the tax on their real estate. They are capitalized for $12,000,000. They pay dividends of 6 per cent on this twelve millions of capitalization. This 6 per cent amounts to $720,000 a year. The value of the franchise which yields this enormous profit is the right to use the streets owned by the Government. If the personal property of the street-railway company were taxed on the same basis as the personal property of the individual whose furniture is taxed—at 1½ per cent on the par value of the $12,000,000—this company would be paying at least $180,000 a year instead of $72,000 a year.

Congress has appropriated $325,000 for the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River. This bridge is to be used by the Anacostia Street Railway Company, and because of that it was required to be built 18 feet wider than would otherwise be necessary.

I figure out, in my own unsophisticated way, that the street-car company occupies 20 per cent of this bridge, and that the bridge was built infinitely heavier because of the necessity for its use by the street-car company than it would have to be built otherwise, but no recommendation, mark you, was made by the Commissioners to the Committee on Appropriations for the collection of any part of the cost of the construction of this bridge from the street-railway company, and it was only because of the indefatigable efforts to dig up information that the committee was able to ascertain at all that some portion of the cost of this bridge should be paid by the street-railway company.

After a careful examination of the president of the railway company he admitted that his company should pay a portion of the expense. His suggestion was that $12,000 would be the fair proportion of the street railway company, but it requires no great stretch of imagination to understand that this would be neither just to the taxpayers of the District nor to the people at large and your committee thought that $32,500, or 10 per cent of the cost, would be the just proportion of the railroad company toward the cost of the construction of this bridge.

This recommendation is, of course, subject to a point of order, but I hope that no Member of the House will allow his personal feelings about which committee should take jurisdiction over the question to impel him to make a point of order, because there can be no doubt that the recommendation is made in the interest of the people of the country and of the people of the District.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, most assuredly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is it true that the Committee on Appropriations has discovered that there is no way of legislating for the District of Columbia except in appropriation bills?

Mr. MADDEN. No; the gentleman did not understand me, I presume.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think I understood the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I said there was no way in which the information which impelled the recommendation made in this bill for the collection of $32,500 could have been discovered except by the investigation made on account of the necessity of appropriations; that such information could not have come to any other committee, because the other committees would not have been called upon to investigate the need for the expenditure. I have no reflection whatever to make upon the rights or ability of other committees to do the things that are assigned to them to do, and I only give this as an explanation of why we make the recommendation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman from Illinois contend that the committee to which bills are properly referred that have for their object the enactment of laws for the government of the District of Columbia could not have sent for the same persons and have secured the same information that the Committee on Appropriations has secured?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; but there would be no incentive for any committee to send for these persons.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is mere speculation.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is not mere speculation. It is a fact incontrovertible, and I will show the gentleman that it is a fact, and that he can not successfully deny it.

The District Commissioners come before the Committee on Appropriations. They indicate a wish for the expenditure of a given sum of money. The committee immediately undertakes to inquire why the demand is made, and they begin to investigate for themselves why this money is needed, and they compel the Commissioners and all who have information to disgorge the information for their use, and finally because of the desire and the necessity for the money in all these instances many things that should be done by the Commissioners of the District are uncovered which would never otherwise be uncovered.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Can I ask you a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Now that the Appropriations Committee has uncovered and found out what you state, is it not proper that a bill should be introduced and referred to the proper legislative committee, so that this matter may be enacted into legislation?

Mr. MADDEN. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no interest except the accomplishment of the result, which ought to be done, and whether it is accomplished through one channel or another makes no difference to me whatever.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that this bridge was authorized, if I recollect correctly, in 1903, and there has never been a suggestion from anybody until now——

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. FITZGERALD (continuing). From any committee or any person that part of the cost of this bridge should be borne by anybody except the District and the Federal Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; this is the first time.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I was going to say, now you have discovered this information, is it not probable the Commissioners of the District would suggest some legislation to cover the situation which you mention?

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say, in reply to the question of the gentleman, that the Commissioners of the District would not give up information or suggest that it was necessary for anybody to pay any part of these expenses, and you could not extract it from them with a corkscrew; neither have they ever made any suggestion about any economy in any line during all the weeks that we had them before us. You ask them where they can economize and they always say they are short of help; that they need more places. Why, I was importuned by a man to vote to create a place which he said was promised him long in advance of the submission of the estimates by the Commissioners.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think, in justice to the Commissioners, the gentleman should state that it was not with their knowledge.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, they said it was not farmed out, but they did not need it, that was evident.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman state here that the Commissioners asked for this place knowing that it was wholly unnecessary?

Mr. MADDEN. We discovered that it was wholly unnecessary. I do not know what they thought.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Well, I assume that the Commissioners held to a contrary opinion or they would not have asked for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, if you can find in any line of the 965 pages of testimony taken before the District Appropriation Committee where any Commissioner by word, deed, or thought suggested a line of economy anywhere in the District government, I would like to have you point it out.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Just a moment. When they asked you for the money to pay these people, did they not tell you what the places were which they sought to have created?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir; and what they wanted them to do; but they were not able to satisfy us in a great many cases that they needed them, and in a great many cases where they did not ask them they have not been able to satisfy us that they ought to have them. Now there is another question about the Anacostia Bridge, which seems to be creating considerable interest.

The investigation showed that the building of the approaches to this bridge, to avoid a grade crossing over the Baltimore and Ohio Railway Company's tracks would necessitate condemnation proceedings in order to secure additional property; that the approach had to be made much longer than originally contemplated; that no provision had been made by the Commissioners that any part of this additional expense be borne by the Baltimore and Ohio Railway Company.

Now, I understand, though I do not know for certain, that when the act for the elimination of grade crossings was passed, that it was understood that the tracks owned by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company were to be taken up, but since then a steel company has organized a plant to which these tracks run, and it is thought that the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company wishes to maintain the tracks where they are.

Investigation shows that this additional cost will amount to $54,000, and a provision is therefore included in the bill to compel the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to pay such additional cost and to oblige it to maintain the viaduct over its tracks in the future.

The tracks at grade created a dangerous crossing. It compelled the increase in the cost of constructing the approach to the bridge. The approach was necessarily built higher than it otherwise would have been, very much longer than it would have to be, and a bridge must be built over the tracks. We have to condemn property to do this, and this cost, all told, is $54,000 more than it would be if the Baltimore and Ohio tracks were not there. And so the committee recommends a provision by which the municipality can collect this $54,000 from the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, and that, too, is subject to a point of order.

That everything should be done to make Washington the most beautiful city in the Union all will agree, but while doing this every precaution should be taken against unnecessary extravagance.

The people of the nation are justly proud of their capital city. Their Representatives are impressed with the importance of maintaining it as a model city and improving it in every way possible.

Nothing should be left undone to make it the most beautiful city in the world, but due regard should always be had for conservatism in the expenditure of the people's money.

No sinecure should be created; no man should be employed who does not render a dollar's worth of work for a dollar of compensation.

The Commissioners of the District are men of unquestioned integrity, but I am firmly of the opinion that at least one Commissioner of the three should be selected to represent the interests of the nation at large, so that he may be independent of local influence and free to express an opinion representative of the economies which it is believed can be recommended in many respects in the government of the District.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Is not one of the three Commissioners selected along the lines you suggest?

Mr. MADDEN. No, sir; he is selected to represent the Army.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. We have no Army here.

Mr. MADDEN. I want a man selected to represent the common, everyday people of the country, one who will represent the 50 per cent of taxation paid by you and me, and all the rest of the people. [Applause.]

The exhibits referred to are as follows:

EXHIBIT A.

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
November 17, 1902.

METHODS OF TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

ASSESSMENT OFFICIALS.

Assessments of both real and personal property are made by the assessor and a board of five (act of July 1, 1902, and 28 Stat., 282) assistant assessors, three of said board being designated by the assessor to act as the assessors of real estate and as the excise board and the two other members of said board designated by the assessor to compose the board of personal tax appraisers. All five members of said board of assistant assessors, together with the assessor, chairman, constitute the board of equalization and review of real estate assessments and also the board of personal tax appeals. The assessor, however, acts as chairman ex officio of the several boards aforesaid. The assessor and the members of the board of assistant assessors may not be removed except for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. The members of the board of assistant assessors are required to perform such other official duties as the assessor may from time to time direct. (Act of July 1, 1902.)

The salary of the assessor is $3,500 per annum, and that of each of the members of the board of assistant assessors $3,000 per annum (28 Stat., 282, and act of July 1, 1902). The assessor is required to furnish bond in the sum of $10,000 (30 Stat., 666), and each member of the board must, before entering upon his duties, take an oath to diligently, faithfully, and impartially perform the duties imposed upon him. (28 Stat., 282.)

ASSSESMENT OF REAL PROPERTY.

Real estate is assessed triennially (28 Stat., 282) at not less than two-thirds of its true value (act of July 1, 1902) by the board of three assistant assessors (28 Stat., 282). This assessment must be completed on or before the first Monday of January in each third year and return of the same made to the assessor, together with all maps, field books, surveys, plats, and all notes and memoranda concerning said assessment. The assessment must be made by said assessors from actual view and from the best sources of information obtainable.

The assessment then passes to the board of equalization and review, composed of the assessor, chairman, and five (act of July 1, 1902, and 28 Stat., 282) assistant assessors. This board convenes on the first Monday of January (28 Stat., 282), and continues in session until review of the assessment is completed, which must be, as nearly as practicable, by the first Monday of June in each third year. Public notice of the time and place of such meeting must be given by publication for two successive days in two daily newspapers in the District of Columbia. The members of the said board are authorized to administer oaths or affirmations, to summon, through the officers of the Metropolitan police force, any person to appear before said board to testify touching matters pertaining to the assessment, such witnesses being allowed the same fees as paid in civil actions before the supreme court of the District of Columbia.

Any person summoned and examined, as aforesaid, and knowingly making false oath or affirmation, is considered guilty of perjury, and upon conviction thereof may be punished according to laws for punishment of perjury (28 Stat., 285).

Any three members of said board shall constitute a quorum for business, and in the absence of the assessor a temporary chairman may be selected. It is the duty of the board of equalization and review to hear appeals from property owners and to fairly and impartially equalize, as a basis for taxation, the values placed upon real property by the board of assistant assessors. In reaching their determination they may raise the valuations of such tracts or lots as, in their opinion, may have been returned below their value and reduce the valuations of such as they may believe to have been returned above their value to such sums as, in their opinion, may be the value thereof. Upon completion of the duties of the board of equalization and review the assessment must be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, after which approval it becomes the basis of taxation for the ensuing three years (28 Stat., 284).

Annually, on or about the 1st of July, the board of assistant assessors is required to make a list of all real property which shall have become subject to taxation, and which is not then on the tax list, and to fix the valuation thereof according to the rules prescribed for assessing real estate. They are also required to make a return of all new structures erected or roofed, and additions to, or improvements of, old structures of over $500 in value, which shall not have been theretofore assessed, specifying the tract or lot on which each of such structures shall have been erected and the value of such structure, and they shall add such valuation to the assessment made of such tract or lot. When improvements on any tract or lot become damaged or destroyed, the board is required to reduce the assessment on such property to the extent of such damage.

Appeals from these yearly assessments are heard by the board of equalization and review between the first and third Mondays of July of each year.

If the board of assistant assessors shall ascertain that any real property has been omitted from assessment for any previous year or years, or has been so assessed that the assessment was void, they must at once reassess such property for each year of such omission and report the same, through the assessor, to the collector of taxes, who is required to at once proceed to collect the taxes so in arrears as other taxes are collected. However, no property which has escaped taxation is liable for a period of more than three years prior to assessment, except in the case of property involved in litigation.

Whenever a subdivision of any real property is made and recorded with the surveyor of the District the board of assistant assessors must reassess the property so subdivided, and the tax on such reassessment is due and payable at the semiannual payment of taxes next ensuing. (28 Stat., 284 and 285.)

RATE OF TAXATION.

The rate of taxation is uniformly, throughout the District of Columbia, 1½ per cent. (Act of July 1, 1902.)

BOOKS OF ASSESSMENT.

The books of assessment are prepared by the assessor before the 1st day of November in each year, and upon completion thereof the assessor is required to make a statement showing the total amount of the assessment of both real and personal property and the total amount of taxes to be collected under said assessments; which statement must be receipted by the collector of taxes, in triplicate, and said collector is held responsible, under his bond, for all such taxes, except such as he may not be able to collect after fully complying with the requirements of law. The original receipt of said assessment and taxes must be forwarded by the assessor to the First Comptroller of the Treasury, the duplicate to the auditor of the District of Columbia, and the triplicate is to be retained by the collector. (27 Stat., 13.)

All real property must be assessed in the name of the owner or trustee or trustees of the owner thereof. All undivided real property of a deceased person may be assessed in the name of such deceased person until the same is divided according to law, or otherwise passed into the possession of some other person or persons, and all real property the ownership of which is unknown shall be assessed "Owner unknown." (28 Stat., 282.)

TAX BILLS.

All general tax bills must be prepared under the direction of the assessor. (27 Stat., 13.) By order of the Commissioners, all special assessment and water-main tax bills are also prepared under his supervision.

DATE OF PAYMENT OF TAXES.

Taxes on realty are levied by fiscal years, and are payable one-half in November, at the option of the owner, no penalty accruing for failure to pay said half until the whole tax becomes due in the following May. For failure to pay before the 1st of June, 1 per cent per month penalty is charged. (Act of February 14, 1902.)

PUBLIC INSPECTION OF RECORDS.

The assessor is required to have the records of his office open to the inspection of the public, free of charge, at such time or times as the public interest will permit. (Act of July 1, 1902.)

EXEMPTIONS.

The act of Congress approved March 3, 1877, made the following provisions as to exemptions from taxation:

"That the property exempt from taxation under this act shall be the following and no other, namely: First, the Corcoran art building, free public library buildings, churches, the Soldiers' Home, and grounds actually occupied by such buildings; secondly, houses for the reformation of offenders, almshouses, buildings belonging to institutions of purely public charity conducted without charge to inmates, profit, or income; cemeteries dedicated and used solely for burial purposes and without private income or profit; but if any portion of any such building, house, grounds, or cemeteries so in terms excepted is larger than is absolutely required and actually used for its legitimate purpose and none other, or is used to secure a rent or income, or for any business purpose, such portion of the same, or a sum equal in value to such portion, shall be taxed against the owner of said building or grounds." (19 Stat., 399.)

This has been modified by the act of July 1, 1902, which provides:

"That hereafter property used for educational purposes, that is not used for private gain, shall be exempt from taxation, and all other

property used for educational purposes shall be assessed and taxed as other property is assessed and taxed."

And also:

"And hereafter no property except that of the United States or the District of Columbia shall be exempt from assessments for improvements."

SALES FOR DELINQUENT TAXES.

The assessor is required to annually prepare a list of taxes on real property in arrears on the 1st day of July. The Commissioners must fix a date of sale and publish the list with notice of sale in a pamphlet, of which not less than 2,000 copies must be printed for distribution to taxpayers applying therefor. The Commissioners must also give notice, by advertisement twice a week for three successive weeks, beginning on the third Monday of February of each year, in three daily newspapers published in the District, that the pamphlet has been printed and that a copy thereof will be given to any taxpayer applying therefor at the office of the collector of taxes. In said pamphlet a description of property sufficient to identify the same is considered a proper description. The expenses of advertising and printing of pamphlet are paid by a charge of 50 cents for each lot or piece of property advertised.

If the taxes due, together with penalties and costs, shall not have been paid prior to date of sale, the property must be sold by the collector of taxes, under the direction of the Commissioners, at public auction, in the collector's office, said sale commencing at least three weeks after first publication of said notice, and continuing each day (Sundays and holidays excepted) until all said delinquent property is sold.

The collector must require from every purchaser a deposit sufficient, in his judgment, to guarantee a full and final settlement for such purchase. Every purchaser other than the District of Columbia shall pay the full amount of his bid, including surplus, if any, to the collector within five days after last day of sale, and if such payment is not made within time specified deposit of person so failing to pay shall be forfeited to the District of Columbia and collector shall issue certificate of sale for such property to the next highest bidder; and if the latter shall not pay the amount of his bid within two days thereafter, the sales upon which the bids were made shall be set aside by the Commissioners and the property shall be considered as having been bid in in the name of the District of Columbia.

In case no other person bids, or bids are insufficient to cover amount of taxes due, together with penalties and costs, the collector shall bid the amount due, together with penalties and costs, and purchase it for the District; but property so bid in for the District of Columbia is not thereafter exempt from taxation. Failure on the part of the District to enforce the liens thus acquired does not release property from any tax that may be due the District.

Immediately after close of sale, upon payment of purchase money, the collector must issue to all purchasers certificates of sale, and if the property is not redeemed from said sale within two years from last day thereof, by payment to the collector, for the use of the holder of the certificate, the amount for which property was sold, exclusive of surplus, and 12 per cent per annum thereon, a deed must be given by the Commissioners to the holder of the certificate, which deed is admitted to be prima facie evidence of a fee-simple title. No deed, however, can be issued until all taxes and assessments due on the property are paid, including taxes for which the District purchased property at tax sale. Nor must said deeds be executed if it shall be discovered that sales were for any cause invalid and ineffectual to pass title to property sold, in which case the Commissioners must cancel the sale and refund the purchase money with 6 per cent per annum interest, together with the surplus, if any.

If any conveyance made by the Commissioners of property sold for taxes shall be set aside by the court, the party in whose favor the decree is rendered must pay to the party holding the conveyance the amount paid for such taxes and conveyances, with interest at 6 per cent per annum. When any tax sale is for any reason set aside or canceled, the property embraced in said sale may be readvertised and sold at the tax sale next ensuing.

Minors and other persons under legal disability are allowed one year after attaining age or after removal of such disability to redeem property sold or bid off by the collector of taxes, by payment of the amount of purchase money, with 8 per cent per annum interest, together with all taxes and assessments that have been paid thereon by the purchaser between the date of sale and date of redemption, with 8 per cent per annum interest on the amount of such taxes and assessments.

Property sold as aforesaid is redeemable from said sale at any time within two years after last day of sale by payment to the collector of taxes, for the use of the holder of the certificate, the sum mentioned therein, exclusive of surplus, with interest thereon at 12 per cent per annum after date of such certificate. Any surplus remaining after collection of tax, penalty, etc., must be deposited by the collector to the credit of the surplus fund, to be paid to owner or owners of property in the same manner as other payments made by the District, but if any property sold as aforesaid is redeemed from sale within the time allowed, the surplus collected at time of sale must be paid to holder of certificate.

The collector is required, within twenty days (exclusive of Sundays and holidays) after last day of sale, to file with the recorder of deeds a written report stating property sold other than that sold to the District of Columbia, to whom it was assessed, taxes due, to whom sold, amount paid, date of sale, cost of sale, and surplus, if any.

If property bid in for the District of Columbia shall not have been redeemed within two years from last day of sale, by payment of taxes, penalties, and costs due at time of sale, and 8 per cent per annum thereon, the Commissioners may sell said property at public or private sale, and issue to the purchaser a deed, which shall have the same force and effect as the deed provided for property sold at regular annual sale.

The collector of taxes may, at any time before expiration of time allowed for redemption of property bid in for District of Columbia, issue certificates of taxes to any person applying therefor, and if property is not redeemed within two years from date of said certificate, by payment of the face of the certificate, exclusive of surplus and 12 per cent per annum thereon, the Commissioners shall issue a deed to the holder of the certificate, which deed shall have the same force and effect as deeds given for property sold at regular annual tax sale. Deeds, however, shall not be issued, either in case of property bid in for the District which has not been redeemed within two years or property bid in for the District upon which certificates of sale are issued within redemption period, unless all taxes and assessments due on the property are paid, nor if the sale to the District was for any cause invalid or ineffectual to give title to the property. (Act of July 1, 1902.)

The assessor is required to prepare and keep in his office, for public inspection, a list of all real estate sold for nonpayment of general or special taxes or assessments, said list to show the date of sale, for what taxes sold, in whose name assessed at time of sale, amount of sale, when and to whom conveyed, if heeded, or if redeemed from sale, the date of redemption. (27 Stat., 37.)

COLLECTION AND DEPOSIT OF REVENUES.

It is the duty of the collector of taxes for the District of Columbia to collect all revenues of the District and deposit the amount collected daily with the Treasurer of the United States, and he is held responsible under his bond for all taxes except such as he may not be able to collect after fully complying with the requirements of law. (20 Stat., 461; 27 Stat., 13.)

Section 2 of the District appropriation law of March 3, 1883, prescribes—

"That hereafter all moneys appropriated for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, together with all revenues of the District of Columbia, from taxes or otherwise, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, as required by the provisions of section 4 of an act approved June 11, 1878." (22 Stat., 470.)

CERTIFIED STATEMENTS OF TAXES.

The assessor is required to furnish certified statements, over his hand and official seal, of all taxes and assessments, general and special, that may be due and unpaid at the time of making said certificates. For each certificate a fee of 50 cents must be paid to the collector of taxes.

When such certificate is issued, it is a bar to the collection from any subsequent purchaser of any tax or assessment omitted from, and which may be a lien upon the real estate mentioned in, said certificate; but such omission does not affect the liability of the person who owned the property at the time such tax was assessed. (27 Stat., 37.)

TEMPORARY REDUCTION OF INTEREST ON ARREARS OF TAXES.

If arrears of taxes for years prior to 1900 are paid before December 31, 1902, 6 per cent per annum interest is charged instead of usual penalties and interest. (Act of February 15, 1902.)

REASSESSMENTS.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed, in cases where general taxes or assessments for local improvements are quashed, set aside, or declared void by the supreme court of the District of Columbia by reason of imperfect or erroneous description of the property against which same was levied, by reason of such tax or assessment not having been authenticated by proper officer, by reason of a defective return of service of notice, or for any technical reason other than the right of the public authorities to levy the tax or assessment, to reassess the property in question, with power to collect such reassessment. Said reassessment, however, must be made within ninety days after judgment or decree of court quashing or setting aside such taxes or assessments. Any amount theretofore paid on the assessment which has been declared void shall be credited upon the reassessment. (29 Stat., 98, and 30 Stat., 721.)

DESIGNATIONS OF PARCELS OF LAND.

Act of March 3, 1899, prescribed a system for numbering each lot, part of lot, or parcel of land in the District of Columbia. The object of this act was to procure uniformity in this respect and to prevent duplications in numbers.

TRANSCRIPTS OF DEEDS, WILLS, ETC.

Act of March 3, 1899, section 3, is as follows:

"That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall cause to be made a daily transcript and entry on the records of said assessor of the designations of lots or parcels of land in said District appearing in instruments of conveyance received for record in the office of the recorder of deeds and the designations of lots or parcels of land in said District transferred by probated wills; and the person or persons whom the Commissioners of said District may designate for the purpose of making such transcripts shall for this purpose at all times, during office hours, have full access to the records of the recorder of deeds and the register of wills of said District." * * *

Special assessments.

ASSESSMENT AND PERMIT WORK.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized (28 Stat., 247 and 248), whenever in their judgment the same is necessary for the public health, safety, or comfort, or when application is made therefor, accompanied by a deposit equal to one-half the estimated cost of the work, to improve and repair alleys and sidewalks, and to construct (see Exhibit B for law of assessment for service sewers) sidewalks of such form and materials as they may determine, and to pay the total cost of said work from appropriations for assessment and permit work.

No property except that of the United States or the District of Columbia, and property owned by foreign governments for legation purposes shall be exempt from assessments for improvements. March 3, 1903 (32 Stats., 961).

Notice must be given by advertisement, twice a week for two weeks, in two newspapers published in the city of Washington, of any such assessment work proposed to be done, designating the location and kind of work, specifying the kind of materials to be used, the estimated cost, and fixing a time and place when and where property owners about to be assessed may appear and present objections thereto and for hearing thereof. One-half of the total cost of such improvements, including expenses of assessment, must be charged against and become a lien upon abutting property, and assessment therefor must be levied pro rata according to the linear frontage of such property.

Notices of the levying of such assessments must be served upon each lot owner, if he or she be a resident of the District and his or her residence known; and if he or she be a nonresident of the District, or his or her residence unknown, such notice must be served upon his or her agent or tenant, as the case may be; and if there be no agent or tenant known to the Commissioners, then they shall give notice of such assessment by advertisement, twice a week for two weeks, in some newspaper published in the District. Service of such notice where owner or his or her tenant or agent resides in the District must be either personal or by leaving the same with some person of suitable age, at the residence or place of business of such agent, owner, or tenant, and return of such service must be made in writing and filed in the office of the Commissioners. The costs of publication of notice and service of notices are paid out of the appropriation for assessment and permit work.

One-half of the cost of such work must be paid to the collector of taxes as follows: One-third within sixty days after service of notice of assessment, without interest; one-third within one year, and the remainder within two years from date of service of notice, interest be-

ing charged at 8 per cent per annum from date of service of notice on amounts unpaid at expiration of sixty days after service of notice of assessment.

Any property upon which such assessment and accrued interest thereon, or any part thereof, remains unpaid at expiration of two years from date of service of notice of assessment shall be subject to sale therefor under the same conditions and penalties imposed for nonpayment of general taxes. If any property, assessed as heretofore explained, shall become liable to sale for any other assessment or tax whatever, then the assessments levied as hereinbefore explained become immediately due and payable, and the property against which they are levied may be sold therefor, together with the accrued interest thereon and the costs of advertising to date of such sale.

Property owners who request improvements under the permit system must deposit, in advance, with the collector of taxes, an amount equal to one-half the estimated cost of such improvements, and in such cases it is not necessary to give notices, as hereinbefore stated.

All moneys received by the collector of taxes for work done upon request of property owners must be deposited by him in the United States Treasury to the credit of the permit fund.

Upon completion of the work done, as aforesaid, at request of property owners, the Commissioners must repay to the then current appropriation for assessment and permit work, out of the permit fund, a sum equivalent to one-half the cost of the work, and shall return to the depositors from the said fund, when application is made therefor, any surplus that may remain over and above one-half the cost of the work. (28 Stat., 247 and 248.)

HOUSE CONNECTIONS.

The cost of service connections with water mains and sewers is assessed against the lots for which said connections are made, and collected in same manner and upon same conditions as to notice as provided for assessment work. (28 Stat., 248.)

OPENING, WIDENING, ETC., OF MINOR STREETS AND ALLEYS.

[See Exhibit D.]

EXTENSIONS OF STREETS AND AVENUES.

In the case of extensions of streets and avenues the Commissioners are authorized to petition the supreme court of the District of Columbia for the condemnation of land necessary for such extension, said court appointing a jury for that purpose, and the jury making return of benefits and damages to abutting property. (Act of March 3, 1899.) Assessments are then levied for benefits to abutting property, such assessments being payable in five equal annual installments, with interest at 4 per cent per annum after sixty days from confirmation of verdict of jury; but in cases of awards for damages only that part of said award is paid by the District as may be in excess of assessment for benefits, and there is credited on assessment for benefits the amount of any award for damages not in excess of said assessment. (Act of July 1, 1902.)

If the aggregate amount of benefits to be assessed as determined by the jury is less than one-half of the amount of award for damages, the Commissioners may, in their discretion, reject the award and assessment, and all proceedings thereunder shall in that event be null and void. (Act of June 6, 1900.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR WATER MAINS.

[See Exhibit B for law on this subject in lieu of portion canceled.]

All moneys received on account of laying of water mains and all other moneys received on account of the water department must be deposited to the credit of the water fund, to be used exclusively for the support of the water department. (L. A., June 23, 1873.)

EXEMPTION FROM ASSESSMENT FOR IMPROVEMENTS.

The only property exempt from assessment for improvements is that of the United States and the District of Columbia. (Act of July 1, 1902.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR REMOVING OR SECURING DANGEROUS STRUCTURES.

The costs of removing or securing, by the District of Columbia, dangerous structures, upon refusal of neglect of owners to perform such work after due notice, must be assessed against the land upon which structure or structures stand or stood, and unless such assessment is paid within ninety days from service of notice the same shall bear interest at rate of 10 per cent per annum from date of assessment until paid and shall be collected as general taxes are collected. (30 Stat., 123.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR INCLOSING DANGEROUS WELLS, ETC.

The cost of fencing or otherwise inclosing, by the District of Columbia, lots upon which exist uncovered wells or other dangerous holes or excavations, after neglect or refusal of owner to perform such work upon due notice, shall be assessed as a tax against the property on which such nuisances exist, the tax so assessed to bear interest at rate of 10 per cent per annum and to be carried on regular tax rolls and collected in manner provided for collection of other taxes. (30 Stat., 924.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR REMOVAL OF WEEDS.

The expense of removal, by the District of Columbia, of weeds of 4 inches or more in height from unoccupied land in the city of Washington or its more densely populated suburbs, upon failure or neglect of owner to perform such work, shall be assessed against the property on which such weeds were located, and said assessments shall bear interest at rate of 10 per cent per annum until paid, shall be carried on regular tax rolls of the District, and paid in manner provided for collection of general taxes. (30 Stat., 959.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR DRAINING LOTS.

In case owner or owners of lots, after due notice, fail or neglect to connect such lots with water mains and sewers, as required by law, the Commissioners shall cause such connections to be made, the expense to be paid out of the emergency fund, such expense, with necessary costs of advertising, to be assessed as a tax against such lots, which tax shall be carried on regular tax rolls and be collected in manner provided for collection of other taxes. (29 Stat., 126.)

The Commissioners are also authorized to make such connections upon any street or avenue about to be paved or otherwise improved before any such pavement or other permanent works are put down, the costs of such connections to be assessed as explained above. (20 Stat., 107; 28 Stat., 144; 29 Stat., 126.)

SPECIAL POLICEMEN AT STREET-RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

The Commissioners are authorized and required to station special policemen at such street-railway crossings and intersections in the city of Washington as they may deem necessary, the expense of such services to be paid pro rata by the respective railway companies. (30 Stat., 489.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR CLEANING OF OFFENSIVE CESSPOOLS.

For cleaning offensive cesspools, by the District of Columbia, in cases where owners or other responsible parties fail or neglect to perform such work, after due notice, the Commissioners are authorized to assess the cost thereof as a tax against the property benefited, which tax shall be carried on the regular tax roll and collected in the manner provided for collection of other taxes. (30 Stat., 233.)

LIGHTING TRACKS OF STEAM RAILWAY COMPANIES.

All railway companies using engines propelled by steam must pay the District of Columbia for the lighting of the streets, avenues, lands, and grounds through which their tracks may be laid. In case of default of such payment, actions at law may be maintained by the District of Columbia against said railway companies. (22 Stat., 466.)

COSTS OF ERECTION OF FIRE ESCAPES.

If the owners, proprietors, lessees, or trustees of buildings used as factories, manufactories, tenement houses, seminaries, colleges, academies, hospitals, or asylums fail to provide such buildings with fire escapes, standpipes, ladders, lights, and alarm gongs, as required by law, after due notice from the Commissioners, such fire escapes, etc., must be erected by the Commissioners, and the costs thereof assessed as a tax against the building on which they are erected and the ground upon which the same stands, and the Commissioners shall issue tax-lien certificates against such buildings and grounds for the amount of such assessment, bearing interest at the rate of 10 per cent per annum, which certificates may be turned over by the Commissioners to the contractor for performing the work. (28 Stat., 810.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR REMOVING SNOW, ICE, DIRT, ETC.

In case the owner or tenant of any house, lot, building, or land shall neglect to cause to be removed snow, ice, sand, dirt, gravel, etc., from paved sidewalks adjacent to said property, as required by law, the Commissioners shall cause removal of same, the costs of which shall be assessed as a tax against the property to which the sidewalks in question belong, and the said tax, so assessed, shall be carried on the regular tax roll and collected in manner provided for collection of other taxes. (28 Stat., 809.)

ASSESSMENTS FOR PAVING STREETS ADJACENT TO STREET-RAILWAY TRACKS.

When any street or avenue through which a street railway runs shall be paved, such railway companies shall bear all of the expense for that portion of the work lying between the exterior rails of the tracks of such roads and for a distance of 2 feet from and exterior to such tracks, on each side thereof, and of keeping the same in repair; and when street railways cross any street or avenue the pavement between the tracks of such railway shall, at the expense of the company owning the tracks, be made to conform to the pavement used upon such street or avenue. If any street-railway company shall neglect or refuse to perform the work required, said pavement shall be laid by the District of Columbia and the costs collected from such company by issuing certificates of indebtedness against the property, real or personal, of such railway company, which certificates shall bear interest at the rate of 10 per cent per annum until paid, and which, until paid, shall remain a lien upon the property on or against which they are issued, together with the franchise of said company; and if such certificates are not paid within one year the Commissioners may proceed to sell the property against which they are issued, or so much thereof as may be necessary to pay the amount due, such sale to be first advertised daily for one week in some newspaper published in the city of Washington, and to be at public auction, to the highest bidder. (20 Stat., 106.)

Taxation of personal property.

The board of personal tax appraisers consists of the assessor, chairman, and the two members of the board of assistant assessors detailed to that duty as hereinbefore explained. (Act of July 1, 1902, and 28 Stat., 282.)

The assessor is required to annually cause to be prepared a printed blank schedule of all tangible personal property and of general merchandise, stock in trade, owned or held in trust, or otherwise, subject to taxation, and of the classes of corporations and companies to be assessed, together with the rate of tax prescribed, to which shall be appended an affidavit in blank, setting forth that the return presents a full and true statement of all such personal property, taxable capital, or other basis of assessment, or either, as the case may be.

When said schedule is ready for delivery, notice thereof must be given by the assessor by advertisement for three successive secular days in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, and a copy of said schedule must be delivered to any citizen applying therefor at the office of the assessor. These schedules must be filled out and sworn to, and returned to the office of the assessor within thirty days after the last publication of advertisement. The members of the board of personal tax appraisers are authorized to administer, without charge, oaths for this purpose. For failure to make return within specified time, 20 per cent of assessed valuation of personal property is added.

Upon the filing of these returns, the two members of the board of assistant assessors designated by the assessor to assess personal property must, under the direction and supervision of the assessor, assess personal property. If the board of personal tax appraisers is not satisfied as to the correctness of any return of personal property, they may reject the same, and said board, or any one of the members thereof, may, from the best information he or they can procure, by making such an examination of the personal property as may be practicable, assess the same in such amount as may to him or them seem just, and notice of the rejection of the return shall be given to the party interested by leaving the same at the address given in said return.

In all cases, however, there is the right of appeal to the board of personal-tax appeals, hereinafter referred to, within fifteen days after delivery of said notice of rejection. Any person making a false affidavit as to taxation of personal property is deemed guilty of perjury, and, upon conviction, is subject to the penalties provided for that offense.

If the personal-tax appraisers fail to complete any of the duties required by law to be performed by them within the time specified, the taxation based upon the same is not, by reason thereof, invalid, but the appraisers must proceed with all reasonable diligence to complete such duties, and their acts are valid as if performed within the time provided therefor.

If at any time within any current year property subject to taxation shall be discovered to have been omitted from assessment the board of personal-tax appraisers shall immediately assess the same for the then

current year, giving notice in writing to the persons or corporation so assessed, who shall have the right of appeal within ten days from date of said notice.

BOARD OF PERSONAL-TAX APPEALS.

The board of five (act of July 1, 1902, and 28 Statutes, 282) assistant assessors, with the assessor as chairman, compose a board of personal-tax appeals, which must convene, in a place to be provided therefor by the assessor, on the first Monday in February of each year, and continue in session to and including the second Monday in March of each year (33 Stat., 563), public notice of the time and place of such meeting having been given by advertisement for two consecutive secular days in two daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia. It is the duty of this board, between the day of convening and December 15 of each year, to hear all appeals made by any person or persons against the assessments made by the board of personal-tax appraisers, and to impartially equalize the valuation of said personal property as the basis for assessment.

Any four members of said board shall constitute a quorum for business, and in the absence of the assessor a temporary chairman may be chosen. The board is empowered to diminish or increase such assessments as they may believe to have been returned at other than their true value to such amount as in their opinion may be the value thereof, and the action of the board in such cases is final.

DISTRAINT AND SALE.

When the taxes on personal property due and payable in each year shall not be paid on or before the 1st of June, the collector of taxes or his deputy may distrain sufficient goods and chattels found within the District of Columbia and belonging to the person charged with such tax to pay the taxes remaining due, together with the penalty thereon, and the costs that may accrue; and for want of such goods and chattels said collector of taxes may levy upon and sell at auction the estate and interest of such person in any parcel of land in said District; and in the case of the levy on any estate or interest in land the proceedings subsequent to sale thereof are the same as provided by law in the case of sales for arrears of taxes against real estate; and in case of distraint of personal property or the levy upon real estate, as aforesaid, the collector of taxes must immediately proceed to advertise the same by public notice, to be posted in the office of said collector, and by advertisement three times within one week, in one or more of the daily newspapers published in said District, stating the time when and the place where such property will be sold, the last publication to be at least six days before the date of sale, and if the said taxes and penalty thereon, and the costs and expenses which shall have accrued thereon, shall not be paid before the day fixed for such sale, which must not be less than ten days after said levy or taking of said property, the collector must proceed to sell at public auction in his office to the highest bidder such property, or so much thereof as may be needed to pay such taxes, penalties, and accrued costs and expenses of such distraint and sale. Said collector must report in detail in writing every distraint and sale of personal property to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their successors in office, and his accounts in respect to every such distraint or sale must forthwith be submitted to the auditor of the District of Columbia and be audited by him. Any surplus resulting from such sale over and above such taxes, costs, and expenses must be paid into the Treasury, and upon being claimed by the owner or owners of the goods and chattels aforesaid must be paid to him or them upon the certificate of the collector of taxes stating in full the amount of such excess.

"That hereafter when the collector of taxes shall distrain any goods and chattels in order to enforce payment of taxes levied under the aforesaid act, approved July 1, 1902, the goods and chattels so seized shall be kept in a safe and convenient place until the day of the sale thereof; and the sale of said goods and chattels shall be at public auction, at such place as the collector of taxes may designate: *Provided, however,* That no such goods and chattels shall be sold upon any bid not sufficient to meet the amount of tax, penalty, and costs; but in case the highest bid therefor is not sufficient to meet the amount of tax, penalty, and costs thereon, said property thereupon shall be bid off by the said collector of taxes in the name of and by the District of Columbia, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may sell the same at private sale to satisfy the tax, penalty, and cost thereafter without further notice." (33 Stat., 564.)

RATE OF TAXATION ON PERSONAL PROPERTY.

On all tangible personal property assessed at a fair cash value (over and above the exemptions provided), including vessels, ships, boats, tools, implements, horses and other animals, carriages, wagons, and other vehicles, there must be paid 1½ per cent on the assessed value thereof.

"Dealers in general merchandise of every description shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 1½ per cent on the average stock in trade for the preceding year.

"After the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person or persons entering the District of Columbia subsequent to June 30 in each year and establishing a place of business for the sale of goods, wares, or merchandise, either at private sale or auction, or engaging in the business of common carrier by vessels, ships, or boats, to conduct such business until a sworn statement of the value of such stock, vessels, ships, and boats has been filed with the assessor of the District of Columbia, who shall thereupon render a bill for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year at the same rate as other personal taxes are levied: *Provided,* That this shall not apply to vessels, ships, or boats if it shall be made to appear by affidavit that any vessel, ship, or boat has been assessed for taxation and the taxes paid elsewhere.

"The assessor is hereby authorized to reassess said stock whenever, in his judgment, it has been undervalued. The goods, wares, and merchandise of any person or persons who shall fail to pay the tax required by this paragraph within three days after beginning business shall be subject to distraint, and it shall be the duty of the assessor to place bills therefor in the hands of the collector of taxes, who shall seize sufficient of the goods of the delinquent to satisfy said tax: *Provided,* That said owner shall have the right of redemption within thirty days on payment of said tax, to which shall be added a penalty of 1 per cent, together with the costs of seizure. The collector shall sell such goods as are not redeemed at public auction, after advertisement for the three days preceding said sale." (33 Stat., 563.)

Hotel companies and the proprietors of hotels are required to pay 1½ per cent on the assessed value of their furniture.

Each national bank, as the trustee for its stockholders, through its president or cashier, and all other incorporated banks and trust companies in the District of Columbia, through their presidents or cashiers, and all gas, electric lighting, and telephone companies, through their proper officers, must make affidavit to the board of personal-tax appraisers on or before the 1st day of August each year as to the amount of its or their gross earnings for the preceding year ending the 30th day of June, and must pay per annum on such gross earnings as follows: Each national bank and all other incorporated banks and trust companies, respectively, 6 per cent; each gas company, 5 per cent; each electric lighting and telephone company, 4 per cent. And in addition thereto the real estate owned by each national or other incorporated bank and each trust, gas, electric lighting, and telephone company in the District of Columbia is taxed as other real estate in said District. Street railroad companies pay 4 per cent per annum on their gross receipts and other taxes, which shall be construed to mean that all street railroad companies shall pay 4 per cent per annum on their gross receipts within the District of Columbia and other taxes as provided by existing law. (33 Stats., 564.) Insurance companies pay 1½ per cent on premium receipts.

All companies, incorporated or otherwise, who guarantee the fidelity of any individual or individuals, such as bonding companies, and all companies who furnish abstracts of titles to real property, or who insure real estate titles, shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 1½ per cent of their gross receipts in the District of Columbia. (Ibid.)

Savings banks having no capital stock and paying interest to their depositors must, through their president or cashier, make affidavit to the board of personal-tax appraisers on or before the 1st day of August in each year as to the amount of their surplus and undivided profits and pay a sum equal to 1½ per cent on the amount of their surplus and undivided profits on the 30th day of June preceding. That hereafter, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1904, incorporated savings banks paying interest to their depositors shall, through their president, or cashier, make report under oath to the board of personal-tax appraisers on or before the 1st day of August in each year as to the amount of their gross earnings, less the amount paid as interest to their depositors for the preceding year ending June 30, and shall pay thereon to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 4 per cent per annum. (Ibid.)

The capital stock of all corporations other than those herein provided for, organized in the District of Columbia or under the laws of any of the States or Territories of the United States, chiefly for the purpose of, and transacting business within, the District of Columbia, except those exempted by the laws relating to the District of Columbia, is appraised in bulk at its fair cash value by the board of personal-tax appraisers, and the corporation issuing the same is liable for the tax thereon according to such value, and must pay a sum equal to 1½ per cent on the assessed valuation thereof; but from the assessed valuation of such capital stock is first deducted the value of any and all real estate owned by such corporation in said District, which real estate is separately taxed against said corporation: *Provided,* That nothing in this paragraph contained shall be construed to include business companies which, by reason of or in addition to incorporation, receive no special franchise or privilege; but all such corporations shall be rated, assessed, and taxed as individuals conducting business in similar lines are rated, assessed, and taxed. (Ibid.)

Building associations in the District of Columbia shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 2 per cent per annum on their entire gross earnings for the preceding year ending June 30. (Ibid.)

All taxes levied under the foregoing provisions of this law are due, payable, and collectible in May of each year, and are subject to the same penalties for nonpayment thereof as the general tax on real estate, until distraint or sale.

Private banks or bankers, not incorporated, pay a tax of $500 per annum. General brokers pay a tax of $250 per annum. The Washington Stock Exchange pays $500 per annum in lieu of tax on members thereof for business done on said exchange. Any broker who is a member of a regularly organized stock exchange located outside of the District of Columbia, and transacting a brokerage business therein, pays $100 per annum. If any person or firm shall have paid the tax provided for banks and bankers, such person or firm can not again be taxed as a broker or brokers. Note brokers pay a tax of $100 per annum. Exceptions are made of cooperative associations whose business is restricted to the members of such association.

The taxes for private banks and bankers, general brokers, and note brokers date from the 1st day of July in each year and expire on the 30th day of June following. Said taxes date from the first day of the month in which the liability begins, and payment must be made for a proportionate amount.

EXEMPTIONS.

The following personal property is exempt from taxation:

The personal property of all library, benevolent, charitable, and scientific institutions incorporated under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia and not conducted for private gain.

Libraries, schoolbooks, wearing apparel, and all family portraits. (Ibid.)

Household and other belongings, not held for sale, to the value of $1,000, owned by the occupant of any dwelling house or other place of abode, in which such household and other belongings may be located.

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF LAW.

Any person violating any of the provisions of the personal-tax law is liable to a penalty of not exceeding $500 for each offense, such penalty to be imposed upon conviction in the police court of the District as other fines and penalties are imposed, and in default of payment of such penalty the person or persons so convicted shall be imprisoned, in the discretion of the court, not exceeding six months. (Act approved July 1, 1902.)

LICENSES.

All licenses are issued by the assessor, over his hand and official seal. No person is permitted to carry on any business, trade, profession, or calling, for which a license is imposed, without having first obtained such license. Applications for licenses must be made to the assessor, and no license can be granted until payment for the same shall have been made. Each license must specify the name of the person to whom issued, the business, trade, profession, calling, etc., for which it is granted, and the location at which such business is to be carried on. Licenses may be assigned or transferred upon application, under the terms and conditions applicable to the original grant-

ing of the same, and the assessor must issue a certificate of such transfer upon the payment of a fee of 50 cents. When more than one business, trade, profession, calling, etc., for which a license is prescribed, shall be carried on by the same person, a license must be obtained for each such business, etc. Licenses are good only for the location designated thereon, and no license can be issued for more than one place of business without payment of separate tax for each. All licenses date from the 1st of November and expire on the 31st of October following, except those specially designated in the following list. Licenses issued at any time after beginning of license year date from first day of month of issue and end the last day of license year, payment being made for proportionate amount of license tax. In cases where license is less than $5 per annum they terminate one year from first day of month of issue. No one holding a license is permitted to allow any other person charged with a separate license to operate under his license. All licenses must be conspicuously posted on premises of the licensee, and be accessible at all times for inspection by police officers or others authorized in that respect. Licensees having no located place of business must exhibit their licenses when requested to do so by proper authorities.

Applications for licenses for hotels and theaters must have written approval of inspector of buildings and chief of fire department. Any license issued to proprietor of a theater or other public place of amusement may be terminated by the Commissioners whenever it shall appear to them that after due notice the person holding such license shall have failed to comply with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioners for the public decency. (Act of March 1, 1901.)

Proprietors of hotels can not obtain a license for less than $30 per annum.

An act to prevent fraudulent transactions on the part of commission merchants, approved March 21, 1892, is made applicable to auctioneers, their agents, and employees.

Drivers of licensed passenger vehicles, while transacting such business, must wear upon their breasts a badge numbered to correspond with license of his vehicle, such badge being furnished by District of Columbia upon payment of fee of 50 cents.

In addition to license for proprietors of livery stables, they must obtain licenses for any vehicles owned by them occupying public stands.

The Commissioners must approve applications for licenses for vehicles for transportation of passengers operated over a definite route.

For entertainments given in church premises or private residences, where the proceeds are for church or charitable purposes and no rental is charged, no license is required.

Applications for licenses for shooting galleries must be accompanied with certificate from inspector of buildings, that suitable precautions have been taken for public safety, and with written authority from majority of occupants and residents on the same side of the square in which proposed gallery is to be located, and also on confronting side of the square fronting opposite to the same. The chief of police is authorized to prescribe the caliber, firearms, and kind of cartridges to be used.

The Commissioners have discretion to refuse licenses for merry-go-rounds, flying horses, etc.

Applications for licenses for massage establishments, mediums, clairvoyants, soothsayers, fortune tellers, and palmists must have the approval of the chief of police.

Hucksters are furnished with badges corresponding to number of license, which must be worn while transacting business, in addition to a corresponding number which must be attached to their vehicles. Hucksters' licenses need not be procured by persons bringing and selling at the several markets produce of their own raising.

The fire marshal must approve applications for licenses for buildings for storage of inflammable materials.

Persons violating any of the provisions of the license law, upon conviction thereof in the police court of the District of Columbia, are punishable by a fine of not more than $500 for each offense, and in default of payment, by imprisonment not exceeding thirty days, in the discretion of the court. (Act approved July 1, 1902.)

Following is a list of rates of licenses prescribed by act approved July 1, 1902:

List of rates of licenses.

Business.	When due.	Rate.	Remarks.
Agricultural exhibits	Nov. 1	$100	Per annum.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Amusements not otherwise provided for.	do	100	Per annum.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Apothecaries	do	6	Per annum.
Art exhibits	do	100	Do.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Athletic grounds		20	Per week.
		5	Per day.
Auctioneers	Nov. 1	100	Per annum.
Automatic machines. (See Slot machines.)			
Automobiles, autovehicles, etc	July 1	9	Do.
Automobile establishments	Nov. 1	25	License for 10 vehicles or less per annum.
		2	Each additional vehicle.
Balls		3	Per night.
Bankers, private (not incorporated).	July 1	500	Per annum.
Barrooms	Nov. 1	800	Do.
Baseball grounds		20	Per week.
		5	Per day.
Baths	Nov. 1	25	Turkish, Russian, or medicated, per annum.
Bill posters	do	20	Per annum.
Billiard rooms	do	12	Per annum for each billiard, bagatelle, jenny lind, or pool table, shuffleboard, or other legitimate game table.
Boarding houses (public)	do	1	Per annum for each room.

List of rates of licenses—Continued.

Business.	When due.	Rate.	Remarks.
Bowling alleys. Hereafter proprietors of bowling alleys in the District of Columbia shall pay to the collector of taxes of said District an annual license tax of $12 for each alley. (33 stat., 565.)			
Boxing schools	Nov. 1	$12	Per annum.
Brewers	do	250	Do.
Brewers' agents	do	250	Do.
Brokers, real estate	do	50	Do.
Brokers, railroad ticket	do	25	Do.
Brokers, general	July 1	250	Do.
Brokers, general (members of stock exchange).	do	100	Do.
Brokers, note	do	100	Do.
Building contractors	Nov. 1	25	Do.
Carnivals	do	100	Do.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Carriages for hire	July 1	6	Drawn by one animal, per annum.
		9	More than one animal, per annum.
		9	By other motive power, per annum.
Carriage and wagon making establishments.	Nov. 1	25	Per annum.
Cattle dealers	do	15	Do.
Cattle exhibits	do	100	Do.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Cigar dealers	do	12	Per annum.
Circuses		200	Per day.
Claim agents	Nov. 1	25	Per annum.
Clairvoyants	do	25	Do.
Commission merchants	do	40	Do.
Concerts		3	Per night.
Confectionery establishments	Nov. 1	12	Per annum.
Contractors of all kinds	do	25	Do.
Cook shops	do	18	Do.
Dairy lunches	do	18	Do.
Dealers in markets	do	5	Do.
Distillers or rectifiers	do	250	Do.
Druggists	do	6	Do.
Eating houses	do	18	Do.
Electromobiles	July 1	9	Do.
Employment offices	Nov. 1	10	Do.
Entertainments		3	Per night.
Entertainment halls	Nov. 1	100	Per annum.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Exhibition halls	do	100	Per annum.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Exhibits—agricultural, art, cattle, floral, food, freaks, industrial, mechanical, museums, poultry, side shows, etc.	do	100	Per annum.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Fairs	do	100	Per annum.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Fencing schools	do	12	Per annum.
Florists	do	15	Do.
Flying horses. (See Merry-go-rounds.)			
Football grounds		20	Per week.
		5	Per day.
Fortune tellers	Nov. 1	25	Per annum.
Fuel hucksters	do	5	Do.
General brokers	July 1	250	Do.
General brokers (members of stock exchange).	do	100	Do.
Golf grounds		20	Per week.
		5	Per day.
Gymnasiums	Nov. 1	12	Per annum.
Hacks. (See Carriages.)			
Hand laundries	do	10	Do.
Hotels	do	1	Per annum for each room for the accommodation of guests.
Hucksters	Apr. 1	12	Per annum for each vehicle.
Ice-cream parlors	Nov. 1	18	Per annum.
Improvement and land companies. (See land and improvement companies.)			
Inflammable oils	do	10	Per annum for storing quantity exceeding 5 barrels.
Information bureaus	do	10	Per annum.
Intelligence offices	do	10	Do.
Investment associations	do	100	Do.
Land and improvement companies.	do	50	Do.
Laundries	do	20	Steam or other power, per annum.
		10	Per annum, operated by hand.
Lawn fêtes. (See Picnics.)			
Lecture halls	do	100	Per annum.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.

List of rates of licenses—Continued.

Business.	When due.	Rate.	Remarks.
Livery stables	Nov. 1	$25	Per annum for 10 stalls.
		2	Each additional stall.
Liquor dealers, retail	do	800	Per annum.
Liquor dealers, wholesale	do	300	That hereafter it shall be unlawful for the licensee, owner, proprietor, or any employee of a licensee, owner, or proprietor of any barroom, or any other establishment in the District of Columbia in which intoxicating liquors of any kind are sold, to sell, give, or dispense in any manner intoxicating liquors of any kind to any person under the age of 21 years. "Any person knowingly violating the provisions of this paragraph shall be amenable to a fine of $25 or imprisonment for thirty days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and in addition to such penalty the license for the place in which such intoxicating liquors were sold to a minor shall be revoked." (33 Stat., 565.)
Liquors, brewers or manufacturers of.	do	250	Per annum.
Market dealers of all kinds	do	5	Do.
Massage establishments	do	25	Do.
Maturity associations	do	100	Do.
Medicated baths. (See Baths.)			
Mediums	do	25	Do.
Merry-go-rounds		12	Per week.
		10	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Note brokers	July 1	100	Per annum.
Omnibuses	do	6	Per annum, one animal.
		9	Per annum, more than one animal.
Oyster houses	Nov. 1	18	Per annum.
Palmists	do	25	Do.
Passenger transportation lines	do	6	Per annum for each vehicle not exceeding 10 passengers.
		12	Exceeding 10 passengers.
Pawnbrokers	do	100	Per annum.
Peddlers	Apr. 1	25	Do.
Picnic grounds	Nov. 1	100	Do.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Polo grounds		20	Per week.
		5	Per day.
Pool rooms	Nov. 1	12	Per annum.
Private banks or bankers (not incorporated).	July 1	500	Do.
Produce dealers	Apr. 1	12	Per annum for each vehicle.
Race tracks		20	Per week.
		5	Per day.
Real estate brokers. (See Brokers, real estate.)			
Rectifiers. (See Distillers.)			
Restaurants	Nov. 1	18	Per annum.
Russian baths. (See Baths.)			
Secondhand dealers of all kinds	do	40	Do.
"Seeing Washington cars." (See Passenger transportation lines.)			
Shooting galleries	do	12	Do.
Skating rinks	do	100	Do.
		10	Per week.
		5	Each subsequent week.
		3	Per day.
Slot machines	do	2	Per annum, each machine.
		50	Per annum, unlimited number.
Soothsayers	do	25	Per annum.
Stock exchange, Washington	July 1	500	Do.
Theaters	Nov. 1	100	Do.
		20	Per week.
		10	Less than one week.
Ticket brokers, railroad. (See Brokers, ticket.)			
Tournaments. (See Race tracks.)			
Turkish baths. (See Baths.)			
Undertakers	do	25	Per annum.
Vehicles for hire	July 1	6	Per annum, one animal.
		9	More than one.
		9	Horseless or motor.
Victualers	Nov. 1	18	Per annum.
Wagon-making establishments. (See Carriage-making establishments.)			
Washington Stock Exchange	July 1	500	Do.

Steam engineers' licenses are of three grades—first, second, and third—the fee for each being $3. Examination before board of engineers is required. Licenses are good until revoked or changed to higher grade. (Act of February 28, 1887, 24 Stat., 427.)

Dealers in deadly and dangerous weapons are required to file bonds of $1,000 each, but no fee is charged. (27 Stat., 117.)

The fee for transferring a license is 50 cents. (Act of July 1, 1902.)

EXHIBIT B.

An act authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, whenever in their judgment the same may be necessary for the public safety, health, comfort, or convenience, to construct water mains and service sewers in any street, avenue, road, or alley in the District of Columbia; and the assessor of said District shall levy assessments for the same against abutting property in the amount and manner hereinafter prescribed.

SEC. 2. That for laying or constructing water mains in the District of Columbia assessments shall be levied at the rate of $1.25 per linear front foot against all lots or land abutting upon that part of the street, avenue, road, or alley in which a water main shall be laid, and that for laying or constructing service sewers in the District of Columbia assessments shall be levied at the rate of $1 per linear front foot against all lots or land abutting upon that part of the street, avenue, road, or alley in which a sewer shall be laid: *Provided*, That assessments for water mains and service sewers in the case of lots or parcels of land not more than 100 feet in depth shall be levied upon the fronts or rears of such lots or parcels of land, and not upon both the fronts and rears of such lots or parcels of land; but lots or parcels of land more than 100 feet in depth, except corner lots, shall be assessed upon both their fronts and rears when water mains or service sewers are laid abutting the same: *Provided*, That corner lots shall be assessed for water mains and service sewers only on their short fronts with a depth of not exceeding 100 feet; any excess of the other front over 100 feet shall be subject to assessment, as hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That the areas of all lots or parcels of land which have been assessed for water mains by the square foot under any previous act of Congress, or of the late legislative assembly of the District of Columbia, shall not be again assessed for water mains: *Provided*, That assessments for water mains or service sewers shall not be levied under this act against lots or parcels of land not more than 100 feet in depth which have theretofore been assessed by their linear front feet by authority of any act of Congress or of the late corporation of Georgetown, and in any assessment or reassessment levied under the provisions of this act credit shall be allowed for any amount which may have been heretofore paid upon any water main or service sewer assessment levied against the same portion of the area of any lot or parcel of land: *Provided further*, That when the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall deem it advantageous to lay water mains or service sewers on each side of any street, avenue, road, or alley assessments shall be levied at the rate, within the time and in the manner in this section provided for, against the lots abutting the side of the street, avenue, road, or alley in which the water main or service sewer is laid.

SEC. 3. That the assessor of the District of Columbia shall give notices as herein provided of the levying of assessments for water mains and service sewers. Assessments shall be levied within sixty days after the completion of the main or service sewer, and the owner or owners affected by such assessments shall be notified that the same have been levied by a notice which shall be served upon the owner of the lot or parcel of land if he or she be a resident of the District of Columbia, and his or her residence be known. If the owner be a nonresident or his or her residence be unknown, the notice shall be served on his or her agent or tenant. The service of such notice, where the owner or his or her agent or tenant resides in the District of Columbia, shall be personal or by leaving the same with some person of suitable age, either a member of his family or in his employ, at the residence or place of business of such owner, agent, or tenant; and return of such service, stating the manner thereof, shall be made in writing under oath and filed in the office of the assessor of the District of Columbia. If there be no agent or tenant known to said assessor, and the owner or owners be not residents of the District of Columbia, or if the owner be a resident of the District of Columbia and can not be found therein, and no person of suitable age as aforesaid can be found at his or her residence or place of business, notice shall be given by advertisement once a week for three successive weeks in some daily newspaper published in said District, and in said publication of said notice each several piece of property shall be described in a separate paragraph, and the cost of such advertisement shall be added to the amount of said assessment and collected in the same manner that said assessment is collected.

SEC. 4. That assessments for water mains and service sewers shall be payable in three equal installments, the first of which shall be due and payable without interest within thirty days from date of service of notice or of the last publication of notice, as the case may be, the second within one year, and the third within two years from the date of assessment, and interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum shall be charged on all amounts which shall remain unpaid at the expiration of thirty days from the date of service of notice or last publication, as the case may be; but the owner of the property assessed may, at his option, at any time after the levying of such assessment, pay the same in full; and the discount heretofore allowed for payment of assessments for water mains within thirty days from date of service of notice of assessments shall not be allowed hereafter: *Provided*, That if any installment of any assessment for water main or service sewer levied under the provisions of this act shall not be paid when due and payable the property against which said assessment was levied may be sold for said delinquent installment at the next ensuing annual tax sale in the same manner and under the same conditions as property sold for delinquent general taxes, if said installment shall not have been paid prior to said sale.

SEC. 5. That property in the county of Washington, not subdivided into blocks or lots, or both, shall not be assessed for water mains or service sewers until subdivided: *Provided*, That where houses are built on any unsubdivided land and connection is made with a water main or service sewer, assessment shall be made as herein provided for in the case of subdivided property by assessing a frontage of 50 feet on each side of said connection with a depth of 100 feet, except that no double assessment shall be levied; said assessment to be levied within sixty days after said connection is made; and if such unsubdivided land is thereafter subdivided into blocks or lots, such lots shall be assessed as herein provided as to subdivided lands, but the 50 feet on each side of said connection, with a depth of 100 feet, shall not be again assessed: *Provided further*, That hereafter assessments at the rate and in the manner herein

provided for shall be levied against each lot or parcel of land abutting any water main or service sewer in all subdivisions of land, within sixty days after the recording of such subdivision in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia, except in cases where said lots or parcels of land have been previously assessed for the same main or service sewer.

SEC. 6. That in all cases where water mains have heretofore been laid and assessments therefor against abutting lots or land not levied pending the introduction of water into such lots or land, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 8, 1898, such assessments shall be levied under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. That the assessor of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized and directed in cases where water-main assessments, or assessments for service sewers, may be quashed, canceled, set aside, or declared void by the supreme court of the District of Columbia, or may otherwise be canceled or set aside, by reason of an imperfect or erroneous description of the lot or parcel of ground against which the same shall have been levied, by reason of such tax or assessment not having been authenticated by the proper officer or by reason of a defective return of service of notice, or for any technical reason other than the right of the authorities of the District of Columbia to levy assessment or lay the main or service sewer in respect of which assessment was levied, to relevy such assessment at the rate and in the manner provided for in this act: *Provided*, That such reassessment shall be made within sixty days from date of such cancellation.

SEC. 8. That all sums received by the collector of taxes under the provisions of this act on account of assessments levied for the construction of service sewers shall be credited to the appropriation under which the sewer was constructed for the fiscal year in which such sums shall be received.

SEC. 9. That a service sewer within the meaning of the provisions of this act shall be a sewer with which connection may be directly made for the purpose of providing sewerage facilities to abutting property, and such sewers shall be so indicated on the records of the sewer division of the engineer department of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 10. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Approved, April 22, 1904.

EXHIBIT C.

An act to amend the law relating to taxation in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1904, the board of personal tax appeals of the District of Columbia shall convene on the first Monday in February of each year, and continue in session to and including the second Monday in March of each year, instead of convening on the 15th day of November and continuing in session until the 15th day of December in each year, as now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," is hereby amended as follows:

Strike out paragraph 3 of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Dealers in general merchandise of every description shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 1½ per cent on the average stock in trade for the preceding year.

"After the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person or persons entering the District of Columbia subsequent to June 30 in each year and establishing a place of business for the sale of goods, wares, or merchandise, either at private sale or at auction, or engaging in the business of common carrier by vessels, ships, or boats, to conduct such business until a sworn statement of the value of such stock, vessels, ships, and boats has been filed with the assessor of the District of Columbia, who shall thereupon render a bill for the unexpired portion of the fiscal year at the same rate as other personal taxes are levied: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to vessels, ships, or boats if it shall be made to appear by affidavit that any vessel, ship, or boat has been assessed for taxation and the taxes paid elsewhere.

"The assessor is hereby authorized to reassess said stock whenever in his judgment it has been undervalued. The goods, wares, and merchandise of any person or persons who shall fail to pay the tax required by this paragraph within three days after beginning business shall be subject to distraint, and it shall be the duty of the assessor to place bills therefor in the hands of the collector of taxes, who shall seize sufficient of the goods of the delinquent to satisfy said tax: *Provided*, That said owner shall have the right of redemption within thirty days on payment of said tax, to which shall be added a penalty of 1 per cent, together with the costs of seizure. The collector shall sell such goods as are not redeemed at public auction after advertisement for the three days preceding said sale."

That that part of the proviso in paragraph 5, section 6, relating to street railroads "shall be construed to mean that all street railroad companies shall pay 4 per cent per annum on their gross receipts within the District of Columbia and other taxes as provided by existing law."

Strike out paragraph 6 of section 6 and substitute following therefor:

"All companies, incorporated or otherwise, who guarantee the fidelity of any individual or individuals, such as bonding companies, and all companies who furnish abstracts of titles to real property, or who insure real estate titles, shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 1½ per cent of their gross receipts in the District of Columbia."

In section 6, at the end of paragraph 7, add—

"That hereafter, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1904, incorporated savings banks paying interest to their depositors shall, through their president or cashier, make report under oath to the board of personal tax appraisers on or before the 1st day of August of each year as to the amount of their gross earnings, less the amount paid as interest to their depositors for the preceding year ending June 30, and shall pay thereon to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 4 per cent per annum."

In section 6 the proviso of paragraph 8 is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph contained shall be construed to include business companies which, by reason of or in addition to incorporation, receive no special franchise or privilege; but all such corporations shall be rated, assessed, and taxed as individuals conducting business in similar lines are rated, assessed, and taxed."

Section 6, paragraph 9, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Building associations in the District of Columbia shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia 2 per cent per annum on their entire gross earnings for the preceding year ending June 30."

In section 6 the second portion of paragraph 10 is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Second. Libraries, schoolbooks, wearing apparel, and all family portraits."

In section 6, at the end of paragraph 12, add—

"That hereafter when the collector of taxes shall distrain any goods and chattels in order to enforce payment of taxes levied under the aforesaid act approved July 1, 1902, the goods and chattels so seized shall be kept in a safe and convenient place until the day of the sale thereof; and the sale of said goods and chattels shall be at public auction, at such place as the collector of taxes may designate: *Provided, however*, That no such goods and chattels shall be sold upon any bid not sufficient to meet the amount of tax, penalty, and costs; but in case the highest bid therefor is not sufficient to meet the amount of tax, penalty, and costs thereon, said property thereupon shall be bid off by the said collector of taxes in the name of and by the District of Columbia, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may sell the same at private sale to satisfy the tax, penalty, and cost thereafter without further notice."

In section 7, paragraph 38, at the end thereof, add—

"That hereafter it shall be unlawful for the licensee, owner, proprietor, or any employee of a licensee, owner, or proprietor of any barroom, or any other establishment in the District of Columbia in which intoxicating liquors of any kind or sold, to sell, give, or dispense in any manner intoxicating liquors of any kind to any person under the age of 21 years.

"Any person knowingly violating the provisions of this paragraph shall be amenable to a fine of $25 or imprisonment for thirty days, or both, in the discretion of the court; and in addition to such penalty the license for the place in which such intoxicating liquors were sold to a minor shall be revoked."

Section 7, paragraph 45, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"That hereafter proprietors of bowling alleys in the District of Columbia shall pay to the collector of taxes of said District an annual license tax of $12 for each alley."

SEC. 3. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Approved, April 28, 1904.

EXHIBIT D.

An act to amend chapter 55 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia."

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 55 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out sections 1608, 1609, 1610, 1611, 1612, and 1613, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 1608. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to open, extend, widen, or straighten alleys and minor streets in the District of Columbia under the following conditions, namely: First, upon the petition of the owners of more than one-half of the real estate in the square or block in which such alley or minor street is sought to be opened, extended, widened, or straightened, accompanied by a plat showing the opening, extension, widening, or straightening proposed; second, when the Commissioners deem that the public interests require such opening, extension, widening, or straightening; third, when the health officer of said District certifies to the necessity for the same on the grounds of public health: *Provided*, That a minor street shall be of a width of not less than 40 feet nor more than 60 feet and shall run through a square or block from one street to another.

"SEC. 1608a. That if in the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of an alley or minor street, or in the extension or widening of public streets or highways, an alley or part of an alley may have been, or may hereafter be, in the judgment of the said Commissioners, rendered useless or unnecessary, said Commissioners are authorized to close the same. That if the alley to be closed is an original alley, they may sell the land contained therein for cash at a price not less than the assessed value of contiguous lots. That if the alley is not an original alley, the title thereto shall revert to the owners of the land abutting thereon, but all such land shall be subject to the assessment for benefits hereinafter referred to.

"SEC. 1608b. That the said Commissioners are authorized to accept the dedication of an alley or alleys and in connection therewith to close any existing alley or alleys in the square or block in which such dedication is made upon the application of the owners of all the property abutting on such existing alley or alleys. That if the alley proposed to be closed is an original alley, the party or parties making the dedication and the parties applying for the closing of the alley or alleys shall present with such application a mutual agreement in writing and under seal, in duplicate, as to the future ownership of the land contained in the alley or alleys to be closed, together with two plats showing the alley or alleys divided into parcels, with the name of the future owner marked on each parcel, in accordance with such agreement. That copies of the order of the Commissioners accepting the dedication and closing the original or subdivisional alley, together with the said agreements and plats in the case of an original alley, shall be forwarded by said Commissioners to the surveyor and recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia for record, and thereafter the title to the land in such subdivisional alley shall revert to the owners of the land abutting thereon, and the title to the land in the original alley shall vest in the parties whose names appear on said plat in accordance with said agreement.

"SEC. 1608c. That the Commissioners are authorized to close any alley or part of alley the width of which is less than 10 feet upon the application in writing of the owners of all the abutting property. If the title to such closed alley is in the United States, the land shall be sold, as provided in section 1608a hereof; and if the title is not in the United States, the land shall revert as provided in said section.

"SEC. 1608d. That whenever the title in fee simple to an entire square is vested in one person or tenants in common or partners, and such owner or owners desire to improve said square by the erection thereon of a building covering not less than two-thirds of the area thereof, or to use said square for the purpose of some business enterprise, the Commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to order any alley or alleys in such square to be closed, and a copy of said order shall be filed with the surveyor and recorder of deeds of said District for record.

"SEC. 1608e. That whenever it becomes necessary to open, widen, extend, or straighten alleys or minor streets by condemnation the said Commissioners shall institute condemnation proceedings in the

supreme court of the District of Columbia, sitting as a district court, by a petition in rem particularly describing the land to be taken, which petition shall be accompanied by duplicate plats to be prepared by the surveyor of said District, showing the courses and boundaries of the alley or minor street proposed to be opened, widened, extended, or straightened, the number of square feet to be taken from each lot or part of lot in the square or block, showing the existing alleys or minor street in said square or block, and such other information as may be necessary for the purposes of such condemnation. Upon the filing of such petition, one copy of the plat, indorsed with the docket number of the case, shall be returned by the clerk of said court to the said surveyor for record in his office.

"SEC. 1608f. That the said court shall cause public notice of not less than ten days to be given of the filing of said proceedings, by advertisement in such manner as the court shall prescribe, which notice shall warn all persons having any interest in the proceedings to attend court at a day to be named in said notice and to continue in attendance until the court shall have made its final order ratifying and confirming the award of damages and assessment of benefits of the jury; and, in addition to such public notice, said court, whenever in its judgment it is practicable to do so, shall cause a copy of said notice to be served by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia, or his deputies, upon such owners of the fee of the land to be condemned as may be found by said marshal or his deputies within the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 1608g. That after the return of the marshal and the filing of proof of publication of the notice provided for in the preceding section, said court shall cause a jury of five judicious, disinterested men, not related to any person interested in the proceedings and not in the service or employment of the District of Columbia or of the United States, to be summoned by the said marshal, to which jurors said court shall administer an oath or affirmation that they are not interested in any manner in the land to be condemned nor in any way related to the parties interested therein, and that they will, without favor or partiality, to the best of their judgment, assess the damages each owner of land taken may sustain by reason of the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of said alley or minor street and the condemnation of lands for the purposes thereof, and assess the benefits resulting therefrom as hereinafter provided. The court, before accepting the jury, shall hear any objections that may be made to any member thereof, and shall have full power to decide upon all such objections, and to excuse any juror or cause any vacancy in the jury, when impaneled, to be filled; and after said jury shall have been organized and shall have viewed the premises, said jury shall proceed to hear and receive such evidence as may be offered or submitted on behalf of the District of Columbia and by any person or persons having any interest in the proceedings for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of said alley or minor street; but all such hearings shall be in the presence of the court and under its supervision and direction. When the hearing is concluded the jury, or a majority of them, shall return to said court, in writing, its verdict of the amount found to be due and payable as damages sustained by reason of the said opening, extension, widening, or straightening under the provisions hereof, and of the pieces or parcels of land benefited by such opening, extension, widening, or straightening, and the amount of the assessment for such benefits against the same.

"SEC. 1608h. That if a part only of any piece or parcel of ground shall be condemned, the jury, in determining its value, shall not take into consideration any benefits that may accrue to the remainder thereof from such opening, extension, widening, or straightening, but such benefits shall be considered in determining what assessment shall be made on or against such part of such piece or parcel of land as may not be taken as hereinbefore provided.

"SEC. 1608i. That the court shall have power to hear and determine any objections which may be filed to said verdict or award, and to set aside and vacate the same, in whole or in part, when satisfied that it is unjust or unreasonable, and in such event a new jury in the case, having the qualifications hereinbefore mentioned, shall be summoned, who shall proceed to assess the damages or benefits, as the case may be, in respect of the land as to which the verdict may be vacated, as in the case of the first jury: *Provided*, That the exceptions or objections to the verdict and award shall be filed within thirty days after the return of such verdict and award: *And provided further*, That if the court is satisfied that part of the verdict or award should be set aside or vacated, then and in that event, at the election of the said Commissioners, the court shall set aside and vacate the entire verdict or award and a new jury shall be summoned in the case as aforesaid. The verdict of a new jury summoned in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be final, and if the amount of damages assessed by any new jury summoned as aforesaid shall not be greater, or if the assessment of benefits shall not be less, than the amount assessed by the jury first summoned, according as the objection to the verdict may have been to the assessment of damages or benefits, the cost of the new jury shall be assessed against the property of the party or parties objecting, but if the party or parties should prevail by the verdict of the new jury, either in increasing his or their damages, or in diminishing the assessment for benefits, then, and in that event, the costs of the new jury shall be paid by the District of Columbia, and if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia do not elect that the entire verdict shall be set aside, and the same be set aside or vacated in part, the residue of the verdict and award shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 1608j. That said jury shall assess as benefits accruing by reason of said opening, extension, widening, or straightening an amount equal to the amount of damages as ascertained by them as hereinbefore provided, including $5 per day for the marshal and $5 per day for each juror for the services of each when actually employed, and all other expenses of such proceedings upon each lot or part of lot or parcel of land in the square or block in which such alley or minor street is to be opened, extended, widened, or straightened, and upon each lot, part of lot, or parcel of ground in the squares or blocks confronting the square in which such alley or minor street is to be opened, extended, widened, or straightened, which will be benefited by such opening, extension, widening, or straightening, in the proportion that said jury may find said lots, parts of lots, or parcels of land will be benefited.

"SEC. 1608k. That when the verdict of said jury shall have been finally ratified and confirmed by the court, as herein provided, the amounts of money awarded and adjudged to be payable for lands taken under the provisions hereof shall be paid to the owners of said lands by the Treasurer of the United States, ex officio commissioner of the sinking fund of the District of Columbia, upon the warrants of the Commissioners of said District, out of any funds available therefor: *Provided*, That in all cases of payments the accounting officers shall take into account the assessment for benefits and the award for damages, and shall pay only such part of said award in respect of any lot as may be in excess of the assessment for benefits against the part of such lot not taken, and there shall be credited on said assessment the amount of said award not in excess of said assessment.

"SEC. 1608l. That when confirmed by the court the several assessments herein provided to be made shall severally be a lien upon the land assessed and shall be collected as special-improvement taxes in the District of Columbia, and shall be payable in four equal annual installments, with interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from and after sixty days after the date of confirmation until paid. That said court may allow amendments in form or substance in any description of property proposed to be taken, or of property assessed for benefits, whenever such amendments will not interfere with the substantial rights of the parties interested, and any such amendment may be made after as well as before the order or judgment confirming the verdict or award aforesaid.

"SEC. 1609. That each juror shall receive as compensation the sum of $5 per day for his services during the time he shall be actually engaged in such services under the provisions hereof.

"SEC. 1610. That no appeal by any interested party from the decision of the supreme court of the District of Columbia confirming the assessment or assessments of benefits or damages herein provided for, nor any other proceeding at law or in equity by such party against the confirmation of such assessment or assessments, shall delay or prevent the payment of award to others in respect to the property condemned, nor delay or prevent the taking of any of said property sought to be condemned, nor the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of such alley or minor street: *Provided, however*, That upon the final determination of said appeal or other proceeding at law or in equity, the amount found to be due and payable as damages sustained by reason of the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of said alley or minor street under the provisions hereof shall be paid as hereinbefore provided.

"SEC. 1611. That all money derived from the sale of land in which the United States is interested, under the provisions of this act, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the credit of the United States.

"SEC. 1612. That in all cases where plats are required to be made under the provisions of this act, or where the said Commissioners shall deem it necessary that they shall be made in order to more effectually carry out any provision hereof, such plats shall be made by the surveyor of the District of Columbia, who shall require the person or persons desiring the same to deposit in advance a sum to defray the cost of preparing the same; any amount of such deposit remaining after the cost of such plats has been paid shall be refunded to the party so depositing: *Provided*, That plats ordered by the said Commissioners shall be prepared by said surveyor free of cost.

"SEC. 1613. That the validity of any condemnation proceeding under the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the opening of alleys in the District of Columbia," approved July 22, 1892, or under the act of Congress entitled "An act to open, widen, and extend alleys in the District of Columbia," approved August 24, 1894, or under the sections of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia hereby repealed, shall not be affected by the want of proper notice to any proprietor of land in the square, except as to such proprietor; and if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that any such proprietor was not notified as required by said acts the said Commissioners may proceed under this act to condemn the land affected by the want of such notice."

Approved, February 23, 1905.

EXHIBIT E.

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington City, general assessment 1902-3.

Square.	Lot.	Front feet.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
1	Part of 17	North 27 feet	2,430	$0.30	$729		School site.
	do	South 27 feet	3,834	.20	767		Do.
	18		7,668	.20	1,534		Do.
	Part of 19	North 30 feet	4,260	.20	852		Do.
44	Part of 8	North 25 feet	2,125	.25	531		
	Sub. 35		1,360	.40	544		
	Sub. 36		1,360	.35	476		
	Sub. 37		1,360	.35	476	$18,000	Toner School.
	Sub. 38		1,360	.35	476		
	Sub. 39		1,360	.35	476		
	Sub. 40		1,785	.30	536		
50	4		4,950	.75	3,713		
	5		4,087	.90	3,678	30,000	Weightman School.
	6		4,675	.65	3,039		
72	Part of 12	South 44 feet on avenue	3,906	1.30	5,078	6,000	Truck B.
73	22		5,291	.75	3,968		Alfred Jones and others, trustees colored schools, Stevens School.
	23		5,899	.75	4,424	50,000	Sayles J. Bowen and others, trustees colored schools, Stevens School.

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington City, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Square.	Lot.	Front feet.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
73	24		5,291	$0.75	$3,968		Sayles J. Bowen and others, trustees colored schools, Stevens School.
78	Part of 13	North 23.40 feet	3,018	1.10	3,320		
	14		4,234	1.20	5,081		
	15		2,483	1.35	3,352		
	16		1,968	1.50	2,952		
	17		2,685	1.35	3,625	$18,000	Western Market house.
	18		4,610	1.25	5,763		
	19		5,729	1.10	6,302		
	20		5,162	1.00	5,162		
	21		5,162	1.00	5,162		
	22		5,729	1.00	5,729	10,000	Third precinct police station.
80	10		9,200	.60	5,520		
	Part of 11	East 20.50 feet	3,926	.60	2,356		
	Sub. 17		2,558	.60	1,535	50,000	Grant School.
	Sub. 18		2,558	.60	1,535		
83	4		9,222	.35	3,221	20,000	Briggs School.
141	Part of 11	West 30 feet	1,500	2.45	3,675	1,000	Old Union engine house (school).
155	Sub. 126		2,292	1.25	2,865		
	Sub. 127		2,292	1.25	2,865		
	Sub. 128		2,292	1.25	2,865	30,000	Adams School.
	Sub. 129		2,292	1.25	2,865		
	Sub. 130		2,292	1.25	2,865		
156	Sub. 34		16,125	1.25	20,156	30,000	Institution for Education of Colored Youth.
158	18		11,384	1.50	17,076	35,000	Force School, land owned by the United States, but the property is controlled by the District of Columbia.
	19		10,444	1.80	18,799		Do.
175	Part of 2	West 5 feet	725	.80	580		
	3		9,099	.80	7,279	19,000	Pump house.
	4		9,099	.80	7,279	800	Do.
	10		7,761	.65	5,045		
	11		9,099	.60	5,459		
176	Sub. 19		2,420	.85	2,057	8,000	Engine house No. 9.
	Sub. 20		2,420	.85	2,057		
177	Part of 9	Back ground	862	1.10	948		
182	Part of 6	West 38.92 feet	3,528	1.70	5,998		William Syphax and others, trustees colored schools, District of Columbia.
	7		4,998	1.90	9,496	40,000	William Syphax and others, trustees colored schools, District of Columbia (Sumner School).
	Part of 8	South 18.17 feet	1,473	1.90	2,799		William Syphax and others, trustees colored schools, District of Columbia.
	Sub. 24		3,322	.80	2,658		Sayles J. Bowen and others, trustees colored schools, District of Columbia.
	Sub. 25		3,225	.85	2,741		Do.
	Sub. 26		3,127	.85	2,658		Do.
	Sub. 27		3,030	.90	2,727	20,000	Sayles J. Bowen and others, trustees colored schools, District of Columbia (Magruder School).
	Sub. 28		2,932	.90	2,639		Sayles J. Bowen and others, trustees colored schools, District of Columbia.
	Sub. 29		2,835	1.10	3,119		Do.
	Sub. 30		1,983	1.60	3,173		William Syphax and others, trustees colored schools, District of Columbia.
184	Sub. 4		3,166	2.65	8,390	6,500	Engine house No. 1.
	Part of sub. 5	East 37 feet	45	2.50	113		
209	Sub. 30		5,000	1.60	8,000	18,000	Berret School.
228	Sub. 3		2,904	1.15	3,340		
	Sub. 4		2,691	1.15	3,095	9,000	Engine house No. 2.
235	Sub. 30		2,860	.70	2,002		
	Sub. 31		2,860	.70	2,002		
	Sub. 32		2,860	.70	2,002	30,000	Harrison School.
	Sub. 33		2,890	.70	2,023		
238	Part of 7	East 7 feet	840	.85	714		
	Sub. 56		2,040	.85	1,734		
	Sub. 57		2,040	.85	1,734		
	Sub. 58		2,040	.85	1,734		
	Sub. 59		2,040	.85	1,734	35,000	Dennison School.
	Sub. 60		2,040	.85	1,734		
	Sub. 61		2,040	.85	1,734		
	Sub. 62		2,045	.85	1,738		
	Sub. 63	On alley	920	.25	230		
	Sub. 64	do	923	.25	231		
	Sub. 65	do	960	.25	240		
	Sub. 66	do	960	.25	240		
	Sub. 67	do	960	.25	240		
	Sub. 68	do	960	.25	240		
	Sub. 69	do	960	.25	240		
	Sub. 70	do	960	.25	240		
	Sub. 71	do	960	.25	240		
	Sub. 72	do	960	.25	240		
255	1		2,417	6.00	12,502		Site for new District building.
	2		3,510	6.00	21,060		Site of new District building.
	3		4,603	6.00	27,618		Do.
	4		3,510	6.00	21,060		Do.
	5		2,417	6.00	12,502		Do.
	6		3,280	6.00	19,680		Do.
	7		3,281	6.00	19,686		Do.
	8		2,416	6.00	14,496		Do.
	9		3,510	6.00	21,060		Do.
	10		4,603	6.00	27,618		Do.
	11		3,509	6.00	21,054		Do.
	12		2,416	6.00	14,496		Do.
	13		3,280	6.00	19,680		Do.
	14		3,280	6.00	19,680		Do.
266	Sub. 3		3,296	.30	989		
	Sub. 4		3,296	.30	989		
	Sub. 5		3,296	.30	989	30,000	Bradley School.
	Sub. 6		3,301	.30	990		
276	Part of sub. 107	North one-half alley	800	.40	320		
	Sub. 108	Alley	1,600	.40	640		
	Sub. 109	do	1,600	.40	640		
	Sub. 110	do	1,600	.40	640		
	Sub. 111	do	1,600	.40	640		
	Sub. 112	do	1,600	1.05	1,680		
	Sub. 113		1,600	1.05	1,680		
	Sub. 114		1,600	1.05	1,680	25,000	Garrison School.
	Sub. 115		1,600	1.05	1,680		
	Part of sub. 116	North half	800	1.05	840		

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington City, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Square.	Lot.	Front feet.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
234	Part of sub. 24	28.83 feet, Twelfth street	3,229	$1.45	$4,682	$8,000	Thomson School.
285	Sub. 14		3,747	2.50	9,368	75,000	Franklin School.
	Sub. 15		3,733	1.50	5,600		
	Sub. 16		3,733	1.50	5,600		
	Sub. 17		3,733	1.50	5,600		
293	Part of 18	South half	2,333	1.80	4,199	12,000	First precinct police station.
	Part of 19	North half	2,333	1.80	4,199		
327	Sub. 10		1,937	.25	484		Potomac School.
	Sub. 11		1,950	.25	488	4,500	
	Sub. 12		1,950	.25	488		
359	Sub. 44		28,480	.80	22,784	75,000	Garnett School.
361	Sub. 18		1,840	.50	920		
	Sub. 19		1,840	.50	920	12,000	Eighth precinct police station.
	Sub. 20		1,840	.50	920		
	Sub. 110		1,860	.70	1,302		
	Sub. 111		1,840	.70	1,270		
	Sub. 112		1,767	.70	1,237		
	Sub. 113		1,721	.70	1,205		
	Sub. 114		1,676	.70	1,173		
	Sub. 115		1,630	.70	1,141	30,000	Phelps School.
363	Sub. 16		1,900	.95	1,805		
	Sub. 17		1,900	.95	1,805	8,000	Engine house No. 7.
375	Sub. 108		1,278	2.25	2,876		
	Sub. 109		1,278	2.25	2,876		
	Sub. 110		1,226	2.25	2,759		
	Sub. 111		1,183	2.25	2,662	45,000	Webster School.
	Sub. 112		1,183	2.25	2,662		
	Sub. 113		1,125	2.25	2,531		
	Sub. 114		1,145	2.25	2,576		
North of 396	1		8,457	1.05	8,880		Site for Business High School.
	2		7,927	1.30	10,305	3,500	Do.
	3		5,960	1.05	6,258		Do.
	4		6,953	1.15	7,996		Do.
	5		6,953	.95	6,605	300	Do.
412	Sub. 12		1,813	.45	816		
	Sub. 13		2,074	.65	1,348		Trustees colored schools.
	Sub. 14		1,959	.45	882	18,000	Trustees colored schools (Anthony Bowen School).
	Sub. 15		1,959	.45	882		Trustees colored schools.
	Sub. 16		1,947	.45	876		Do.
431	Part of 5	North 19.50 feet	2,034	2.25	4,577		
	Part of 6	South half	2,661	2.25	5,987	7,000	Engine house No. 14.
444	Sub. 18		2,205	1.05	2,315		
	Sub. 19		2,205	1.05	2,315		
	Sub. 20		2,205	1.05	2,315	85,000	Manual Training School.
	Sub. 21		2,205	1.05	2,315		
	Sub. 22		2,205	1.05	2,315		
	Sub. 23		2,205	1.05	2,315		
	Sub. 24		2,205	1.05	2,315		
	Sub. 25		2,205	1.05	2,315		
	Sub. 26		4,409	1.35	5,952		
446	Sub. 2		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 3		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 4		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 5		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 6		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 7		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 8		2,700	.70	1,890	60,000	Central High School.
	Sub. 9		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 10		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 11		2,400	.70	1,680		
	Sub. 12		2,400	1.45	3,480		
	Sub. 13		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 14		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 15		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 16		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 17		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 18		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 19		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 20		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 21		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 22		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 23		2,400	1.15	2,760	30,000	Polk School.
	Sub. 24		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 25		2,400	1.15	2,760		
	Sub. 26		2,400	1.40	3,360		
	Sub. 27		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 28		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 29		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 30		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 31		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 32		2,700	.70	1,890	35,000	Henry School.
	Sub. 33		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 34		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 35		2,700	.70	1,890		
	Sub. 36		2,700	.70	1,890		
471	Sub. 3		2,200	.30	660		
	Sub. 4		2,200	.30	660		
	Sub. 5		2,200	.30	660	20,000	Ambush School.
	Sub. 6		2,200	.30	660		
	Sub. 7		2,200	.30	660		
481	Part of 11	South 31 feet	2,895	.65	1,882	1,500	Second precinct police station.
	12		5,468	.65	3,554	11,000	Do.
South of 482	All		6,448	1.75	11,284	15,000	Abbott School.
489	3		4,662	2.80	13,054	10,000	Police court building.
	Part of 4	South 20.54 feet	1,277	2.50	3,193	2,000	Do.
494	8		19,950	.35	6,983		
	9		19,987	.45	8,994	45,000	Jefferson School.
	10		23,351	.30	7,005		
	Part of 12	East 31.08 feet	6,500	.30	1,950	5,000	Engine house No. 4.
495	Sub. 59		2,853	.65	1,854		
	Sub. 60		2,100	.55	1,155		
	Sub. 61		2,100	.55	1,155	25,000	Amidon School.
	Sub. 62		2,100	.55	1,155		
	Sub. 72		2,199	.35	770	10,600	Fourth precinct police station.
	Sub. 73		2,199	.35	770		
502	67		3,750	.30	1,125		
	68		3,750	.30	1,125		

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington City, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Square.	Lot.	Front feet.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
502	69		3,750	$0.30	$1,125	$20,000	Greenleaf School.
	70		3,750	.30	1,125		
509	76		1,425	.55	784		
	77		1,425	.55	784		
	78		1,425	.55	784		
	79		1,425	.55	784		
	80		1,425	.55	784		
	81		1,425	.55	784		
	82		1,425	.55	784		
	83		1,425	.55	784		
	84		1,425	.55	784		
	85		1,425	.55	784	25,000	Morse School.
	86		1,425	.55	784		
	87		2,643	.55	1,454		
511	Sub. 10		2,880	.40	1,152		A. Jones and others, trustees colored schools.
	Sub. 11		2,880	.40	1,152	15,000	A. Jones and others, trustees colored schools (John F. Cook School).
	Sub. 12		2,880	.40	1,152		A. Jones and others, trustees colored schools.
517	Part of 7	30 feet on avenue	2,085	1.40	2,919	5,000	Engine house No. 6.
526	11		5,104	.70	3,573		
	12		4,549	.70	3,184	15,000	Banneker School.
Res. 7	Sub. 2		31,622	5.00	158,110		Washington Market.
	Sub. 3		42,857	6.50	278,571		Do.
541	5		6,037	.25	1,509		
	Sub. 73		2,039	.25	519		
	Sub. 74		2,038	.25	510		
	Sub. 75		2,038	.25	510	25,000	Smallwood School.
	Sub. 76		2,038	.25	510		
542	1		3,525	.25	1,234		
	2		3,725	.30	1,118		
	3		5,125	.25	1,281		
	4		5,125	.25	1,281	25,000	Sayles J. Bowen School.
	5		5,065	.25	1,266		
	Part of 25	South 8.50 feet	850	.25	213		
	26		4,200	.25	1,050		
553	21		7,312	.35	2,559		
	22		7,695	.35	2,693		
	23		7,695	.35	2,693	80,000	Manual Training School (colored).
	24		7,695	.35	2,693		
554	Part of 13	North 46.67 feet	5,459	.45	2,457		
	14		7,799	.45	3,510	20,000	Twining School.
	Part of 15	South 46.67 feet	5,459	.45	2,457		
555	Sub. 67		2,215	1.05	2,326	6,000	Truck D.
	Sub. 68		2,215	1.05	2,326		
557	13		8,197	.60	4,918		
	14		8,197	.60	4,918	50,000	Colored High School.
	15		8,197	.60	4,918		
	Part of 20	South 40 feet	3,200	.45	1,440		
	Part of 20	North 16.62 feet and background.	2,245	.45	1,010		
	21		6,400	.70	4,480	15,000	Douglass School.
	24		8,196	.25	2,049	100	
	Part of 25	West 40 feet	5,464	.25	1,366	600	
	Part of 25	East 20 feet	2,732	.25	683		
	Sub. 81		86	.40	34		
562	18		4,500	.70	3,150		
	19		4,500	.70	3,150	28,000	Seaton School.
	20		4,500	.70	3,150		
	21		4,500	.70	3,150		
	Part of 22	West 5 feet	750	.70	525		
578	Sub. 26		2,000	.30	600		
	Sub. 27		2,000	.30	600		
	Sub. 28		2,000	.30	600		
	Sub. 29		2,000	.30	600		
	Sub. 30		2,000	.30	600	20,000	Bell School.
	Sub. 31		2,000	.30	600		
	Sub. 32		2,000	.30	600		
	Sub. 33		1,920	.30	576		
East of 590	All		9,088	.35	3,181	20,000	Daniel Breed and others, trustees (colored schools, District of Columbia)—Randall School.
615	Sub. 2		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 3		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 4		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 5		2,000	.35	700	25,000	(School.)
	Sub. 6		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 7		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 8		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 9		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 10		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 11		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 12		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 13		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 14		2,000	.35	700	30,000	Slater School.
	Sub. 15		2,000	.35	700		
	Sub. 16		2,000	.35	700		
621	Part of 1	North 41.58 feet	4,366	.60	2,620		
	13		10,500	.55	5,775	25,000	Jones School.
	24		8,122	.40	3,249	25,000	Blake School.
	68		2,873	.40	1,149		
625	Sub. 17		2,900	1.00	2,900		
	Sub. 18		2,593	1.00	2,593		
	Sub. 19		7,271	1.00	7,271	30,000	Gales School.
630	Sub. 54		6,627	.55	3,645	8,000	Sixth precinct police station.
633	Sub. 51		1,923	.55	1,058		
	Sub. 52		1,935	.55	1,064		
	Sub. 53		1,935	.55	1,064		
	Sub. 67		1,800	.55	990		
	Sub. 68		1,800	.55	990		
	Sub. 69		1,800	.55	990		
	Sub. 70		1,789	.55	984	20,000	Arthur School.
	Sub. 71		1,736	.55	955		
	Sub. 72		1,680	.55	924		
	Sub. 73		1,624	.55	893		
	Sub. 74		1,568	.55	862		
653	6		9,590	.05	480	25,000	Syphax School.
	7		9,590	.05	480		

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington City, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Square.	Lot.	Front feet.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
683	1		14,775	$1.10	$16,253	$14,000	Engine house No. 3, assessed to the United States, but controlled by the District of Columbia.
	Part of 11	Background	6,087	.15	913		Do.
685	Part of 7	North 31.67 feet	3,412	1.15	3,924	5,000	Truck A.
762	4		6,000	.70	4,200		Sayles J. Bowen, trustee colored schools.
	5		5,600	1.20	6,720	20,000	William Syphax and others, trustees colored schools, Lincoln School.
765	Sub. 23		1,900	.40	760		
	Sub. 24		1,900	.40	760		
	Sub. 25		1,900	.40	760		
	Sub. 26		1,900	.40	760		
	Sub. 27		1,900	.40	760		
	Sub. 28		1,900	.40	760		
	Sub. 29		1,539	.55	846	20,000	Dent School.
778	13		4,125	.60	2,475	30,000	Logan School.
	14		5,000	.40	2,000		
792	5		6,400	.75	4,800	25,000	Brent School.
	Part of 6	South 20 feet	2,100	.55	1,155		
	Part of 6	North 55.67 feet	6,651	.90	5,986		
696	Part of 5	Background	6,149	.20	1,230		
	Sub. 42		14,377	.35	5,032	25,000	Giddings School.
801	13		6,375	.12	765	7,000	McCormick School.
	14		7,200	.12	864		
812	14		5,753	.40	2,302		
	15		5,995	.40	2,398	20,000	Carberry School.
814	10		4,543	.95	4,316		
	11		3,885	1.25	4,856	27,000	Peabody School.
	12		4,602	.75	3,452		
	Part of sub. D	East half	1,530	.95	1,511		
823	15		5,464	.25	1,366	25,000	Lenox School.
	16		5,464	.25	1,366		
830	Part of sub. 16	West 4.47 feet	443	.20	89		
	Sub. 17		1,872	.20	374		
	Sub. 18		1,871	.20	374		
	Sub. 19		1,871	.20	374		
	Sub. 20		1,871	.20	374		
	Sub. 21		1,980	.30	594	15,000	Hayes School.
	Sub. 22		1,620	.20	324		
	Part of sub. 23	South 9.80 feet	971	.20	194		
838	Sub. 26		2,102	.80	1,682		
	Sub. 43		1,875	.80	1,500		
	Sub. 44		1,875	.80	1,500	18,000	Hilton School.
	Sub. 45		1,875	.80	1,500		
	Sub. 46		1,875	.80	1,500		
845	3		4,800	.70	3,360	6,000	Fifth precinct police station.
858	Sub. H		3,293	.15	494		
	Sub. I		3,120	.15	468		
	Sub. K		3,120	.15	468		
	Sub. L		3,120	.15	468	20,000	Blair School.
	Sub. M		3,120	.15	468		
	Sub. N		3,120	.15	468		
	Sub. O		3,120	.15	468		
860	Sub. 91		2,087	.50	1,044		
	Sub. 92		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 93		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 94		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 95		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 96		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 97		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 98		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 99		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 100		1,800	.35	630		
872	1		5,012	.75	3,759		
	2		6,708	.55	3,689		
	3		6,930	.60	4,159		
	4		6,393	.65	4,157		
	Part of 5	East 11.13 feet	1,534	.65	997		
	Part of 9	Background	395	.15	59		
	Part of 10	East 40.06 feet	6,170	.70	4,250		
	11		8,882	.70	6,217	17,100	Engine house No. 8.
	12		7,234	.90	6,511		
	13		12,969	.90	11,672		
	14		7,091	.40	2,836	20,000	Eastern Market.
	15		5,500	.55	3,025		
877	Part of 1	East 37 feet	1,788	.60	1,073	1,200	Manual Training (Blair).
	Part of 34	South 18.33 feet	1,375	.45	619		
891	Part of sub. 19	North half	1,150	.25	288		
	Sub. 20		2,300	.25	575		
	Sub. 21		2,300	.25	575		
	Sub. 22		2,300	.25	575	25,000	Taylor School.
	Sub. 23		2,300	.25	575		
	Sub. 24		2,300	.25	575		
901	1		4,180	.90	3,762		
	2		4,930	.70	3,451	50,000	Wallach School.
	3		6,397	.70	4,478		
	4		8,475	.80	6,780		
	5		6,217	.60	3,730		
	6		5,599	.60	3,359		
	7		5,599	.60	3,359		
	8		5,673	.60	3,404	50,000	Eastern High School.
	9		4,666	.75	3,500		
	10		5,885	.45	2,648		
	11		5,885	.45	2,648		
	12		4,966	.70	3,476	30,000	Towers School.
	13		5,667	.45	2,550		
	14		5,599	.45	2,520		
	15		5,599	.45	2,520		
	16		6,217	.45	2,798		
	17		5,206	.60	3,124		
925	Part of 6	North 30 feet	2,400	.55	1,320		
South of 928	All		3,250	.45	1,463	700	School (Anacostia).
936	Sub. 32		1,897	.30	569		
	Sub. 33		1,897	.30	569	10,000	Ninth precinct police station.
	Sub. 34		1,897	.30	569		
938	7		6,282	.35	2,199		
	8		4,702	.40	1,881		
	9		4,340	.45	1,953	25,000	Edmonds School.
	10		5,916	.20	1,183		

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington City, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Square.	Lot.	Front feet.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
960	Part of 10	North 36 feet	3,059	$0.25	$765		
	11		4,350	.40	1,740	$18,000	Madison School.
	Part of 12	West 30.71 feet	2,571	.25	643		
974	Sub. 19		5,774	.35	2,028		
	Sub. 20		5,794	.35	2,029	25,000	Tyler School.
985	1		3,981	.30	1,194	22,000	Lovejoy School.
	2		4,973	.20	995		
	18		5,056	.20	1,011		
995	19		4,058	.35	1,420		
	20		3,718	.40	1,487	30,000	Cranch School.
	Part of 21	North 38 feet	3,068	.35	1,074		
1010	Part of 1	West 10 feet	1,000	.30	300		
	2		10,000	.30	3,000	20,000	Maury School.
	Part of 17	South 14 feet and alley	1,540	.10	154		
	Part of 18	57.83 feet, alley	6,252	.10	625		
1028	Part of 17	East 20 feet	2,000	.35	700		
	Part of 18	North 100 feet	8,000	.35	2,800	20,000	Pierce School.
	Sub. 37		1,800	.35	630		
	Sub. 38		1,800	.35	630	10,000	Engine house No. 10.
	Sub. 39		1,885	.35	660		
1042	Part of 8	West 13.92 feet	2,366	.15	355		
	9		9,109	.15	1,366		
	10		9,109	.15	1,366	20,000	Buchanan School.
1061	Part of 18	West 51 feet	4,416	.13	574		
	Part of 18	East 5 feet	380	.13	49		
	19		3,975	.20	795	18,000	Payne School.
	Part of 20	53 feet on Fifteenth street.	4,125	.15	619		
	Part of 20	Background	630	.15	95		
1098	16		11,883	.04	475		William Syphax and others, trustees colored schools District of Columbia.
	17		11,883	.04	475		Do.
1185	Part of 42	45 feet on Grace street and 60.50 feet on Thirty-third street.	2,723	.35	953		Old fish market.
1186	Part of 42	40 feet on M street and 248 feet on Market Space.	9,920	.60	5,952	15,000	Market, Georgetown.
1200	Part of 47	45.67 feet next 44 feet and west 3.50 feet.	4,275	1.10	4,703	5,000	Engine house No. 5.
	Part of 48	South 31 feet	2,480	.45	1,116	2,000	
	Part of 49	North 13.50 feet	940	.45	423		
1214	Part of 14	East 30 feet	3,600	.20	720		
	Part of 14	North 44 feet	1,320	.65	858		
	Part of 15	Background	2,400	.10	240		
	17		6,720	.30	2,016	20,000	Corcoran School.
1215	Part of 27	Background	2,564	.10	253		
	Part of 28	do	5,128	.10	513		
	Part of 29	East 91.58 feet	5,128	.45	2,308	20,000	Phillips School.
	Part of 30	West 3.42 feet	193	.45	87		
	Part of 31	Background	193	.10	19		
	Part of 32	do	96	.10	10		
1220	Part of 26	West 45 feet	4,455	.40	1,782		
	Part of 27	East 50.35 feet	4,985	.40	1,994	20,000	Wormley School.
	Part of 75	Background	2,800	.20	560		
	Part of 76	do	1,000	.20	200		
1222	Part of 47	West 54.50 feet and south 93 feet on Thirty-sixth.	5,068	.40	2,027	2,000	Threlkeld School.
1244	Part of 130	West 20.50 feet	3,116	.30	935		
	131		10,640	.30	3,192	40,000	Curtis School.
	Part of 132	East half	5,320	.30	1,596		
	Part of 132	West half	5,320	.30	1,596		
	Part of 153	East 13 feet	1,950	.30	585		
	154		10,500	.30	3,150	20,000	Addison School.
1255	Part of 180	East 37 feet	4,625	.35	1,619	3,000	Pump house.
	Part of 181	West 27 feet	4,050	.30	1,215		
	Part of 181	East 43 feet	6,450	.30	1,935	15,000	Seventh precinct police station.
	Part of 182	West 28 feet	4,200	.30	1,260		
1264	87		5,640	.10	564		Public school.
1277	Part of 21	Background	2,500	.06	150		
	24		5,000	.20	1,000	12,000	Truck E.
1279	Part of 208	North 192 feet	7,296	.35	2,554	1,500	High (street) School,
1282	Sub. 14		17,825	.35	6,239	20,000	Jackson School.
1293	Sub. 1		2,500	.50	1,250		
	Part of 2	West 70 feet	12,600	.10	1,260		
	Sub. 3		2,500	.45	1,125		
	Sub. 4		2,500	.40	1,000		
	Sub. 5		2,500	.40	1,000		
	Sub. 6		2,500	.40	1,000		
	Sub. 7		2,500	.40	1,000		
	Sub. 8		3,439	.10	344		
	Sub. 9		7,200	.10	720		
	Sub. 10		7,200	.10	720		
	Sub. 11		7,200	.10	720		
	Sub. 12		7,200	.10	720		
	Sub. 13		8,400	.10	840		
	Part	268.67 feet, T street	48,359	.10	4,836	60,000	Western High School.
1297	Part of sub. B	South 100 feet	18,204	.12	2,184	15,000	Fillmore School.
1299	259		182,028	.04	7,281		
	260		128,898	.05	6,445	35,000	Poorhouse and Industrial School.

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington County, general assessment 1902-3.

Plat.	Location.	Lot.	Front feet.	Acres.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
2	Burleath, block 132	Sub. 1			9,255	$0.05	$463		District of Columbia.
		Sub. 3			3,085	.05	154		Do.
		Sub. 4			3,370	.05	169	$500	Do.
		Sub. 5			2,800	.05	140		Do.
	Conduit road			0.25	10,890	.03	327	500	On United States land (school).
	Wisconsin avenue				1,600	.05	80		District of Columbia (powder house).
	Tunlaw road			1	43,560	.02	871		District of Columbia (school).
	Whitehaven, C. and H.:								
	Block 1	23			10,002	.02	200		District of Columbia.
	Block 1	24			10,284	.02	206		Do.
	Block 1	25			14,344	.02	287		Do.

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington County, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Plat.	Location.	Lot.	Front feet.	Acres.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground.	Improvements.	Name assessed.
2	Whitehaven, C. and H.—Con.								
	Block 1	26			8,852	$0.02	$177		District of Columbia.
	Block 1	27			7,518	.02	150		Do.
	Block 1	28			7,647	.02	153		Do.
	Block 1	29			7,775	.02	156		Do.
	Block 1	30			7,903	.02	158		Do.
	Block 1	Part of 31	25		4,928	.02	99		Do.
	Block 1	Part of 32	25		5,039	.02	101		Do.
	Block 1	Part of 33	25		5,147	.02	103		Do.
	Block 1	Part of 34	25		5,250	.02	105	$4,000	District of Columbia (school).
	Block 1	Part of 35	25		5,359	.02	107		District of Columbia.
	Block 1	Part of 36	26.74		7,546	.02	151		Do.
3	Chain Bridge road			0.50	21,780	.02	436	300	District of Columbia (school).
4	Wisconsin avenue			1	43,560	.05	2,178	11,000	District of Columbia (Tennallytown School).
	Murdock's	Part of 3		.10	4,747	5.00	50		District of Columbia.
	Grasslands and Dumblain, block 10.	Part		.10	4,601	.10	460	9,500	District of Columbia engine house (chemical No. 3).
5	Grant road			1	43,560	.03	1,307	800	District of Columbia (school).
	Near Grant road	Part of 14	North, 227.50 feet	.55	24,226	.02	485		District of Columbia.
		Part of 15	do	.52	22,472	.02	449		Do.
	Connecticut avenue			.91	39,640	.05	1,982	5,000	District of Columbia (school).
	Wisconsin avenue			.10	4,747	.03	142		
	Giles Dyer estate	5		1	43,560	.03	1,307	55,000	District of Columbia (reservoir).
	do	6		1	43,560	.03	1,307		Do.
	Reno:								
	Block 8	29			2,500	.03	75		District of Columbia.
		30			2,500	.03	75		Do.
		31			2,500	.03	75		Do.
		32			2,500	.03	75		Do.
	Block 13	14½			1,280	.04	51		Do.
		27½			1,867	.04	75		Do.
7	Military road			$0.50	21,780	.01	218	200	Do.
8	High street extended			8		1,000.00	8,000	19,000	Industrial Home School.
9	Todd and Brown:								
	Block 3	6			7,500	.15	1,125		Contagious hospital site.
		7			7,500	.15	1,125		Do.
		22			7,500	.15	1,125		Do.
		23			7,500	.15	1,125		Do.
	Block 6	3			7,500	.15	1,125	18,000	District of Columbia (school).
		4			7,500	.15	1,125		District of Columbia.
	Block 7	18			7,500	.15	1,125		Do.
		19			7,500	.15	1,125	16,000	District of Columbia (Bruce School).
		20			7,500	.15	1,125		District of Columbia.
		21			7,500	.15	1,125		Do.
	Block 10	Part of 20	East half		3,750	.15	563		Do.
		21			7,500	.15	1,125	13,000	District of Columbia (police station).
	Columbia Heights:								
	Block 22	12			7,813	.30	2,344	18,000	District of Columbia (Hubbard School).
		13			7,813	.30	2,344		District of Columbia.
		Part of 14	West 20 feet		3,125	.30	938		Do.
	Block 36	Part of 13	North 35.11 feet		6,238	.50	3,119	8,000	District of Columbia (engine house No. 11).
	Block 37	12			9,770	.45	4,397	10,700	District of Columbia (truck F).
	S. P. Brown's sub., block 3	5			25,530	.25	6,383	17,000	District of Columbia (school).
	Meridian Hill:								
	Block 10	23			7,500	.15	1,125	20,000	District of Columbia (Wilson School).
		24			7,500	.15	1,125		District of Columbia.
	Block 12	Part of 3	Background		466	.15	70		Do.
		Part of 4	do		525	.15	79		Do.
		Part of 5	do		1,205	.15	181		Do.
		Part of 6	do		1,030	.15	155		Do.
		Part of 7	do		70	.15	11		Do.
		Part of 8	do		368	.15	55		Do.
	Washington Heights, block 8	12			7,374	.50	3,687		Do.
		Sub. 64			1,599	.45	720		Do.
		Sub. 65			2,585	.45	1,163		Do.
		Sub. 66			2,320	.45	1,044	25,000	District of Columbia (Morgan School).
		Sub. 67			2,320	.45	1,044		District of Columbia.
		Sub. 68			2,320	.45	1,044		Do.
		Sub. 69			2,320	.45	1,044		Do.
		Sub. 70			2,320	.45	1,044		Do.
10	Piney Branch road			.18	7,948	.02	159		Do.
				2.61		900.00	2,349		District of Columbia (embraced in middle reservoir).
				6.40		900.00	5,760	235,000	Do.
11	Brightwood avenue			.27	11,761	.06	706	8,000	District of Columbia (chemical engine house No. 2).
				15.82		1,000.00	15,820	100	District of Columbia (hospital site).
				16.71		1,000.00	16,710		Do.
12	Brightwood avenue			.42	18,234	.05	912	13,000	District of Columbia (Brightwood School).
	Rock Creek Ford road			.50	21,780	.01	218	200	District of Columbia (school).
	Military road			1	43,560	.03	1,307	2,500	Do.
13	Blair road			.50	21,780	.03	150	300	Do.
	Brightwood avenue			.70	30,492	.03	915	11,500	Do.
	Chillum Castle								
	Manor, block 7	1			13,806	.02	276		District of Columbia.
		2			8,368	.02	167	6,000	District of Columbia (school).
		3			6,977	.02	140		District of Columbia.
		4			8,085	.02	162		Do.
		5			9,194	.02	184		Do.
		6			7,500	.02	150		Do.
14	Petworth:								
	Block 1	All			8,403	.15	1,260		District of Columbia (public reservation).
	Block 3	do			689	.15	103		Do.
	Block 26	Sub. 18			5,270	.10	527		District of Columbia.
		Sub. 19			5,270	.10	527		Do.
		Sub. 20			5,270	.10	527		Do.
		Part of sub. 21	East 15 feet		2,325	.10	233		Do.
	Block 33	All			2,060	.15	309		District of Columbia (public reservation).
	Block 46	do			1,996	.02	40		Do.
	Block 60	do			1,996	.02	40		Do.
	Block 65	do			1,996	.03	60		Do.

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington County, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Plat.	Location.	Lot.	Front feet.	Acres.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground	Improvements.	Name assessed.
	Petworth—Continued.								
14	Block 71	Lot			2,251	$0.04	$90		District of Columbia (public reservation).
	Block 76	do			2,000	.08	160		Do.
	Block 82	do			1,996	.08	160		Do.
	Block 95	do			2,510	.03	75		Do.
	Block 111	do			1,741	.10	174		Do.
15	Lincoln avenue			0.03	1,354	1,500.00	45		District of Columbia.
	Bloomingdale, block 11	1			5,000	.35	1,750	$9,000	District of Columbia (engine house No. 12).
	Le Droit Park addition:								
	Block 25	Part of 23	West 12.65 feet, Trumbull street; 16.07 feet next east 2 feet, Albany street.		1,292	.05	65		District of Columbia.
		Part of 24	East 3.36 feet, Trumbull street.		76	.05	4		Do.
	Block 27	All			67,735	.10	6,774		Do.
	Block 32	11			2,245	.20	449		Do.
		12			2,281	.20	456		Do.
		13			2,315	.20	463		Do.
		14			2,353	.20	471		Do.
		15			2,388	.20	478		Do.
		16			2,453	.20	491		Do.
		20			2,023	.15	303		Do.
		21			2,000	.15	300		Do.
		22			2,000	.15	300		Do.
		23			2,000	.15	300		Do.
		24			2,000	.15	300		Do.
		25			2,000	.15	300		Do.
	Block 34	Part of 5	16.07 feet next east 1.07		2,008	.05	100		Do.
		Part of 6	Background		950	.05	47		Do.
	Howard University:								
	Block 3	Part of 8	60 feet next south 151.25 feet.		9,075	.35	3,176	10,000	District of Columbia (school).
		Part of 9	60 feet		9,075	.35	3,176		District of Columbia.
	Block 16[a]							600,000	Pumping station.
		22			7,500	.15	1,125		District of Columbia.
		23			7,500	.15	1,125		Do.
		24			7,500	.15	1,125		Do.
16	Rock Creek Church road			1	43,560	.03	1,307	1,000	District of Columbia (school).
18	Queen's Chapel road			1	46,522	.02	930	6,800	District of Columbia (Langdon School).
	Cuckhild's Delight	Part of sub. 6		1	43,731	.02	875	2,000	District of Columbia (school).
	Granby	Part of 40		.63	27,241	.01	272	500	Do.
19	West Eckington, block 8	21			2,700	.35	945	18,000	District of Columbia (Eckington School).
		22			1,800	.30	540		District of Columbia.
		23			1,800	.30	540		Do.
		24			1,800	.30	540		Do.
		25			1,800	.30	540		Do.
		26			1,800	.30	540		Do.
		27			1,800	.30	540		Do.
	Keating's	2			10,706	.15	1,606	32,000	District of Columbia (Emory School).
		3			10,311	.20	2,062	1,000	District of Columbia.
	Brookland:								
	Block 13	9			7,500	.10	750	18,000	District of Columbia (school).
		10			7,500	.08	600		District of Columbia.
		11			7,500	.08	600		Do.
	Block 22	18			7,500	.06	450	8,500	District of Columbia (chemical company No. 4).
	Ivy City, block 6	41			3,600	.02	72		District of Columbia (colored school).
		42			3,600	.02	72	1,500	Do.
20	Columbia Pike			.75	32,670	.04	1,307	4,000	District of Columbia (Hamilton School).
	Trinidad, block 4	17			9,000	.20	1,800	2,000	District of Columbia (Wheatley School).
		18			7,500	.10	750		District of Columbia.
		19			7,500	.10	750		Do.
		20			7,500	.10	750		Do.
	Rosedale, block 23	Sub. 36			4,009	.25	1,002		Do.
		Sub. 37			2,400	.20	480		Do.
		Sub. 38			2,400	.20	480		Do.
		Sub. 39			2,400	.20	480	18,000	District of Columbia (Webb School).
		Sub. 40			2,400	.20	480		District of Columbia.
		Sub. 41			2,400	.20	480		Do.
		Sub. 42			2,400	.20	480		Do.
22	Anacostia road			1	43,560	.02	871	4,000	District of Columbia (Bennings School).
	Kenilworth addition, block 5	61			2,144	.03	64		District of Columbia.
		62			3,000	.03	90		
		63			3,000	.03	90	18,000	District of Columbia (school).
		64			3,000	.03	90		District of Columbia.
		65			3,000	.03	90		Do.
		66			2,237	.03	68		Do.
		67			2,199	.03	66		Do.
		68			2,230	.03	67		Do.
23	Burrville, section 3, block 5	46			2,500	.01	25		Do.
		47			2,500	.01	25		Do.
		48			2,500	.01	25		
		49			2,500	.01	25		Do.
		50			2,500	.01	25	1,500	District of Columbia (school).
		51			2,500	.01	25		District of Columbia.
24	Anacostia road			1	43,560	.01	436	800	District of Columbia (school).
	Benning road			.50	21,780	.02	436	2,000	Do.
25	Bowen road			.50	21,780	.03	653	2,000	Do.
26	Anacostia road—Eighteenth street extended.			.23	10,000	.03	301	3,000	District of Columbia (pumping station).
	Hamilton road			1	43,560	.02	871	3,500	District of Columbia (school).
				3.05	133,005	.01	1,330		District of Columbia (Good Hope School).
	Twining City, block 4	47			3,750	.02	75		District of Columbia.
		48			3,750	.02	75		Do.
		49			3,750	.02	75	18,000	District of Columbia (Orr School).
		50			3,750	.02	75		District of Columbia.
		51			3,538	.02	71		Do.

[a] Lands assessed in the name of the United States.

District of Columbia property exempt in Washington County, general assessment 1902-3—Continued.

Plat.	Location.	Lot.	Front feet.	Acres.	Square feet.	Rate.	Ground	Improvements.	Name assessed.
	Barry farm:								
26	Block 7	Part of 1	South 141.82 feet		24,686	$0.02	$494	$3,000	District of Columbia (school).
		Part of 2	North 41.58 feet, Nichols avenue.		7,301	.025	183		Do.
	Block 9	1			43,560	.04	1,742	25,000	Do.
	Uniontown	187			3,120	.09	281		District of Columbia.
		188			3,120	.09	281		Do.
		189			3,120	.09	281		Do.
		190			3,120	.09	281	20,000	District of Columbia (Van Buren School).
		191			3,120	.09	281		District of Columbia.
		206			3,120	.08	250		Do.
		207			3,120	.08	250		Do.
		208			3,120	.08	250	6,000	District of Columbia (Van Buren School Annex).
		209			3,120	.08	250		District of Columbia.
		210			3,120	.08	250		Do.
		Part of 218	East 11 feet		1,430	.08	114		Do.
		219			3,120	.12	374	7,000	District of Columbia (engine house No. 15).
27	Nichols avenue			2.47	107,593	.03	3,228	12,000	District of Columbia (school).
	Randle Park, block 1	2			7,500	.04	300	15,000	District of Columbia (chemical engine house No. 5).
30	Bellevue	1		28.46		70.00	1,992		District of Columbia.
		4		32.48		70.00	2,274	400	Do.
		Part of 5		25.44		125.00		3,180	Do.
		Part of 7		30.10		70.00	2,107		Do.
		8		55.65		80.00	4,452	300	Do.
		9		49.92		70.00	3,494		Do.
		Part of 10		34.20		80.00	2,736		Do.
		11		1		70.00	70		Do.

EXHIBIT F.

FEBRUARY 19, 1906.

Hon. HENRY L. WEST,
Commissioner, District of Columbia.

SIR: Referring to the expense of maintaining the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia, in response to your direction for report, I respectfully beg leave to state that the police jurisdiction embraces the entire territory of the District, about 70 square miles in extent, and including 700 linear miles of streets and alleys and —— linear miles of roads. The territory includes the cities of Washington and Georgetown and numerous towns and villages, all well populated, the density of population gradually decreasing in the direction of the boundary lines or contiguous States of Maryland and Virginia, and the police distribution is made to conform to the requirements of the population and valuable improvements contained therein.

For the fiscal year 1904, the expenses of the department, including clerks, messengers, drivers, fuel, contingent and miscellaneous expenses, and rent of police headquarters and substation house, were	$812,245
For sake of comparison with the larger cities it is fair to deduct rental of buildings, for on a general proposition most of the municipalities own their police houses. This decrease would be	2,880
Leaving as the expense	810,365

Washington and Georgetown contain a population of 259,100, the county or suburban section of the District of Columbia a population of 64,223. Thus it will be observed that there is a large population outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown requiring police protection. In addition to the citizens and their families included in this population may be found such valuable properties as the American University, Soldiers' Home, Government Hospital for the Insane, Naval Observatory, Methodist University, Episcopal University, and the various street railway improvements and parks.

The roads leading to the various towns, villages, and institutions are patronized not only by our own people, but by distinguished officials and visitors whose welfare must be guarded. There are in addition several bridge approaches which must be looked after, as they furnish means of escape for disorderly and criminal characters to outside jurisdictions.

The most emphatic argument in favor of considering the whole District of Columbia in connection with the expense for police service is shown by the following list of towns and villages with population, the roads and avenues leading to and from the same being necessarily largely patronized:

List of towns and villages, with population.

Name of town.	White.	Colored.	Total.
Anacostia	3,349	140	3,489
Hillsdale	131	2,315	2,446
Twining City	481	20	501
Congress Heights	746	3	749
East Washington Park	60		60
Good Hope	118	18	136
Garfield	23	592	615
Giesboro	160	18	178
Shepard's	44	16	60
United States Government Hospital for the Insane	2,401	503	2,904
Tennallytown	987	393	1,380
Cleveland Park	282	59	341
American University Park	64	1	65
Wesley Heights	17		17
County:			
Eighth precinct	7,032	4,172	11,204
Ninth precinct	1,576	141	1,717
Kendall Green	219	47	266
Trinidad	1,470	661	2,131
Benning	452	263	715

List of towns and villages, with population—Continued.

Name of town.	White.	Colored.	Total.
Kenilworth	206	122	328
Beanwood	33	284	317
Burrville	4	195	199
Central Heights	49	2	51
Fairmont		12	12
Glendale	9	42	51
Lincoln		120	120
Central Avenue	10	2	12
Chesapeake Junction		48	48
Ivy City	116	286	402
Montello	62	41	103
Winthrop	79	9	88
Langdon	548	5	553
Cottage Place	59		59
Reform School	172	190	362
Avalon Heights	137		137
Greenvail	87	12	99
Blair	13	14	27
Kalorama	331	63	394
Tuttles	168	32	200
Washington Heights	561	129	690
Littles	297	50	347
Clifbourne	246	49	295
Com. subdivision	800	118	918
Columbia College	564	36	600
University Park	348	34	382
Columbia College, South	845	44	889
Sherman subdivision	245	24	269
Mount Pleasant	1,455	122	1,577
Ingleside	194	38	232
Dennison subdivision	199	10	209
Meridian Hill	469	1,202	1,671
Lanier Heights	329	45	374
Columbia Heights	2,938	308	3,246
Holmead Manor	946	67	1,013
Purner's	125	4	129
Todd & Brown's	1,649	830	2,479
Wright & Dole	411	595	1,006
Petworth	430	12	442
Gass's subdivision	231	3	234
Whitney Close	119	1	120
Bellevue	399	59	458
Schuetzen Park	6		6
Howard University	186	661	847
Barbour & Moore	873	10	883
Dobbins's subdivision	212	1	213
Filtration Plant	78	15	93
Prospect Hill and Glenwood	15		15
Trinity College	113	7	120
United States Soldiers' Home	985	50	1,035
Woodburn Station	39	58	97
Stotts Station	96	22	118
Lamond Station	94	55	149
Takoma	304	78	382
Brightwood Park	656	31	687
Brightwood subdivision	407	191	598
North Columbia Heights	102	28	130
Eckington	322	28	350
Edgewood	233	4	237
Metropolis	84	4	88
West Brookland	102	1	103
South Brookland	466	82	548
Sherwoods	139		139
Brookland	753	75	828
University Heights	252	4	256
Rock Creek Park	13		13

The population of the roads intervening between these places is 5,972.

It is quite evident that the police force has extensive life and property interests outside of the city of Washington to supervise and protect, aside from the people and traffic which is constantly carried on with the surrounding population and interests.

The river must be patrolled 7 miles below the city proper, 3 miles front and the Anacostia Branch, in all about 12 miles, which necessitates an expenditure as follows: One lieutenant, foot privates, boat, miscellaneous expenses—$13,140.

Within the city of Washington are located those important and distinguished official interests which are to be found in no other American city, the homes and official quarters of the President, Cabinet officers, Supreme Court, Senators, Representatives, and foreign legations.

It can not be questioned but that every freedom from annoyance should be afforded these persons and their residences. Experience warrants that special precautions be taken by the police to insure them against embarrassment or molestation; this in the absence of any other provision having been made. Aside from their official stations they are our distinguished citizens and residents.

Not writing as an alarmist, but that you may more fully appreciate the situation, the offices and homes of some of these prominent people are known to have been intruded upon and assaults have been committed by irresponsible persons with whom the police must deal. When the records show that 605 individuals said to have been suffering from mental impairments have been investigated by the police in the past year, 406 of whom were admitted to the Government Hospital for the Insane, some idea of the responsibility and delicacy of the situation may be had.

Proceeding, therefore, on the basis that the entire District of Columbia should be considered in comparing the police expense, and that unusual and superior intelligence is required of the agents within the city of Washington, which does not enter into conditions elsewhere, and, bearing in mind the further social conditions which do not prevail in northern cities, the expense in detail and its distribution will be considered.

In the District outside of Washington, which includes nine of the towns first mentioned and the Government Hospital for the Insane, with a population of 11,591 persons, the police detail is as follows: Two sergeants (mounted), seven privates (mounted), fourteen foot privates, two desk sergeants, two drivers, one laborer (two reliefs in twenty-four hours, or about nine men on duty at one time, and reserve duty)—$28,080.

In the District outside of Washington, which includes four more of the towns previously enumerated, two bridges and Rock Creek Park, reservoir, National Park, with a population of 5,198, police detail is as follows: Two sergeants (mounted), twelve mounted privates, fourteen foot privates, one desk sergeant, one laborer (three reliefs in twenty-four hours, or about nine men on duty at one time, and reserve duty)—$33,900.

In the District outside of Washington, which includes twenty towns and subdivisions previously enumerated, with railways, etc., and a population of 8,198, the police detail is as follows: Two sergeants (mounted), ten mounted privates, nine foot privates (three reliefs in twenty-four hours, or about seven men on duty at one time, and reserve duty)—$24,780.

In the District outside of Washington, which includes forty-nine towns and subdivisions previously mentioned, and a population of 27,693, the police detail is as follows: One lieutenant, three sergeants, forty-five foot privates, two sergeants (mounted), twelve mounted privates, two desk sergeants, two drivers, two laborers (three reliefs in twenty-four hours, or about seventeen men on duty at one time, three men detailed in the city and reserve duty)—$68,120.

The details made by order of the Commissioners to the police court, workhouse, health office, District building, etc., further diminishes the amount of cost. In their stead bailiffs and watchmen should be employed—$25,320.

To the above should be added miscellaneous expenses—probably $12,000.

The many regulations promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of Congress, which do not prevail elsewhere, require an active, constant, and intelligent work on the part of the force, and which accounts for the large number of arrests. The last year there were 32,016 cases of arrest, most of which were for misdemeanors or petty offenses, and the same percentage would hold good for 1904.

1904.

City.	Area.	Cost.	Arrests, 1902.	Additional force wanted.	Cost per square mile.
	Sq. miles				
District of Columbia	70	$810,365	29,543	50	$11,576
St. Louis	62	1,948,864	25,524	----------	31,111
Boston	43	1,758,420	34,732	200	43,219
Baltimore	31	1,059,046	31,423	100	34,162
Buffalo	42	787,613	18,716	----------	18,780
Pittsburg	28	620,000	----------	100	22,142
Newark	18	509,644	6,626	100	28,313

1905.

City.	Area.	Population.	Cost.	Cost per square mile.	Arrests, 1902.
	Sq. miles				
District of Columbia	70	323,000	$812,170	$11,602	29,543
Cincinnati	42	400,000	807,856	14,473	12,749
Detroit	29	350,000	627,255	21,698	8,978
Milwaukee	22	312,000	382,356	16,971	5,666
Jersey City	12	235,000	437,000	36,416	--------

There are 373 private watchmen employed on the inside of Government buildings—State, War, and Navy, Interior, and other Departments—who change watch. But twenty-five of these perform outside duty, those at the Smithsonian Institution and Agricultural Department, where they have large grounds, and over all of which the police exercise jurisdiction, including the parks. The exterior of all Government property is supervised by the Metropolitan police. Watchmen are employed in the large office buildings of the Government, as they are in all large buildings in the principal cities of the country.

If the cases of arrest are in anywise considered to indicate the work required of the force in the District, it is by far the least expensive in the country.

Very respectfully,

RICHARD SYLVESTER,
Major and Superintendent.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 6, 1906.

Hon. HENRY L. WEST,
Commissioner, District of Columbia.

SIR: The police force of the District of Columbia consists of 692 officers and privates, divided according to the following table:

	Major and superintendent.	Captain and assistant superintendent.	Captains.	Lieutenants.	Sergeants.	Privates.	Total.	Privates. Sick.	With leave.	Suspended.	Detailed.	Post duty.	Patrol duty.
Headquarters	1	1	4	1	----	20	27	----	----	----	----	----	----
Precincts:													
First	----	----	----	1	4	66	71	3	6	----	11	12	34
Second	----	----	----	1	3	57	61	4	2	----	9	3	39
Third	----	----	----	1	3	67	71	2	2	----	9	3	51
Fourth	----	----	----	1	4	55	60	1	3	1	11	8	31
Fifth	----	----	----	1	5	74	80	1	2	----	13	4	54
Sixth	----	----	----	1	4	61	66	1	5	----	15	7	33
Seventh	----	----	----	1	6	63	70	5	5	----	9	13	31
Eighth	----	----	----	1	2	49	52	3	2	1	5	4	34
Ninth	----	----	----	1	4	63	68	1	4	----	9	12	37
Tenth	----	----	----	1	5	59	65	1	2	----	4	16	36
Vacancy	----	----	----	----	----	a1	a1	----	----	----	----	----	----
Total	1	1	4	11	40	635	692	22	33	2	95	82	380

a Including twenty detectives and not including twenty-two station clerks or desk sergeants.

The officers and privates are paid as follows:

1 major and superintendent		$4,000
1 captain and assistant superintendent		1,800
4 captains	each	1,500
11 lieutenants	do	1,320
40 sergeants	do	1,140
265 privates of class 2	do	1,080
370 privates of class 1	do	900

Very respectfully,

RICHARD SYLVESTER,
Major and Superintendent.

EXHIBIT G.

Debt of the District of Columbia.

DEBT.

As shown by detailed statement marked "A," the funded debt of the District of Columbia on June 30, 1905, as shown by the report of the Treasurer of the United States as ex-officio commissioner of the sinking fund, and verified by the books kept in this office, was	$12,051,350.00
The unfunded actual indebtedness due to the United States on June 30, 1905, as set forth in detail in statement "C," and also shown by the statement of the revenue account of the District of Columbia by the Auditor for the State and other Departments, and by the auditor of the District, made pursuant to law, was	2,240,030.14
Total debt of the District of Columbia, funded and unfunded, on June 30, 1905	14,291,380.14

STATEMENT A.—*Funded debt, District of Columbia.*

District of Columbia, account of bonded indebtedness	$12,051,350.00
District of Columbia registered 3.65 per cent $1,000 bonds	528,000.00
District of Columbia registered 3.65 per cent $5,000 bonds	10,880,000.00
District of Columbia 3.65 per cent coupon bonds, $50 and $500 bonds	643,350.00
Total	12,051,350.00

Unsigned bonds.

District of Columbia 3.65 per cent coupon bonds, $50 each	$450.00
District of Columbia 3.65 per cent coupon bonds, $500 each	41,000.00

STATEMENT C.—*Account of the District of Columbia with the Treasury of the United States for advances from appropriations payable wholly and in part from its revenues, with interest thereon, and receipts from all sources (other than trust and special funds), deposited in the Treasury of the United States, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905.*

	Detail.	Total.	Grand total.
BALANCES.			
Amount due the United States from the District of Columbia on account of advances under the acts of Feb. 11, 1901, and July 1, 1902, in excess of revenues to meet appropriations chargeable to the District of Columbia for the fiscal years that follow:			
Fiscal year 1901	$220,182.57		
Fiscal year 1902	1,539,055.77		
	1,759,238.34		
Interest computed for the fiscal year 1903, at 2 per cent per annum, as required by the act of July 1, 1902, on the above $1,759,238.34, the actual indebtedness of the District of Columbia July 1, 1902, for advances made by the United States on account of appropriations charged to said District in excess of the revenues thereof	35,184.76		
	1,794,423.10		
Surplus of receipts over advances for the fiscal year 1903	140,905.59		
Amount due the United States from the District of Columbia July 1, 1903, on account of advances to that date, in excess of the revenues, to meet the proportionate part of appropriations charged to the District of Columbia	1,653,517.51		
Interest computed for the fiscal year 1904, at 2 per cent per annum, as required by the act of March 3, 1903, on the above $1,653,517.51, the actual indebtedness of the District of Columbia July 1, 1903, for advances made by the United States on account of appropriations charged to the revenues of said District in excess of the revenues thereof	33,070.35		
	1,686,587.86		
Surplus of receipts over advances for the fiscal year 1904	336,926.17		
Amount due the United States from the District of Columbia July 1, 1904, on account of advances to that date in excess of the revenues to meet the proportionate part of appropriations charged to the District of Columbia		$1,349,661.69	
ADVANCES.			
Total amount advanced by the United States on account of appropriations payable wholly and in part from the revenues of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, on account of:			
Requisitions on the Treasurer of the United States	11,696,231.69		
Transfers between District of Columbia appropriations: Settlement transfers debiting District of Columbia appropriations	45,436.76		
Transfers to District of Columbia trust and special funds: Settlement transfers debiting District of Columbia appropriations	38,263.41		
Transfers to United States appropriations: Settlement transfers debiting District of Columbia appropriations	256,131.05		
Direct settlements made by the United States Treasury Department: Debiting District of Columbia appropriations	34,855.13		
Total advances and charges made by transfers and settlements on account of District of Columbia appropriations during the fiscal year 1905	12,070,918.04		

STATEMENT C.—*Account of the District of Columbia with the Treasury of the United States, etc.*—Continued.

	Detail.	Total.	Grand total.
ADVANCES—continued.			
Proportion of the above advances and charges to District of Columbia appropriations during the fiscal year 1905, charged to the revenues of the District of Columbia, as follows:			
Requisitions on the Treasurer of the United States	$5,907,309.95		
Transfers between District of Columbia appropriations: Settlement transfers debiting District of Columbia appropriations	22,718.38		
Transfers to District of Columbia trust and special funds: Settlement transfers debiting District of Columbia appropriations	19,131.70		
Transfers to United States appropriations: Settlement transfers debiting District of Columbia appropriations	128,065.53		
Direct settlements by the United States Treasury: Debiting District of Columbia appropriations	17,427.56		
Total proportion of advances and charges made on account of the District of Columbia appropriations during the fiscal year 1905, charged to the revenues of the District of Columbia		$6,094,653.12	
Interest computed for the fiscal year 1905, at 2 per cent per annum, as required by the act of April 27, 1904, on $1,349,661.69, the actual indebtedness of the District of Columbia July 1, 1904, for advances made by the United States on account of appropriations charged to the revenues of said District in excess of the revenues thereof		26,993.23	
Total to June 30, 1905, charged to the revenues of the District of Columbia			$7,471,308.04
RECEIPTS.			
Revenues collected by the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia and by him deposited in the Treasury of the United States, as verified by his daily reports audited in this office		4,842,064.35	
Receipts from sundry sources forming part of the revenues of the District of Columbia, deposited directly in the Treasury of the United States:			
By the recorder of deeds, surplus fees	3,037.64		
By the register of wills, surplus fees	.95		
One-half of proceeds derived from sales of old material by the warden of the jail	87.54		
One-half of proceeds of sale of old material by the recorder of deeds	45.31		
One-half of proceeds derived from sale of old material by the Girls' Reform School, District of Columbia	3.95		
One-half of amount of cash which remained to the official credit of the treasurer of the Washington Hospital for Foundlings, arising from the difference between audited claims and checks issued thereon	.28		
Amount of surplus deposit to the credit of the police relief fund, District of Columbia, derived from police court fines, in excess of the amount required to pay policemen's pensions for the fiscal year 1905	40.00		
One-half of proceeds derived from sale of farm products and work of shops at Reform School, District of Columbia	2,364.52		
Total revenues from sundry sources		5,580.19	
Total revenues deposited during the fiscal year 1905 to the credit of the general fund of the District of Columbia		4,847,644.54	
Total repayments to District of Columbia appropriations during the fiscal year 1905	658,358.49		

STATEMENT C.—*Account of the District of Columbia with the Treasury of the United States, etc.*—Continued.

	Detail.	Total.	Grand total.
RECEIPTS—continued.			
Transfers between District of Columbia appropriations: Settlement transfers crediting District of Columbia appropriations	$45,436.76		
Transfers from District of Columbia trust and special funds: Settlement transfers crediting District of Columbia appropriations	34,339.80		
Total repayments and credit transfers made on account of District of Columbia appropriations during the fiscal year 1905	738,135.05		
Proportion of the above repayments and settlement transfers during the fiscal year 1905 credited to the District of Columbia on account of:			
Repayments to appropriations	340,443.15		
Transfers between District of Columbia appropriations: Settlement transfers crediting District of Columbia appropriations	22,741.19		
Transfers from District of Columbia trust and special funds: Settlement transfers crediting District of Columbia appropriations	17,199.72		
Total proportion of repayments and settlement transfers credited to the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1905		$380,384.06	
Advances made on account of the appropriation for buildings, Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia, the proportion of which heretofore charged to the revenues of the District is, under the provisions of the sundry civil act approved Mar. 3, 1905, to be credited to said revenues:			
Total advances made on account of the appropriation for buildings, Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia	6,948.60		
Less amount of repayment to said appropriation	450.00		
Net amount of advances from the appropriation for buildings, Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia	6,498.60		
Proportion of the above net advances from the appropriation buildings, Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia, credited to the District of Columbia		3,249.30	
Aggregate of revenues and credits to the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1905			$5,231,277.90
Actual deficiency in the receipts from revenues of the District of Columbia and its proportionate share of repayments and sundry credits to meet the advances made by the United States Treasury on account of the proportionate part of appropriations charged to said District during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905			2,240,030.14

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in all communities one of the objects of most tender consideration and solicitude is the maintenance and care of those of our fellow-citizens who unfortunately have become bereft of their reason. In all of the States and Territories institutions have been established and are maintained at great expense for the care of these unfortunates. The United States Government as a government maintains two—and, I belive, two only—of these institutions. One is located in the Indian Territory and the other is located in the District of Columbia.

I have taken the floor for the purpose of calling attention to the one located in the District of Columbia, known as St. Elizabeth's Hospital for the Insane. I think, Mr. Chairman, from facts in my possession it is time that the Congress of the United States knew something of the management, the control, and the conduct of this institution. At every session of Congress large sums of money are appropriated for its maintenance, great sums are annually expended for the care of its inmates. It is peculiarly an institution within the direct control of the Congress. During the month of February past there appeared in the Washington newspapers comments upon the management of this institution. These publications were of such a character that, as a Representative of this body, I felt that it was incumbent upon Congress to investigate that institution and ascertain, at least, whether or no the charges preferred against it were true. On the 18th day of February, 1906, there appeared in the Washington Times an article referring to this institution, which article I send to the Clerk's desk and desire to have read as a part of my remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICO-LEGAL SOCIETY PUSHING CAMPAIGN FOR PROPER CARE OF CRIMINAL INSANE—COMMITTEE REPORTS ON ALLEGED CONDITIONS AT ST. ELIZABETH'S—BILL BEFORE CONGRESS—RADICAL CHANGES ARE URGED BY THOSE INTERESTED IN MOVEMENT.

The Medico-Legal Society of the District is waging in Congress a campaign to secure the release of the criminal insane from the Government Hospital for the Insane in this city. The society looks upon the present system as a great wrong to the District and it has high hope that its efforts will meet with success at the present session.

Under the present law three classes of persons are committed to St. Elizabeth's—the indigent insane of the District of Columbia, insane soldiers and sailors of the United States Army and Navy, and the criminal insane of the whole country, who enter the plea of insanity in a Federal court and have it sustained.

PRECEPTS OF BILL.

The bill introduced in Congress last week directs the Attorney-General to transfer the criminal insane now at St. Elizabeth's to State institutions, especially provided for the custody of the criminal insane, and in the future to send such persons directly to such institutions. The bill further provides the Attorney-General shall report to Congress the cost of building a pavilion for the criminal insane within the Federal prison at Atlanta.

The first provision of the bill is designed to give immediate relief; the second suggests a permanent solution of the whole problem.

Dr. Charles M. Emmons, who is taking a deep interest in the movement, says it is in the interest of the insane not criminal, whose misfortunes compel their confinement at St. Elizabeth's. He regards it as wholly unjust in action and wrong in principle.

COMMITTEE REPORT.

Doctor Emmons believes, moreover, that if the criminal insane were confined in a penitentiary, as, he says, they should be, the number of pleas of insanity would be very considerably reduced.

The criminal who knows a plea of insanity will not keep him out of prison—and a real prison—is not so likely to make it.

Dr. Charles M. Emmons and Attorney Richard P. Evans have just submitted their report to the society, and it was given out last night.

The committee disavowed any intention to reflect upon the integrity or ability of Dr. William A. White, the superintendent of the institution, who is an alienist of national reputation.

SOME COMPLAINTS MADE.

In speaking of the discipline at St. Elizabeth's Hospital, the committee says:

"It would appear from complaints and statements made to us that strait-jackets, handcuffs, etc., are in frequent use; that the 'feeding tube' has been upon occasions thrust through the nostril down the throat as a method of punishment and discipline, as well as of alleged necessity; that 'wringing out' by wet towels and 'toweling' with dry towels placed about the patient's neck and twisted from behind until the patient falls over semiconscious (sometimes with soap in the mouth) is not an uncommon practice; that the 'saddle' has been used at times, a contrivance upon which refractory patients are said to be placed in a reclining position, fastened hand, foot, and neck, and so that no movement is possible except to roll the eyes around a circumscribed area of the ceiling, and thus left for hours.

"Kicking and cuffing by attendants for failure to obey orders or do work properly, or for 'taking an extra spoonful of beans' at table, etc., is alleged. An incident is told of an attendant, disturbed at night by a somnambulistic patient, striking him in the mouth and knocking him down, and carrying his own hand in a bandage for several days in consequence; and of another attendant breaking a patient's leg in disciplining him.

MAKE PATIENTS FEAR.

"There are different ways of training a horse—but one attendant made the statement that he was instructed to make patients fear him, as he would a horse, etc., and he commenced doing so, his first day on, by knocking a patient down and choking him, after which 'he had no trouble with that one.'

"Many other like occurrences are reported, but these are more than sufficient, if true, to present a vivid contrast to the methods of gentleness and sympathy carried out in other institutions.

"The committee has no thought or idea that these practices, if they exist, are known to or permitted by the superintendent, but he is a very busy man, and has to leave all details of care and treatment to his subordinates. He personally told a member of the committee that the administrative details of improvements, expenditure of $1,500,000 during past years in new buildings, alterations of heating and lighting plant, landscape gardening, etc., his duties in connection with other hospital plans, calls as an expert alienist to distant points, his literary labors, financial responsibilities, etc., kept him working over hours and left no time for him to give personal medical attention to the patients in the hospital; and in all of the court cases in which the superintendent has testified he stated that he had no personal knowledge of the patients until brought to his attention by the court proceedings.

"The superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane and the United States attorney for the District of Columbia hold that the officials of the Soldiers' Homes have unlimited military authority over all who enter said Homes (although these officials are merely civilians and the National Home an incorporated institution); that said officials have delegated to them the authority of the Rules and Articles of War over the inmates of said Homes, and have the right and power to commit them to an insane asylum, at their pleasure, without due process or law, for an indefinite period (frequently for life), and their jurisdiction continues without limitation of term; that these honorably discharged soldiers and sailors have no right to an inquisition into their

sanity by due process of law, and that the courts have no jurisdiction over them because they are not civilians.

LAW IN THE CASE.

"A majority of the judges of the supreme court of the District of Columbia have taken a contrary view of the law, namely, Chief Justice Clabaugh and Justices Anderson, Wright, and Gould.

"Justice Barnard held with them in the Shaffer case, but recently he reversed himself in the case of Jesse Owsley, wherein he held the commitment legal and denied a motion for inquisition by a jury into the sanity of the ex-soldier.

"As stated in the report of Superintendent White, the cases of Alexander N. Willis and James L. Shaffer were decided adversely to the Government by Justices Wright and Barnard, and they were released and discharged, and the district attorney took appeals in both cases to the court of appeals. The records were printed and cases set for hearing at the January term, but on the first day of the term the District attorney, by order of the Attorney-General, dismissed his appeals in both cases.

"The inferences naturally follow that * * * said commitments are unconstitutional; that such honorably discharged soldiers and sailors are American citizens and entitled to due process of law where their liberty is concerned, and that they are not subject to unlimited authority and power of civilian officials, acting under alleged delegated military powers of the Rules and Articles of War, independent of the constitutional rights of the citizen and of the judiciary.

"The Willis case is no doubt exceptional; this is a brief of its history. An old man, but vigorous of body and intellect, prevailed upon to deed valuable property to a relative, with usual promises of support, etc. Drugged in New York, taken thence, unconscious, 1,000 miles to the Soldiers' Home, Milwaukee, Wis.; from there by the lettre de cachet route to St. Elizabeth; there regarded as insane, and his very statement of the facts taken as absolute proof of 'persecutory mania;' punished in the hospital for attempt to secure legal assistance for his release; his pension of $12 per month used by the hospital; his pension of $50 per month, for life, as an old employee of Arnold, Constable & Co., commuted and released by said relative for a cash payment, made to said relative, for $250; penniless and friendless, his prospect for escape from life imprisonment among the insane exceedingly small.

"But a warm-hearted, energetic woman believed his story and enlisted counsel in his behalf; for months an investigation carried on and story proven true; habeas corpus proceedings instituted and his commitment held unconstitutional and illegal by Justice Wright, who stated on the bench 'that one might as well argue that a policeman could be authorized to arrest a citizen, charge him with murder, pronounce him guilty, and hang him to a lamp post;' remanded for six days to give opportunity for the superintendent to have inquisition by due process of law into his sanity, and discharged from custody and from the hospital because of failure of the superintendent to institute such proceedings. Willis was a sane man held for nearly two years, discharged without one dollar of money and without decent clothing.

THE SHAFFER CASE.

"In the Shaffer case, it appears he was too religious to suit the taste of an official in the hospital ward at the Soldiers' Home, who commanded him to stop praying with the sick inmates whom he visited; his refusal occasioned his lettre de cachet to St. Elizabeth; there he showed no signs of insanity, but his requests for discharge were refused and his release by habeas corpus resisted. He is now at home in the Pennsylvania mountains leading a useful life and respected and beloved by his friends and relatives. He also escaped what promised to be a life term, as his case was said to be 'incurable' by the 'expert' in charge. He was assisted to his home by the board of charities. A $20 bill, sent him by a nephew to aid in securing his freedom, in a letter to St. Elizabeth, never reached him.

"These are exceptional cases, of course, but there appear to be others with similar ear marks.

"But how about those who remain—sane or insane?

"Crowded out of the better accommodations by the 'pay patients,' and District 'indigents'—many of whom appear to be wives and feeble relatives of nontaxpaying Government employees—these old soldiers and sailors, for whom the best things of the hospital were intended when it was established, must be content with inferior quarters and vastly inferior food.

THE ALLEGED BULL PEN.

"Most of them, some 500, are confined in what they have christened the 'bull pen,' officially known as 'Atkin's Hall,' under the care and supervision of a very young physician, of about six months' practice previous to his connection with the institution.

"The 'bull pen' is a triangular inclosure of about 3 acres, of which about one-half is occupied by buildings. It is surrounded by brick walls and high paling fences, through which the inmates can be seen tramping wearily back and forth like caged animals, or sitting listlessly awaiting the bell for meals. Some have been there for a decade or over. No occupation, nothing to divert or stimulate their minds, subject to being disciplined for infraction of rules which (although held to be insane), they are required to understand, remember, and obey.

"Forbidden the right to consult counsel, or to be examined by outside physicians; ragged, wretched, and forlorn; with no hope for release prior to the day when 'taps' for them shall sound, and, feet foremost, they may be borne to the dissecting room for the pathologist to carve and pickle and lecture over their still warm though lifeless remains.

"One old soldier stated 'that he was treated as well as any old dog shut up in a back yard, with water to drink and a tough chunk to gnaw on; if he did not attempt to dig out, or jump the fence, or howl at the moon, he was left alone and kept out of trouble; that he never got medicine unless he asked for it when constipated.'"

The following named have been elected officers of the Medico-Legal Society to serve for the ensuing year:

President, Robert Reyburn, M. D.; vice-president, W. D. Hughes, M. D.; secretary, Charles M. Emmons, M. D.; treasurer, C. B. Robinson, D. V. S.; attorney, Richard P. Evans; associate attorney, James E. Padgett.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that article and others induced me to introduce in this House on the 13th day of February last a bill which provided for the separation of the criminal insane from those who are not criminal. That bill upon its introduction went to the Committee on the Judiciary and has remained there every since. I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, without having it read, a copy of that bill. I desire also, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD, without consuming the time necessary to read them, an article from the Washington Times, under date of February 19, 1906, an article from the Washington Post, and an article from the Evening Star of the same date.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to say that he was going to put in the RECORD certain newspaper articles.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have asked permission to insert them in the RECORD without having them read.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object to that. I desire to have them read.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hope the gentleman will not object, because it will consume every bit of my time if I have those articles read.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman from Florida think that it is wise to assail a public institution by anonymous, irresponsible newspaper articles, without even giving the House an opportunity to know what they are?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not agree with the gentleman that the Washington Post, the Washington Times, and the Washington Star are either anonymous or irresponsible.

Mr. GROSVENOR. They are certainly anonymous, because they are not editorial articles, as I understand it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. They are articles appearing in the news columns, for which they vouch, and for which they are responsible. An action of libel would lie if they did not tell the truth.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman always assume to be true everything that he sees in the newspapers?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No more than I do what I hear politicians assert at various times.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I suppose the gentleman, not being a politician, of course is not a good judge of what politicians say!

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think I am a pretty fair judge of politicians. The gentleman has objected. I do not want him to take up all my time, making a speech about it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I withdraw my objection. We will see what these articles are.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the request of the gentleman from Florida will be granted.

There was no objection.

The bill and newspaper articles referred to are as follows:

A bill to remove criminal insane from the Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the approval of this act no person charged with offense against the United States who shall set up and allege insanity, or become and be insane pending trial therefor, and no person who shall have been convicted of any offense in a court of the United States, and who shall, while imprisoned under such conviction in any prison or penitentiary of any State or Territory, or of the United States, become and be insane, shall be committed in or transferred to the Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That within sixty days from and after the approval of this act all such persons named in the preceding section charged with crime and subject to be indicted and tried therefor, or convicted of crime and undergoing sentence therefor, who shall be inmates of and confined in the said Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia under any transfer or commitment by any authority whatsoever, shall be removed therefrom and transferred to an insane asylum in any State or Territory where there are accommodations for the separate care, custody, and treatment of the criminal insane, to be selected and designated by the Attorney-General of the United States.

SEC. 3. That upon application of the Attorney-General of the United States the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to remove and transfer the said insane persons under criminal charge or conviction, as aforesaid, from the Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia to any insane asylum in any State or Territory that shall be designated by the Attorney-General for their commitment and custody.

SEC. 4. That the Attorney-General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed, in his discretion, to contract with any State or Territory insane or lunatic asylum for the care, custody, and treatment of such insane persons, while remaining so insane and until their removal or discharge, in such amounts as he may deem just and reasonable.

SEC. 5. That the Attorney-General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain and report to the Congress the cost of erection and maintenance of a separate pavilion for the care, custody, and treatment of said insane persons, convicted of or charged with offenses against the United States, at the United States penitentiary at Atlanta, in the State of Georgia, or elsewhere outside of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. That the necessary money required to effect the purpose of this act is hereby appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States, out of any money not otherwise appropriated by existing law.

SEC. 7. That all law and parts of law inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

[Washington Times, February 19, 1906.]

DOCTOR WHITE DENIES ABUSE OF INSANE—DECLARES ST. ELIZABETH INMATES WELL TREATED—SAYS HE HAS NOT SEEN ANY BRUTALITY IN FOURTEEN YEARS.

Smarting deeply under the charges made in the report by a committee of the Medico-Legal Society of the District, as published exclusively in yesterday's Times, that inmates of the St. Elizabeth's Asylum were

made to suffer indignities and abuses by the physicians and attendants there, Dr. William A. White, superintendent of the institution, emphatically declares that such is not the case in that institution, and furthermore would not be tolerated if they were known to exist.

PATIENTS OFTEN ASSAULT DOCTORS.

"If the truth be known," declared Doctor White to-day, "more physicians in insane asylums and hospitals are assaulted by patients than patients are ever assaulted by physicians. I have been fourteen years connected with institutions of this kind and during this time have never known of a case of brutality to a patient by a physician in charge, but have known many cases in which physicians have been assaulted by crazed patients."

Doctor White also denies the statement made in the Medico-Legal Society's report to the effect that warm bodies were ever dissected or that insane criminals are housed indiscriminately with other inmates of the asylum.

CRIMINALS KEPT SEPARATE.

"These two statements," declared Doctor White, "are without foundation. As to our housing insane criminals among other inmates, I will state emphatically that such is not the case. We have a separate building for the criminal insane, provided some years ago by act of Congress, and in no other building are these patients put."

"Such reports as these," added Doctor White, "work incalculable harm, in that they reflect badly on an institution which, far from intending harm to patients, works untold relief and good to a community. Instead of establishing confidence in the authorities of this institution, as we are striving to do, it spreads alarm among people who have friends or relatives, the belief entering their minds that patients are subjected to harsh treatment. Furthermore, we maintain no secrecy here, as has been stated, but, on the other hand, our methods are open to investigation by anyone who cares to visit the institution."

INVESTIGATION PROBABLE.

Further than this, Doctor White declined to be quoted, stating that he would leave this to the action of the board of visitors of the asylum, which would, he said, in all probability make a thorough investigation of the charges.

With this purpose in view, the board of visitors, composed of Dr. F. N. Gunnell, ex-Surgeon-General United States Navy; William A. Maury; Mrs. A. M. Gangewer; Surgeon-General Walter Wyman, of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; Brig. Gen. John Moore; S. H. Kauffmann; Rev. Teunis S. Hamlin; Dr. G. L. Magruder, and Mrs. Gardiner Hubbard, will meet in the office of the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission to discuss their probable action with reference to the alleged harsh methods in vogue at the asylum.

[Washington Post, February 19, 1906.]

INSANE ASYLUM ABUSES.

Strait-jackets and handcuffs are in frequent use.

The "feeding tube" has been upon occasions thrust through the nostril down the throat as a method of discipline as well as of alleged necessity.

"Wringing out" by wet towels and "toweling" with dry towels placed upon the prisoner's neck and twisted from behind until the patient falls over semiconscious (sometimes with soap in the mouth) is not an uncommon practice.

The "saddle" has been used at times, a contrivance upon which refractory patients are said to be placed in a reclining position, fastened hand, foot, and neck, so that no movement is possible except to roll the eyes around a circumscribed area of the ceiling, and thus left for hours.

Kicking and cuffing by attendants for failure to obey orders, or do work properly, or for "taking an extra spoonful of beans" at table is alleged.

An incident is told of an attendant, disturbed at night by a somnambulistic patient, striking him on the mouth and knocking him down, and carrying his own hand in a bandage for several days in consequence, and of another attendant breaking a patient's leg in disciplining him.

A like proportion of autopsies—114 out of 236 deaths—occurring in our city hospitals would necessitate a large staff of deputy coroners, especially if dissections were commenced "within three hours after death, while the body is still warm, "as has been authoritatively stated is done at St. Elizabeth.

The dead seem to be excellently well cared for with newest scientific appliances by the medical staff and "internes."

But how about the living insane?

WHAT THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS.

The committee recommends that the Medico-Legal Society take action with the view of securing legislation to effect the following objects:

First. That the insane criminals and those charged with crime be transferred elsewhere for custody and treatment, and that further commitments of the criminal insane in St. Elizabeth be prohibited.

Second. That the patients in St. Elizabeth shall have the personal service and attention of an experienced and expert alienist as a medical director, who shall not be charged with administrative details of buildings, finances, etc.

Third. That an effective system of inspection of conditions and methods prevailing in the Government Hospital for the Insane in this District (and all other similar institutions), and for an auditing of the expenditures and accounts thereof, by officials independent of and unconnected with said hospital, be provided.

Fourth. That provision be made for an inquisition by a jury into sanity of all ex-soldiers, sailors, and marines transferred from National Soldiers' Homes to St. Elizabeth after thirty days from and after their commitment therein, upon request, in writing, of such patient or of his friends or attorney, filed with the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and within five days after the filing of such request.

Fifth. That no distinction of accommodations and food shall be permitted among the male patients in St. Elizabeth, civil or military, and that their food shall be in every respect equal to that enjoyed by the attendants.

Sixth. That a hospital be established under separate control for reception and treatment of cases of inebriety and the drug habit before commitment to St. Elizabeth, and that no commitments of patients suffering from such causes shall be for a longer continuous period than six months.

Seventh. That an institution for the care and education of feeble-minded children of the District of Columbia, now sent elsewhere at great expense, be established in this District.

Eighth. That the pension money of all ex-soldiers, sailors, and marines be not chargeable for any board or maintenance on account of their treatment and confinement in St. Elizabeth, but that such pension shall be held for their benefit in the same manner as now held by the Soldiers' Homes.

Ninth. That no fees or commissions shall be allowed or paid out of any pension money to any committee or guardian of any pensioner while he shall remain an inmate of said hospital for any alleged services rendered as such committee or guardian, nor any fees be paid to physicians or others connected with said hospital for testifying on question of such pensioner's sanity.

Tenth. That the maximum per capita cost of maintenance of a District patient in St. Elizabeth shall not exceed $190 per annum, so long as the total number of patients in the hospital shall be in excess of 1,500.

Eleventh. That the confinement of persons against their will in said hospital, who have only some harmless hobby, fad, or fancy not dangerous to themselves or others, and who are able to care for their own persons, shall be prohibited.

Twelfth. That measures be effected for the separation of the patients into classes on the cottage or colony plan, and to the adoption of the best and most advanced methods of care and treatment of the insane in St. Elizabeth; that patients suffering from tuberculosis be colonized on part of the farm lands of the hospital and given benefit of open-air methods of treatment.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES M. EMMONS, M. D., *Secretary*,
RICHARD P. EVANS, *Attorney*,
Committee.

[Washington Star, February 19, 1906.]

BOARD TAKES ACTION—RECOGNITION OF CHARGES AGAINST ST. ELIZABETH'S MANAGEMENT—HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE—SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS BY THE MEDICO-LEGAL SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON—NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS—GROSS ABUSE CHARGED, WHICH THE COMMITTEE IN ITS REPORT SAYS SHOULD BE REMEDIED.

A meeting of the official board of visitors to the Government Hospital for the Insane is being held this afternoon to consider serious charges that have been made against that institution by a committee of the Medico-Legal Society, composed of Dr. Charles M. Emmons and Richard P. Evans, an attorney.

Owing to the unavoidable detention of two of the members of the board, it was more than an hour late in getting together, the time originally set being 2 o'clock.

The meeting is being held in the rooms of the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission on H street, near the Cosmos Club house. The call for the assembling of the board was issued this forenoon by Dr. William A. White, superintendent of the hospital, who is also secretary of the board of visitors.

The visitors are appointed by the President and are supposed to represent the different elements comprising the inmates of the institution. Thus the board has as members Dr. F. M. Gunnell, surgeon-general of the Navy (retired), representing the sailor inmates; Gen. John Moore, surgeon-general of the Army (retired), representing the soldier inmates; Gen. Walter Wyman, surgeon-general of the Marine-Hospital Service, representing the merchant sailors; Dr. G. L. Magruder, a lay physician; Mr. S. H. Kauffmann, representing the indigent insane of the District of Columbia; Judge W. A. Maury, of the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission, who is the legal member of the board; Rev. Tennis S. Hamlin, Mrs. A. M. Gangewer, and Mrs. Gardiner G. Hubbard.

WHAT THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER.

The main duties of the board are to investigate allegations made against the hospital; to make official visits to the institution every month; to audit the accounts of Doctor White, and to hold meetings twice every year.

At the meeting in progress to-day the board will take up all the charges made by the Medico-Legal Society, which embrace allegations that strait-jackets, handcuffs, etc., are in frequent use; that the "feeding tube" has been upon occasions thrust through the nostril down the throat as a method of punishment and discipline as well as of alleged necessity. Many other like occurrences are reported. The committee say it has no idea that these practices, if they exist, are known or permitted by the superintendent, but he has to leave all details of care and treatment to his subordinates. The committee state that all criminals under charge or sentence should be transferred elsewhere, and that the conditions surrounding many of the ex-soldiers and sailors confined in St. Elizabeth's reflects no credit upon either the hospital authorities or the Government.

Reference is made to the "bull pen," where, it is said, some 500 are confined, the management of which the committee condemns. As to medical treatment these old soldiers receive, the report says there appears to be no information obtainable from the reports, judging from those examined under authority of court.

The committee refers to the report of the superintendent of the hospital regarding autopsies, and makes this comment:

"A like proportion of autopsies (114 out of 236 deaths) occurring in our city hospitals would necessitate a large staff of deputy coroners, especially if dissections were commenced 'within three hours after death, while the body was still warm,' as has been authoritatively stated is done at St. Elizabeth's."

STATEMENT BY DOCTOR WHITE.

When Doctor White was seen by a Star reporter to-day he said he would not attempt to make specific denial of the several allegations, as the entire matter would be thoroughly gone over by the board of visitors at its meeting this afternoon. Doctor White said the investigators of the Medico-Legal Society wanted to examine certain records and patients. Permission to do this was refused them, Doctor White added, because the records of certain of the patients are in no sense public records. For instance, there are many persons whose mothers, fathers, wives, and other relatives are patients at the institution, and they would not like to have their sad and unfortunate condition exploited in any manner whatever.

"There are more than 3,000 patients in the Government Hospital for the Insane," said Doctor White, "and I can say without fear of contradiction that there are fewer cases of disorder and maltreatment in this community of the insane than there is in the average town of an equal number of sane persons. The unpardonable sin in this institution is the ill treatment of patients by attendants or other employees.

Any employee, even though he be a member of my official staff, who maltreats one of the unfortunates under his care or condones such an offense will be instantly dismissed by me."

Doctor White said considerably more injuries, and frequently serious ones, were inflicted on attendants by the insane patients than vice versa. He had several times procured the arrest of attendants for striking or otherwise injuring the insane under their charge, and their dismissal from the institution was, of course, a foregone conclusion.

HAS NEVER TOLERATED ABUSE.

"I will not tolerate the abuse of the unfortunate people under my care," said Doctor White emphatically, "and I have never done so. When such cases are brought to my attention I act decisively. But I can not be expected to know of every detail of all these buildings and their thousands of inmates. I must trust some of these to my assistants. As it is, I am governor, pooh-bah, mayor, financier, and everything else here.

"The committee of the Medico-Legal Society has recommended that the executive management of the institution should be separated from the professional department," said the reporter.

"The proposed separation of the alienist from the administrative branch," replied Doctor White, "would simply be impracticable. It has been tried elsewhere and has proved to be a failure. Its trial is in the nature of ancient history. It is necessary to have an alienist in charge of the administration of such an establishment as this in order to determine what is needed, both as to materials and measures. You would not place a paper hanger in charge of a machine shop, would you?"

HIS CONSCIENCE CLEAR.

The superintendent declared that the charges that have been made against the institution do not disturb him, as his conscience is clear as to its management, so far as he is concerned. He said abuse has become one of the perquisites of the office, which a noted French writer has referred to as martyrdom. It is Doctor White's opinion that an institution such as the Government Hospital for the Insane should enjoy the fullest confidence of the public, otherwise its confidence is weakened. It appears to him, he said, that the Medico-Legal Society is striving to destroy this confidence.

ALLEGED BULL PEN.

Referring to the allegations made against the so-called "bull pen," Doctor White said it was simply an inclosure in which provisional liberty was given to those of the patients who can not be trusted in the open grounds of the hospital, because they might wander away, climb over the walls, get run over on the railroad tracks, or injure themselves by falling with attacks of epileptic fits.

"There are no high and gloomy walls about the so-called 'bull pen,' as has been stated, but the buildings occupied by the epileptics and others who can not be trusted in the open are surrounded by ornamental paling fences not more than 5 feet high, and in the inclosure are fountains, flowers, settees, etc.

"It is a question of allowing the unfortunates I have described to have daily walks and fresh air in this inclosure or else keep them confined indoors. The criminal insane are not confined with these in the misnamed 'bull pen,' but are segregated in the building known as 'Howard Hall,' where they are kept in confinement."

In conclusion Doctor White said he would welcome the investigation, as he declared he had nothing to fear.

COMMISSIONER MACFARLAND'S COMMENT.

In commenting this morning on the report made by the Medico-Legal Society on the Government Hospital for the Insane, Commissioner Macfarland said:

"The Commissioners, of course, have nothing to do with the administration of the Government Hospital for the Insane, which is under the supervision of the Interior Department and of a board of visitors appointed by the National Government. Our relation to the institution is confined to sending indigent District patients there under the act of Congress, and at a certain per capita charged. However, our board of charities has been considering for some time, at my instance, the question as to whether it would not be better to have a separate institution for the District insane, and also provision for epileptics and the feebleminded of, and similar classes not now adequately provided for, and also the question as to the cost of caring for our patients at the Government Hospital for the Insane. No conclusion has yet been reached. The question of the manner of commitment of District patients is under consideration in the committees of Congress."

DECLINES TO TALK.

United States District Attorney Daniel W. Baker to-day declined to make any statement in reference to the disclosures respecting the alleged improper condition of affairs at the Government Hospital for the Insane. Mr. Baker said that he knew nothing about the matter except from published accounts.

SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES.

After disclaiming any intention of reflecting on the ability of Dr. William A. White, the superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane, as an alienist or on his personal integrity, the committee makes allegations of which the following is a summary:

That strait-jackets and handcuffs are frequently used on patients; that a contrivance called a saddle, upon which patients are bound hand, foot, and neck, in a reclining position, and in such position that they are unable to move, is frequently used, in which condition patients are frequently left for several hours at a time; that tubes have been frequently thrust from the nostrils into the mouth of patients, and they have been fed in this way, both, it was said, as a matter of necessity and for purpose of discipline; that it is not an uncommon practice to fasten towels, both wet and dry, about the neck of a patient and to twist them from behind until the patient falls in a semiconscious condition; that soap is often placed in the mouth of patients; that kicking and cuffing of the inmates are not at all uncommon, and that it is done for very minor offenses, an incident being that an attendant knocked a patient down, and injuring his own hand in consequence, for the reason, alleged, that the patient disturbed his sleep. Another attendant, it is charged, broke the leg of a patient in an effort to discipline him.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS.

"The committee recommends that the Medico-Legal Society take action with the view of securing legislation to effect the following objects:

"First. That the insane criminals and those charged with crime be transferred elsewhere for custody and treatment, and that further commitments of the criminal insane in St. Elizabeth be prohibited.

"Second. That the patients in St. Elizabeth shall have the personal service and attention of an experienced and expert alienist as a medical director, who shall not be charged with administrative details of buildings, finances, etc.

"Third. That an effective system of inspection of conditions and methods prevailing in the Government Hospital for the Insane in this District (and all other similar institutions) and for an auditing of the expenditures and accounts thereof, by officials independent of and unconnected with said hospital, be provided.

"Fourth. That provision be made for an inquisition by a jury into sanity of all ex soldiers, sailors, and marines transferred from Soldiers' Homes to St. Elizabeth after thirty days from and after their commitment therein, upon request, in writing, of such patient or of his friends or attorney, filed with the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and within five days after the filing of such request.

"Fifth. That no distinction of accommodations and food shall be permitted among the male patients in St. Elizabeth, civil or military, and that their food shall be in every respect equal to that enjoyed by the attendants.

"Sixth. That a hospital be established under separate control for reception and treatment of cases of inebriety and the drug habit before commitment to St. Elizabeth; and that no commitments of patients suffering from such causes shall be for a longer continuous period than six months.

"Seventh. That an institution for the care and education of feebleminded children of the District of Columbia, now sent elsewhere at great expense, be established in this District.

REGARDING PENSION MONEY.

"Eighth. That the pension money of all ex soldiers, sailors, and marines be not chargeable for any board or maintenance on account of their treatment and confinement in St. Elizabeth, but that such pension shall be held for their benefit in the same manner as now held by the Soldiers' Homes.

"Ninth. That no fees or commissions shall be allowed or paid out of any pension money to any committee or guardian of any pensioner while he shall remain an inmate of said hospital for any alleged services rendered as such committee or guardian; nor any fees be paid to physicians or others connected with said hospital for testifying on question of such pensioner's sanity.

"Tenth. That the maximum per capita cost of maintenance of a District patient in St. Elizabeth shall not exceed $190 per annum, so long as the total number of patients in the hospital shall be in excess of 1,500.

"Eleventh. That the confinement of persons against their will in said hospital, who have only some harmless hobby, fad, or fancy, not dangerous to themselves or others, and who are able to care for their own persons, shall be prohibited.

"Twelfth. That measures be effected for the separation of the patients into classes, on the cottage or colony plan, and to the adoption of the best and most advanced methods of care and treatment of the insane in St. Elizabeth. That patients suffering from tuberculosis be colonized on part of the farm lands of the hospital and given benefit of open-air methods of treatment.

"Respectfully submitted.

"CHARLES M. EMMONS, M. D., *Secretary*,
"RICHARD P. EVANS, *Attorney*,
"*Committee*."

[Washington Times, February 20, 1906.]

WE COURT INQUIRY OF ST. ELIZABETH'S: DOCTOR MAGRUDER—BOARD OF VISITORS PLANS PUBLIC INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES—PATIENTS WELL TREATED—USE OF HANDCUFFS AND STRAIT-JACKETS VIGOROUSLY DENIED.

"A wide investigation into the charges of cruelty to patients at St. Elizabeth's Asylum made by the Medico-Legal Society will be at once started by the board of visitors of the institution."

Dr. G. Lloyd Magruder, a member of the board of visitors, made this statement following a meeting of the board:

INVESTIGATION IS COURTED.

"Not only do we court a most thorough sifting of the charges," declared Doctor Magruder, "but we shall insist upon the appearance and testimony of the persons who have been responsible for them. The investigation will be open to the public, and the board will welcome the appearance of anyone who can put us into possession of existing abuses at St. Elizabeth's.

"This investigation will be conducted on lines similar to that of some two years ago, when certain irresponsible charges were made regarding the alleged unwholesome character of the beef served to patients. These charges created a considerable stir at the time, but when sifted to the bottom by the board were found to be without truth.

"The board of visitors pays frequent visits to the institution and, without exception, have always found every detail there in perfect condition. The asylum may be regarded as a model one, and one in which the managers take great pride. As to Doctor White, the board considers him one of the most capable alienists engaged in the care of the insane to-day. His long association in this work and his successful handling of nearly 3,000 patients bears out this statement perfectly.

DENIES USE OF HANDCUFFS.

"The assertion that strait-jackets and handcuffs are in constant use is, I believe, without any semblance of truth. Two years ago the board issued a general order forbidding the use of any undue restraint in connection with handling patients, and since then I have reason to know the order has been faithfully observed.

"Another statement which deserves condemnation is that vicious criminal insane are confined with those only mildly affected. This charge is without foundation. If it were so, it would be cruel and unjust, and public disapproval would put a stop to the practice at once. The fact is that the asylum is equipped with a substantial building set apart for the criminal insane alone. When the time comes that the present building is inadequate, another will be asked for."

Doctor Magruder followed this statement by saying that it seemed somewhat unusual that charges of such a serious nature as those brought by the Medico-Legal Society against the asylum management were not first brought to the attention of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hitchcock instead of being made public through the press.

Doctor Gunnell, president of the board, stated also that a thorough investigation of the charges would be insisted upon. He declared that the board of visitors wished for nothing more than to know the truth.

INQUIRY WILL BE THOROUGH.

"Charges of this nature," he said, "although not infrequent at such institutions, where the management has to deal with constant com-

plaints, are most serious and will be thoroughly investigated, no matter whom they affect."

Dr. William White, superintendent in charge of the asylum, said he would be guided by the board's action. He had nothing to fear on the score of abuses to patients, he declared, and would welcome an investigation into the causes for the recent charges.

The work of the board of visitors will probably be protracted, and Secretary of the Interior Hitchcock may not be informed of their findings until some time next month. The grand jury may, in the meantime, have an investigation. It is not thought, however, that the board will be disposed to regard seriously the changes suggested by the Medico-Legal Society, particularly with reference to a separation of the criminal insane, in view of the fact that they are already separated.

[Washington Post, February 21, 1906.]

DOUBT ITS EFFICIENCY—INVESTIGATION BY ASYLUM BOARD IS QUESTIONED—NATURALLY WOULD FEEL TIMID—RICHARD P. EVANS, OF MEDICO-LEGAL SOCIETY COMMITTEE, THINKS CONGRESS OR SECRETARY OF INTERIOR SHOULD APPOINT BODY TO PROBE CHARGES—DOCTOR EMMONS CRITICISES METHODS OF TREATMENT.

The board of visitors of St. Elizabeth's Insane Asylum is not the body to investigate the charges of cruelty and mismanagement set forth by the committee of the Medico-Legal Society, according to Richard P. Evans and Dr. Charles M. Emmons, of that committee.

"This board is responsible for everything that goes wrong, and naturally would feel timid about probing too closely," said Mr. Evans. "Doctor White, the superintendent of the hospital, is secretary of the board. Doctor Hamlin, a member of the board, secured commitments for certain patients at the institution and he probably has a temerity about investigating.

"In my opinion, the board of visitors should suggest that a committee of Congress, or a committee acting under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, should investigate the conditions at the insane asylum.

FIND THINGS IN GOOD SHAPE.

"The board makes monthly visits to the asylum and always finds things in tiptop shape. The members go there at a certain hour, and, I am told, that just before they arrive there is a great amount of scrubbing and house cleaning. They look through the buildings, enjoy a luncheon in the superintendent's office, and—how should they know anything about the hazing of defenseless imbeciles by the attendants? This cruelty is not done publicly.

"I have the greatest respect for Doctor White, and believe he is capable, but I don't think he knows anything about raising pigs and running farms. I think he has much knowledge as to the treatment of insane patients, and am sure that if more of it were used there would be greater benefits. His report shows that a great deal of building improvement has been done, but it does not show what new methods have been adopted for the treatment of the insane. Doctor White says the so-called 'bull pen' is a breathing spot for patients. There are several hundred acres of ground at the institution, and the patients should be given larger breathing space than an acre and a half, where from 300 to 500 are crowded together."

MOST EXPENSIVE INSTITUTION.

To the committee's report, which is being printed and will be transmitted to the board of visitors, the Secretary of the Interior, and others interested, has been appended a statement showing that St. Elizabeth's Insane Asylum is the most expensive of eighty-odd large institutions in the United States, and that the methods of treating the patients are harsher. The institution on Blackwells Island, New York, where there are a thousand more patients, is conducted on more economical plans, says Doctor Emmons.

Reports of superintendents of other insane asylums, says Mr. Evans, show that they have many new and effective methods of treating patents. "Patients are kept apart as much as possible," he said, "because insanity has a tendency to spread. The indigent and feeble-minded are not kept with the criminal insane. Female attendants have been employed to care for the most violent patients. A cross word or an unkind look, it has been shown, serves to undo much that has been accomplished with a person who is insane.

SELDOM SEEN BY PATIENTS.

"Doctor White, of course, does not know of the hazing of his patients, because the victims are afraid to tell him, and the cruel attendants certainly are not going to do so. I am told he is rarely seen by the patients, as he goes through the wards so seldom that many do not know him when they see him. His predecessor could be looked for any hour in the day or night, coming from some side door, stairway, basement, or any unexpected place, and he generally knew what was going on.

"Attendants of insane patients have a great deal to contend with, I know, and as they are only mortal, they are sometimes to be excused for giving vent to their torment; but poor, irresponsible insane persons should not be compelled to suffer. Only the rules prohibiting cruelty to patients stand between the attendants and the patients, and I am told there have been many vile assaults, which, of course, will never come to light. Conditions should be changed so as to remedy this untoward situation."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman who is entitled to the floor if he will not yield to me to move that the committee rise for the purpose of considering the resolution that came from the Senate a few moments ago for the relief of the people of San Francisco and the Pacific coast?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. With pleasure.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had under consideration the bill H. R. 18198—the District of Columbia appropriation bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

THE SAN FRANCISCO DISASTER.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution that came a few moments ago from the Senate in relation to the relief of the sufferers of California, and move, first, to strike out the preamble to the resolution, and then will offer the following as a substitute for the entire resolution of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] asks unanimous consent at this time to take up the Senate joint resolution indicated for the purpose of considering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will omit the reading of the Senate resolution and report the amendment by way of a substitute.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. I do not know what amount the Senate amendment provides. I suggest that at least it be read or that somebody state its provisions.

Mr. TAWNEY. I can state in a moment what the Senate resolution provides. The Senate resolution recites the terrible catastrophe——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I understand that; but what is the provision of the resolution?

Mr. TAWNEY. The resolution authorizes the Secretary of War to expend $500,000, or appropriates $500,000, to be expended by the Secretary of War in rendering aid and assistance to the people on the Pacific coast who have been afflicted by this terrible calamity.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, how much is provided for in the resolution you propose?

Mr. TAWNEY. The resolution of the Senate, in the first place, is not as broad as the resolution which we passed here last evening.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does it contain any more money?

Mr. TAWNEY. It contains less money, in fact. We placed all resources of the Government under the control of three Secretaries on the Pacific coast, and made them available for this relief. Now we propose to increase the appropriation carried by the Senate resolution—five hundred thousand—to a million dollars, to be expended by the Secretary of War, in his discretion. The substitute resolution which I offer also requires the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to cooperate with the Secretary of War in rendering assistance to the people of that locality who have been damaged by reason of this earthquake and fire.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why I made the inquiry was just simply to find out how much money we are giving.

Mr. TAWNEY. We appropriate by this substitute resolution for the immediate relief of the people of San Francisco and neighboring cities a million dollars to be expended by the Secretary of War, under his direction and in his discretion, and in addition to that it requires the cooperation of three other distinct branches of the Government in rendering assistance to these people. The Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries was in the committee room a few moments ago, and informed me that if authority were given the *Albatross*, a large vessel, which is now within 7 miles of San Francisco, can be utilized immediately, and so can some of the vessels of the Navy and vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service. Under the Senate resolution none of these would be available. It is for the purpose of enlarging the scope of the relief by giving authority to a greater number of the Departments of the Government to act with the Secretary of War and to increase the appropriation that we propose this substitute for the Senate resolution.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, in the presence of this tragic calamity this is a time for speedy action and not speeches. We ought to pass the resolution for succor and relief right away. If anything is going to be done for the aid of these unfortunate people it ought to be done now, and quickly done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the Senate resolution, and reading the proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to issue rations and quartermaster's supplies for the relief of destitute persons in the region devastated by earthquake and fire in the State of California, and making appropriation to relieve the sufferers by said disaster.

Amend by striking out the preamble and striking out all after the resolving clause and inserting the following:

"That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to procure, in open market or otherwise, subsistence and quartermaster's supplies, in addition to such supplies belonging to the military establishment and available, and issue the same to such destitute persons who have been rendered homeless or are in needy circumstances as a result of the earthquake which occurred April 18, and the pending conflagration, and in executing this joint resolution the Secretary of War is directed to cooperate with the authorities of the State of California and the mayors of the cities of San Francisco, Berkeley, Oakland, Alameda, and such other cities on the Pacific coast as may have sustained damage.

"*Be it further resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce and Labor are hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary of War in extending relief and assistance to these stricken people herein referred to, to the extent of the use of the naval vessels, revenue cutters, and other vessels, and Government supplies under their control on the Pacific coast.

"*Be it further resolved*, That to enable the Secretary of War to execute the provisions of this joint resolution there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $1,000,000, to be expended under the direction and under the discretion of the Secretary of War."

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

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

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to a third reading.

The amendment striking out the preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TAWNEY. I move to amend the title by striking out the title of the Senate joint resolution and inserting the following:

Joint resolution for the relief of sufferers from earthquake and conflagration on the Pacific coast.

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TAWNEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. TAWNEY, the House again resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am very much obliged. Now, Mr. Chairman, after these articles appeared in these three newspapers, which I consider to be responsible, I introduced in this House a resolution on February 21, one and two days after these articles appeared, asking for the appointment of a congressional committee to investigate these charges. That resolution went to the Committee on Rules where it has quietly slept ever since. Now, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that when charges of this nature against the management of a public institution are made, it is not only the privilege, but the solemn sworn duty of Congress to investigate. Here we are appropriating thousands of dollars, aye, sir, up into the millions, to care for this institution, and appropriating the money properly; because if there is any class of our fellow-citizens upon the earth deserving our very best care, deserving of our every consideration, deserving of our most tender solicitude, it is this class who, unfortunately, have lost their reason.

In this asylum are three classes of people, the indigent insane of the District of Columbia, the insane soldiers and sailors of the United States, and the insane criminals from all over this country who raise and establish the plea of insanity in a Federal court. But, Mr. Chairman, although that resolution was introduced two months ago, it has quietly slept; and the Committee on Rules, the oligarchy of the American House of Representatives, has allowed it to sleep and has never taken one step to let the American people know whether these charges, involving the sacred honor of the American people, are true or not. They have allowed it to sleep there in the face of the fact that the charges have been made all over this country, and in the face of the further fact that they have been furnished with copies of ten sworn affidavits testifying to the truth of the charges. The committee was furnished with these ten copies of affidavits and advised that the originals would be forthcoming at any time when the committee might desire to have them.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the newspapers of the city of Washington have been filled for several days past with accounts of mismanagement and brutality at the St. Elizabeth Government Hospital for the Insane, located in the city of Washington; and

Whereas the Medico-Legal Society of the city of Washington has, through a duly appointed committee, published to the world a story of outrageous mismanagement of the affairs of said institution, and has also detailed to the public a story of brutalities perpetrated in said institution upon the helpless inmates; and

Whereas the American people are entitled to know the truth with regard to these charges: Therefore, be it

Resolved, First. That the Speaker of this House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint from the membership of this body a committee of five with full power, and whose duty it shall be to make a full and complete examination of all the facts relating to the said charges, and report their findings and conclusions to this House.

Second. That the said special committee is fully empowered to send for persons and papers, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, to administer oaths, to take testimony and reduce the same to writing, and to employ such clerical and stenographical help as may be necessary.

Mr. Richard P. Evans, a member of the Washington bar, of good standing in his profession, and the attorney for the Medico-Legal Society, on the 12th day of the present month addressed a communication to the Committee on Rules, inclosing ten affidavits, each detailing acts of extreme cruelty and gross mismanagement at this institution. The communication of Mr. Evans and the affidavits, together with one or two more, I herewith submit:

1403 NEW YORK AVENUE NW.,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1906.

Honorable CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES,
House of Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: In support of resolution No. 277, calling for an investigation by a committee of the House into the management of the Government Hospital for the Insane, introduced by Mr. CLARK of Florida February 21, 1906, and referred to your committee, I have the honor to file herewith copies of certain affidavits—ten in number—together with other papers and a copy of the report of the Medico-Legal Society of this city, the publication of which occasioned the introduction of said resolution.

I have other similar affidavits and statements now in my possession, and further corroborative testimony to same state of facts will be available at the proper time.

The allegations of abusive and brutal methods and of neglect and mismanagement contained in said affidavits are such as to demand an immediate, thorough, and impartial investigation in the interests of humanity, economy, and public confidence.

It is true that a bill (H. R. 15643) was introduced by a member of your committee, Mr. GROSVENOR, proposing to confer judicial powers upon the board of visitors of the Government Hospital for the Insane for the apparent purpose of this investigation, and that said bill was enacted by the House, with numerous amendments, on March 12, 1906, but that act now rests in a Senate committee, where the said board of visitors are endeavoring to have said amendments stricken out.

But the ladies and gentlemen composing said board of visitors hold offices of honor and confidence, with duties of efficient supervision of the affairs and management of said hospital, and the superintendent of the hospital is secretary of said board, and they are each individually responsible for all abuses of any duration, existence of faulty methods, and lack of efficient and economical administration of the hospital.

Consequently the secretary and each member of the board of visitors have a personal interest in the outcome of any inquiry into alleged abuses permitted or mismanagement occurring under their administration and supervision, and their verdict would necessarily reflect credit or discredit upon their own official acts.

As a matter of fact, no legislation was needed to empower the board of visitors of St. Elizabeth to investigate the affairs of that institution. Every book, paper, and record there has been subject to its inspection, and every official and employee at its beck and call; each individual patient and inmate could have been privately examined at any time by any member of the board; every meal could have been partaken of, every ward inspected without notice any hour of the day or night; every contract and expenditure inquired into. If sworn statements were desired, the board of visitors could have had special examiners of the Interior Department assigned to take testimony of employees and inmates, under oath. What the members of said board of visitors failed to do previous to the publication of the Medico-Legal Society report, they could have been doing every minute of the time since; but their efforts have apparently been misdirected to attempted investigation of the Medico-Legal Society; and I am informed that special examiners of the Interior Department have been secretly engaged in the endeavor to secure from former clients, in different States, some statements upon which to attempt to secure my disbarment from practice.

The superintendent, I am informed, has gathered up the straitjackets, etc., and deposited them in a room on "center," and has since said publication investigated the laundry upon charges filed some time prior thereto, and considerable improvement in conditions and attention is reported; but, so far as known, the board of visitors have remained quiescent.

At all events, the confidence of the public would be more pronounced in an investigation conducted by a committee of the House of Representatives, as provided in said resolution; such an investigation would be more thorough and productive of more beneficial and permanent results to the soldiers and sailors, and other inmates of St. Elizabeth (present and future), and of the citizens of this District than could be expected from an inquiry conducted by the board of visitors, hampered by personal feelings and prejudices and former friend by intimacy and confidential relations with officials of the hospital whose interests would be involved.

A careful consideration of the inclosures will disclose other important matters for inquiry and amendment, in addition to the main one of methods of discipline and restraint complained of. The present procedure of commitment of inmates of the National Soldiers' Homes, and disposition of their pension and other funds, and the antiquated and inadequate methods of finance and supervision—not materially changed since institution of the hospital in 1855, when growth to present proportions and responsibilities was not anticipated—seem to require remedial legislation.

Soliciting appropriate action by your committee, I am, with great respect,

Your obedient servant, RICHARD P. EVANS,
Attorney at Law.

This affidavit was not filed with the Committee on Rules:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Before me, a notary public, in and for the District of Columbia, personally appeared Joseph A. Kinsey, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, who, being first duly sworn according to law, on oath states:

That he is the same Joseph A. Kinsey who was an inmate of the Government Hospital for the Insane from about the 18th day of March, 1904, until on or about the 30th day of September, 1904; that he went there of his own free will for medical treatment, but what "treatment" he himself received, and he saw others receive, was such that he would in preference jump into the Potomac River rather than undergo such another experience. Chokings, blows, kicks, tying in bed, and threats, poor food and worse tobacco, inattention, and abuse was the daily experience of affiant and other patients on Gray Ash Ward. While on Oak Ward, then a hospital ward, he received kind treatment from the nurses, Miss McLaughlin and Miss Perry. They were good and sympathetic, and affiant and all other patients under their care and attention appreciated it very gratefully.

Affiant was choked by strangle hold around neck by Attendants Moffit, Tennyson, and Thrift; he was attacked by a patient while attendants were elsewhere, and had several ribs fractured on both sides; previous to that Tennyson kicked him in the ribs; affiant has

seen said Tennyson, who is a big man, weighing over 200 pounds, jump on a patient's stomach with his knees; saw a patient on Oak Ward punched in stomach and wrung out (strangled) by an attendant; affiant was seldom without one or two black eyes, and they were not uncommon among other patients; on account of his appearance affiant's wife was frequently denied seeing him when she would call. A patient named Dodge was treated very badly; he afterwards died in the hospital, but from what cause affiant does not know; affiant has been told that said Dodge had a beautiful pair of black eyes when his wife received the body from St. Elizabeth.

Affiant noticed that patients who toadied to the attendants, did their work for them, and gave them no trouble, got along very nicely; but others, who required attention of the attendants, and were a little troublesome, were treated brutally; for instance, if a demented patient would want to walk he would be frequently grabbed, choked, and slammed in a chair, or thrown in a room; or a patient might wander from his particular ward hall into the reception hall, and he would be rushed by the attendants back into his hall with great violence, sometimes being thrown headlong on the floor; it was no place for the insane who needed attention, for they were treated like dogs by the attendants, who, for the most part, were lazy, heartless, and worthless. Patients were afraid to make complaints, for their goose would be cooked by the attendants if they did. Affiant was several times tied in bed without any reason; was willing to lie there; on one occasion he nearly strangled himself endeavoring to get loose. It is not a pleasant sensation to be tied down and left there, and feel your limbs getting numb, and no one pay any attention to you; that was affiant's and other patients' experience. There was no need for the rough and brutal treatment affiant experienced and frequently saw; kindness and patience upon part of the attendants would have left no occasion for it whatever; but no sane man would put up with such abuse without resenting it, and what could be expected of a man a little or a good deal off his head? They would be irritated into resistence, and then struck, choked, kicked, and otherwise punished. Doctor White never came through except on Sunday mornings, and then he would have other doctors with him and just go through formally.

Affiant has been working at his trade as a tailor ever since he left St. Elizabeth, and is so working now. That his residence is 468 K street SW.

JOSEPH A. KINSEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of March, 1906.

[SEAL.] BEN C. MCQUAY,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

STATE OF OHIO,
County of Montgomery:

Personally appeared before me, in the county and State aforesaid, James L. Shaffer, aged 61 years, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, who, being first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says: That he is the identical James L. Shaffer who was committed to the Government Hospital for the Insane upon an order signed by M. T. McMahon, president of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, dated December 31, 1904, and held in said hospital for the insane until August 1, 1905, when he was discharged therefrom upon order of court in a habeas corpus proceeding; that during his confinement in said hospital he was not insane, but of good understanding, and that he fully comprehended all the circumstances and events coming under his observation during said period; that while in what is called "Atkins Hall"—or what the old soldiers there call the "bull pen"—he witnessed many acts of harsh and brutal treatment of the patients by the attendants; that he saw attendants choke patients into almost insensibility, grab them and throw them down on the hard floor, and kick and strike them; that he saw an attendant named Skinner assault an ex-soldier patient named Mike McKaskey at the dining table because he took a spoonful or so too many beans; this patient was not bright, but an inoffensive man; the attendant came up behind him and slapped him right and left on the cheeks, struck him in the side with his fists, and then grabbed him by the throat and pulled him over backwards, and dragged him out of the dining room into a side room, where, affiant was informed and believes, he beat him shamefully. There was an old man known as "Old Isaac" in Garfield basement; the attendants used to nag and make fun of him until they would get him in a rage, then abuse and misuse him; affiant saw an attendant named Groves standing over "Old Isaac" in a water-closet, kicking and stamping him, the old man screaming meanwhile.

These assaults were common, everyday occurrences, happening almost anywhere; they are against the rules and the doctors are supposed not to know of them, but they must certainly know and simply ignore and wink at them.

The surroundings were harsh and unpleasant, especially to anyone of a sensitive and decent nature; cursing and swearing by the attendants at the patients was common practice; food was of poor quality and poorly cooked. There was no "medical treatment" that he saw except physic or something of that kind was given when asked for by the patient. Eight or ten men were frequently compelled to bathe in one tub of water, which was obnoxious to affiant. There was nothing for affiant to do but sit around in the shade, watch the doctors and others play ball, etc.; nothing to employ the time in a beneficial way. So far as affiant saw, the superintendent, Doctor White, gave very little, if any, attention to the patients.

JAMES L. SHAFFER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March, 1906, and corrections made by me.

[SEAL.] W. H. HOSKOT,
Deputy Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas,
Montgomery County, Ohio.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for said District, personally appeared Spencer Herbert, of said District, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, who, being first duly sworn according to law, on oath states that for the two years next preceding about the 25th day of September, 1905, he was employed as a laundryman in the laundry building at St. Elizabeth; that he laundered a good many strait-jackets, which were made of heavy canvas such as he has seen boat sails made of, with heavy brass eyelets up the back to lace up like a woman's corset; that in August or September, 1905, he remembers distinctly that an attendant from Allison Building called for five or six strait-jackets, which he took with him; that affiant understood at the time that most of the consumptives were put in the Allison Building. During the summer of 1905 affiant saw patients in Howard Hall with strait-jackets on and also strapped in beds, and he also saw them with strait-jackets on in the Home Building No. 1. He saw two patients with strait-jackets there at one time; that affiant knows of one case of a negro, then in East Lodge, whenever he was taken out in the grounds for exercise had his hands fastened with leather handcuffs; that affiant saw an attendant in annex 1 (a hospital ward) hit a negro patient in the head with his keys, and it caused a lump about the size of an egg to rise upon his head; that when the doctor came through thirty minutes afterwards he saw the lump and inquired the cause of it, and the attendant told him that the patient was struck with a mopstick by another patient; affiant has seen attendants on a number of occasions wring patients out with towels in Dawes 2, in White Ash, and P Building; that in P Building he saw two attendants "wring" out a negro with a towel some time about the month of July, 1905, for about a half hour, from 7.30 to 8 o'clock p. m.; they would twist the towel about his neck until he would become unconscious, then wait until he would begin to recover consciousness, and then would wring him out again until his tongue would hang out; he was afterwards put in the strong room, this was to subdue him; affiant has seen patients in the laundry repeatedly struck by employees because they would not work fast enough; there was one patient named Bede who almost every day affiant saw kicked and struck alternately by employees; that on one occasion he saw an employee named Sidney run around with Bede on his shoulder and then drop him on the hard concrete floor; he remembers a patient named John Sheedy as being very much overworked and frequently struck by employees—it was really a sin the way these men were overworked and imposed upon; that a large part of the time the patients there were soaking wet from water and perspiration; that he has seen a female attendant beat a negro woman with her fists, this was during the summer of 1905; that affiant frequently heard the foreman of the laundry use profane language at the patients and others, and has frequently seen the said foreman, Manche, drunk while in the hospital grounds; that there were about seventeen male patients employed in the laundry most of the time while he was there and they worked harder than the regular employees, who, for the most part, acted as overseers and let the patients do most of the work. There were about twenty-five female patients in the laundry, about six male employees, and some forty girls. There were two girls kept to do the doctors' laundry, and one girl and a patient to do the special work for the bosses and officials; the servants of the doctors got their clothes laundered there.

The food was very poor and badly cooked; eggs were served about once a week, but were for the most part bad; the patients and employees in the laundry ate at the same table and had the same food and affiant has frequently left the table because of the odor of the bad eggs when broken.

That the machinery in the laundry was more than sufficient for the work before the purchase of new machinery last summer, which had not been used when affiant left, which he did because of the bad food and poor pay he was receiving.

That his residence is 916 Third street SE., in this city.

SPENCER HERBERT.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 31st day of March, A. D. 1906.

[SEAL.] JOHN H. KING, *Notary Public.*

A true copy.

R. P. EVANS, *Attorney.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for said District, Patrick O'Connor, aged 38 years, a resident of said District now and for twenty years last past, who, being duly sworn according to law, on oath says: That he has been employed in the Government Hospital for the Insane (St. Elizabeth) for about thirteen years—about five years as a fireman in the boiler house, about one year in the general kitchen, and about seven years on the wards as an attendant; that he has also been employed as a daily hand for some eight months prior to about the 1st day of January, 1906; that he was an attendant in Howard Hall for about five years, and witnessed many acts of brutality of the attendants to the patients; that he saw patients choked and struck and kicked by the attendants, ribs broken, heads cut open, eyes blackened, and the patients otherwise bruised and injured by being violently thrown down on the floor and jumped on with the attendants' knees. Wet towels were thrown about their necks and twisted until they would fall unconscious. These things were of daily occurrence. Shaving and bath days were the worst, the patients objecting being brutally choked and punished. Sometimes as many as six patients would be bathed in the same tub of water. That false reports would be made of these injuries by the head attendants, ascribing them to accident or attacks of other patients. He has seen patients so hurt by the attendants dragged down in the cellar and kept there until after the doctor had passed through. Patients were strapped, tied down, put in bed saddles, etc., at the whim of the attendants frequently, not to be troubled with them or to "get even with them" for complaining, or something of that sort. Of course, they would report that the patient was violent or dangerous.

There was some bad cases among the criminals, but in affiant's opinion this violent and brutal treatment was unnecessary, and, in fact, did great harm to the patients' mental condition in many instances.

There was no separation of the different classes of the insane—the mild cases mixed with the violent. The courtyard in center of Howard Hall was only airing place they had, and it was awful there in hot weather. A number of the criminal insane were worked outside among the other insane patients. Old soldiers were taken from other buildings to Howard Hall for punishment for infraction of rules or displeasing the doctors.

When the board of visitors would go through patients who wanted to speak to them and complain of their treatment were kept back by the guards. This was under Doctor Richardson's administration, but the board of visitors were practically the same as now. In West Lodge and West Lodge 2 the treatment of the patients was practically the same. Wringing out with wet towels was common. In White Ash ward he recollects twelve patients "strapped" at one time in straw beds, all in a line. Strait-jackets were frequently in use. In affiant's opinion this was largely for the convenience of the attendants, to save them trouble of watching and attending to them. On board visiting days the patients that were bruised or ragged and unclean looking were hustled out of sight; down to the woods, or anywhere out of sight. The best looking among the patients were kept on exhibition for the board of visitors.

While acting as fireman he saw the patients worked very hard hauling coal and ashes. In affiant's opinion they were overworked.

In affiant's opinion, if there were more attendants and they had less hours of work, much of the rough treatment of the patients would be done away with.

That his observation and information makes him believe conditions are no better now under Doctor White than formerly, unless very recently improved.

That in last December, a little before Christmas, he saw an attendant or keeper go to a patient who was singing, or rather "crooning," tell him to shut up, and then put his arm around his neck and cut his wind off and dropped him on the ground, where he lay some time before he got up. That during his last service there affiant filed a written complaint with Doctor White about a foreman, Adams Foremour, who sent affiant to his own house to do work there—putting down carpet, move furniture—while he was on duty for the hospital and being so paid; and also for sending affiant four or five times out of the hospital grounds, during his working hours, for whisky, which he drank in the grounds; said foreman also sent Dan Connors and Ed Brooks out of the grounds after whisky; that affiant took the letter to Doctor White, and also explained the matter fully to him after he read the letter, but nothing was ever done with the foreman. That affiant informed Special Officer Clark that Government shoes and clothing were being sold by said foreman's brother to the workmen, and several discharges were made in consequence, but the said shoes and clothing were not taken back, and no one was prosecuted.

Affiant further states that on one occasion he washed the blood stains out of a wrapper or gown on the body of a colored woman after it had been dissected at the rest, and the body was still warm; he washed off the blood and put the body on a slab and placed the body in a cooling compartment. Doctor Blackburn was then in charge.

PATRICK O'CONNOR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of March, 1906.

[SEAL.] JOHN H. KING,
Notary Public.

A true copy.

R. P. EVANS, *Attorney.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Personally appeared before me Thornton O. Pyles, residing in Washington, D. C., who, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that for about two years and a half next preceding May 30, 1904, he was employed as an attendant and nurse at the Government Hospital for the Insane (St. Elizabeth), being about one year under the present superintendent, Dr. William A. White; that he was previously a graduate of the Nurses' Training School at Norristown, Pa., and has a diploma; that he served as a nurse nearly four years in the Norristown State Insane Asylum, of Norristown, Pa.; that on account of his actively advocating better treatment and food and clothing for the inmates he was discharged about 30th day of May, 1904, his resignation having been requested twenty days previously for having taken active interest in bettering conditions among patients and employees and writing articles for newspapers; that he has in his possession a petition or protest, which was signed by a number of the attendants and employees under Doctor White, setting forth serious grounds of complaint, which he will produce when called upon; that while acting as head attendant under Doctor White on "Garfield first" there was a scarcity of help, which he complained of, as accidents happened for that reason, and the help was poor and inexperienced in many cases; that his ward adjoined "Gray Ash," and that joined "Oak ward;" that in both of these wards he saw in frequent use the "bed saddle," straight jackets, and handcuffs, with heavy straps attached, and the feeding tube used in a rough manner, frequently without vaseline on it—merely dipped in pan of water; that he has seen towels thrown around patients' necks and twisted until their wind was cut off; that these appliances were used because of scarcity and inefficiency of help. The "bed saddle" referred to was an arrangement by which patient is laid on his back, his feet strapped to foot of the bed, his hands to sides of the bed, body fastened immovable, and the only motion possible being a movement of the head. That the food furnished was not as good in variety or preparation as he has seen and eaten in two almshouses, in one of which he has been employed and the other he frequently visited; and food was much better at Dixmont State Hospital, Pennsylvania. Many times there was a very insufficient amount of food sent to the patients in his ward, and he had frequently made complaint and procured more food, but other attendants preferred to let their patients go hungry than go to any trouble about it. That he has seen a great deal of teasing the patients and of rough usage and abuse on part of the young class of attendants. That there were a good many patients in Howard Hall who were not criminals. That the superintendent, Doctor White, would seldom visit these wards, and when he did do so would pass through hurriedly and would not stop to talk with or pay any attention to the patients.

That during the entire period of his service he only recollects the board of visitors going through the above-named wards two or three times. On "board days" notice would come around to clean up, and everything would be put in shipshape for the visitors.

That it was a common occurrence to hustle patients from Garfield first and second, White Ash, Dawes first, and Dawes second, who were poorly clad and not very presentable, out of the wards to the secluded part of the woods out of sight of the board of visitors; that there were a good many ex-soldiers among them. On board days the food was much better than at other times, but on the average it was very poor and poorly cooked. That at time of his discharge he was active in a union of the hospital attendants, which had occasioned an investigation by the board of visitors, and which resulted in a whitewash and affiant's discharge; that affiant was not called upon to testify, and was gotten rid of; and he is informed that the finest piece of corned beef procurable in market was exhibited before the board of visitors as a sample of that furnished the patients, and they accepted the same without further inquiry; that affiant made frequent complaints to Doctor White about the food and treatment of the patients; that the diet of different wards varies about as much as that of the Raleigh Hotel and a 3-cent lunch room.

THORNTON O. PYLES.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of March, 1906.

[SEAL.] JOHN H. KING,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, Mrs. Margaret Lochte, aged 37 years, who, being first duly sworn according to law, upon her oath states: That she was committed to the Government Hospital for the Insane (St. Elizabeth) in June, 1905; that she was never in court, but was adjudged insane in her absence; that she was discharged from said hospital on March 13, 1906, instant, upon sworn certificate of the superintendent, Dr. William A. White, that she was of sound mind.

Affiant further states that she saw frequent acts of ill-usage of patients by attendants while in said hospital; that she saw an attendant catch a Miss Ferber by the hair and drag her into a room; that she has seen a patient struck in the face and her eye blackened; that Miss Ferber was taken roughly from the table before she had finished her meal and locked up in a side room for no apparent good reason; that affiant has been "toweled" twice with wet towels thrown over her head and face and twisted or "wrung out" under her chin; that affiant was struck in the face with a stick by an attendant, whom she can identify, and one of her eyes injured so that Doctor Hough noticed it afterwards, and asked her the cause of it, and she told him, and the doctor told the attendant not to do so again, and had some private words with her that affiant did not overhear. That affiant is a Catholic, and a number of times asked for a priest, but no priest came, and she was told that the priest only visited the hospital once a year; that she was thus deprived of such consolation.

That affiant was unnecessarily fed with a feeding tube thrust down her throat when she was willing and able to eat; the nurse or attendant had told the doctor that affiant would not eat, and he ordered the feeding tube, and it was used on her, although she protested, and told the doctor that she was willing to eat, and asked him to try her. The food was coarse; she was compelled to wear woolen stockings and felt slippers in August; letters she wrote were not mailed, and she was annoyed and worried in other ways; that Doctor White never spoke to her, but when she left the hospital Doctor Clark asked her if she could forget everything that happened there. Affiant left hospital on parole about September 17, 1905; was finally discharged as above stated.

Mrs. MARGARET LOCHTE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of March, 1906; and I certify that the affiant, Mrs. Margaret Lochte, is well known to me as reputable and entitled to credit.

[SEAL.] P. VIERBUCHEN,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, Nannie H. Griffin, who, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is 30 years of age and resides in the District of Columbia; that her mother, Mrs. Cecelia J. Griffin, has been an inmate of St. Elizabeth since April 14, 1904; that affiant and her sister, Jennie H. Griffin, have made daily visits to their mother ever since her admission there; that they both saw her mother the day after her admission in Elm ward, center building, in a separate room; she had only her night dress on, and bare feet, with window open and cold air blowing in; that she had not been accustomed to such exposure; she was then walking about the room; for three weeks after that the doctor refused to let them see their mother, stating "it would be detrimental to her for them to see her;" that finally they absolutely insisted upon seeing her, and found her with three ribs broken, her throat and nose bruised and blackened, one side of her face badly swollen, and she had what they call a "rest sheet" on her; this "rest sheet" is made of heavy canvas, solid in front with heavy brass eyelet holes at the back, the eyelets being heavier than an ordinary finger ring; it is laced up the back like a corset with heavy cord and confines the arms; this was placed on next to the naked flesh, and she still has the marks of this "rest sheet" across her back; it extended to her knees and they were skinned and bruised from rubbing against it; this was early in May, 1904; her mother was then 65 years of age. Affiant could obtain no information as to how her mother's injuries were received. Doctor Clark stated the ribs were broken before she came there, but this was not true, and affiant has certificates of two physicians to disprove it.

That her mother cried and begged affiant and her sister to have the "rest sheet" removed, which they insisted upon having done, and they found the flesh all bruised and discolored from the eyelet rings and lacing. That they have never put that "rest sheet" on her mother since, but affiant has frequently seen it upon other patients. (That it seems impossible for a patient to release herself from the "rest sheet," but it is stated that a Mrs. Powers did so in a room when she was locked in and left to herself, and that she took out the lacing and hanged herself with it in January, 1905.) When the "rest sheet" was taken off affiant found her mother's ribs bandaged and plastered, and then, for first time, knew that her ribs were broken. Since then, on the 17th of January, 1906, her mother had her right hip fractured by falling on the polished slippery floor in the dormitory (tower No. 1), as affiant is informed, and is now suffering with the same. That there are about twenty-six patients in that ward, nearly all of them bed patients, and there is usually one nurse or attendant who has also at night to go upstairs to about fifteen or twenty patients there; of course she can not be in both places at once. Since her mother's leg was fractured there has been an additional nurse in care of her, and when that nurse leaves for supper, or other reason, it takes the regular ward nurse from the other patients. That patients are frequently tied in bed with "restraining sheets" twisted and fastened across the body so as to hold them in bed. All of this is due, in affiant's opinion, to lack of sufficient nurses and attendants. Many of these patients should be dressed and placed in chairs or permitted to walk about, but this would require the care of more nurses and attendants. These nurses or attendants have some fourteen hours or more service, and it is a hard task for them to give what attention they do.

About a month ago I found one of the patients had wriggled partly out of the restraining sheet and was hanging by the neck from the bed, strangling; her name was Doctor ———, a female physician; affiant screamed for help and the nurse heard her (in the dining room) and came to her assistance, and they released the patient and saved her from strangling. Affiant and her sister remain quite late at night, and are well acquainted with conditions; the food is very poor, heat badly regulated, and patients very poorly attended to, all due, in affiant's opinion, to poor management.

NANNIE H. GRIFFIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of March, 1906.

[SEAL.] EDWARD F. RIGGS,
Notary Public.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, Mervin A. Daddysman, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, who being first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says:

That he was admitted to St. Elizabeth in February, 1905, and was

released in July, 1905; that he was first placed in sick ward and remained there about two weeks, and received fair treatment from the female nurses there; that he was removed from there to "Sycamore," where, about a week after his transfer, he was seized by the throat by an attendant and choked, causing him to bite his tongue badly; that the attendant (whose name was George Wedon, affiant believes) told affiant to move his chair in which he was sitting, and as affiant started to do so—but not quickly enough to suit the attendant—the said attendant sprang upon him and choked him, cursing him at the same time. He then endeavored to take French leave, but was overtaken and brought back to the hospital, and placed in Gray Ash ward; here he saw daily abuse of patients; a favorite method of punishment was to put towels around patients' necks and twist them—"wring them out," it was called; this was a daily occurrence; an attendant named Fred and another whose name affiant does not know, were specially active in this toweling. A head attendant named Hogan was very abusive to the patients; said Hogan, on one occasion, told affiant to carry a large bundle of laundry to the laundry building; affiant was reading a paper and did not know he was addressing affiant, and said Hogan and said attendant Fred struck affiant in the jaw, beat him, kicked him in back and ribs and over kidneys, injured affiant's hand, and blacked his eyes. After being thoroughly beaten, affiant was compelled to take the laundry down to the building, and afterwards affiant was confined to bed for three days (without any medical attendance whatever) in consequence of said beating. Affiant's mother saw his swollen hand and blacked eyes, but affiant did not tell her the cause of it until after his release from the hospital, being afraid to do so. Affiant further states that he has seen other patients beaten in the same way he was and with as little reason; that he has seen them dragged from the table by the throat because they tried to get more food; frequently he did not get enough to eat, and what there was to eat was poor and badly cooked for the most part; that Hogan attempted to apologize for his attack upon affiant some time afterwards.

That he has seen several patients bathe in same tub of water; they ordered affiant to bathe in water after others, but affiant refused to do so; the patients generally appeared to be in constant state of apprehension and fear of the attendants.

That affiant had no medical attention, and the doctor rarely spoke to him, and gave little attention to any of them.

That affiant frequently asked to be allowed to work around, but this was refused; that he is now employed at his trade.

MERVIN A. DADDYSMAN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of March, 1906.
[SEAL.] JOHN H. KING,
Notary Public.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

I, S. Dawes Shuster, state that I was taken to St. Elizabeth on about 18th of June, 1904; was declared insane by jury about June 27, 1904; was certified by superintendent as sane and decreed by court as sane and restored to civil rights January 5, 1906; that I was released on parole in November, 1905, I believe, through efforts of sister. Was sent there for neurasthenia; had been taking medicine for nervousness, etc. That I was in a very nervous, prostrated condition when sent to hospital and during my confinement there; I had been used to refined associations and good table and pleasant surroundings. In my sick and nervous condition I was peculiarly affected by rough and coarse manners and treatment. Cursing and rough commands to me and others from morning to night was the rule; all wards appeared to be about the same; not a word of sympathy or kindness from the attendants, but was kindly spoken to and treated by a nurse, Miss Martin, in B. B. building. I tried to treat the attendants in a gentlemanly way, but the attendants would "God damn me" and threaten to strike me, and on one occasion had it not been for a sailor in the ward (who afterwards said he would knock the attendant's head off if he struck me), I am sure I would have been assaulted by one of the attendants; he and his brother—who, I understand, has been discharged for some cause—were brutal, coarse, insulting, and abusive all the time; they kept me in a constant condition of fear and nervous apprehension. On one occasion I was sick and weak and a little slow in getting out of bed and said attendant caught me by the leg and dragged me partly out; I begged him to let me alone, but he said there was nothing the matter with me but "damned laziness" and I had to get out. While on "Oak ward" I saw said attendant's brother seize a patient by the throat and smash him up against the wall; they had told him to sit down, but he would get up and walk up and down, and this assault was to make him mind and keep quiet, I presume; also saw a patient grabbed at table by throat and legs by two attendants and dragged away; I did not see patient do anything out of the way and don't know reason for the assault. On one occasion an attendant in B. B. building heard a patient making exclamations, and he asked me. "What in hell was the matter with that man?" I told him that the patient had some hallucination of some one mistreating him; the attendant said, "Damn him, he'll have to cut that out;" he then entered the patient's room (his name was Ford) and closed the door—all but a crack, through which I heard a strangling, choking noise, as if the patient was being throttled; I told the supervisor, but he laughed me off and told me I ought to complain to the doctor. It was useless and dangerous to make complaints, as open threats were made as to what would be done with patients who complained. The food was unfit even for day laborers and awful for invalids; if it had been properly cooked it perhaps might have been passable.

I seldom saw an egg on table; we had oat meal without milk, except a few drops; frequently no milk at all; chicken was unknown, except occasionally a stew or for special diet, and this was on a hospital ward. The bathing was positively indecent to a man of any decency of habit or feeling.

There should be more attendants and a better class of men, and inspection at irregular times day and night by competent inspectors, in my opinion.

A gold collar button and a small penknife which were taken from me when I entered were not returned, and my requests for them have been "bluffed off."

S. D. SHUSTER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of March, 1906.
[SEAL.] CHARLES S. MUIR,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Before me, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, personally appeared George W. Bastin, of Congress Heights, D. C., who, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been an inmate of the Government Hospital for the Insane (St. Elizabeth) as a patient and employee; that he was first admitted as a patient in September, 1888, and was a patient until about April, 1893, when he was employed as a barber, shaving and hair cutting the patients regularly, and after finishing their work he would shave and cut the hair of the attendants and employees; that he served as such barber until October 5, 1897, when he was discharged as an employee and left the institution. He was receiving $30 per month salary from the hospital for attending its patients, and regular charges from the employees for serving them. He shaved one of the physicians regularly.

That he was readmitted to the institution about December 1, 1903, as a patient, and remained there until about June 9, 1905, when he was discharged as cured; during this last-named period he also shaved himself and employees, but got no pay from the Government. His trouble was caused by constipation and obstruction of the bowels, but he was not insane, and had full powers of observation and knowledge of the hospital hapenings during his entire location there. That he is an honorably discharged soldier—Regular Army service—and a pensioner at $17 per month. That during his last term in said hospital, under the present superintendent, Doctor White, he saw no improvement in methods of treatment or discipline, excepting, perhaps, the introduction of hot baths, which he could get about two weeks after he would ask for the same. The food, if any different, is worse than under Doctor Godding's administration. The preparation and cooking of it is largely done by inexperienced help, and even when in the raw it is passably good, it is made almost uneatable when served.

His observation of the visits of the board of visitors and of the superintendent showed them to be merely formal, and not such inspection as would serve any good purpose. Everything was cleaned up, and the rough-looking, poorly dressed male patients, soldiers, and civilians hustled to the woods out of sight in all kinds of weather; this he has seen frequently done on visiting days. The ladies on the committee would pass their kid-glove fingers over the cups and plates to see that they were clean, but he never knew them to pass through and inspect the food on the tables when the boys were eating, after it was cooked. In affiant's opinion the visits of the board of visitors only occasioned a weekly cleaning up and a little better food on their days of visiting in the wards they visited.

As to treatment and discipline, affiant states that it was in general rough and brutal; cursing and blows were of frequent occurrence under Godding and White. During his last term there, under Doctor White, he has witnessed frequent cases of ill treatment; in particular he mentions the conduct of one Jones, a student and night nurse, known as "Doctor Jones," who, on a number of occasions would get irritated because the patients would make a noise, or otherwise interfere with his reading and studying, and would jump up, curse, and swear at them, throw them down, kick them, and jump with his knees on their stomach, and threaten to kill them if they did not keep quiet. It was a common thing for some of the attendants to crack patients on the neck with their key straps; he has seen towels placed about patients' necks and twisted until they would be almost strangled. The bathing was simply dirty, between half a dozen and a dozen patients being frequently compelled to bath in the same water.

Affiant has seen canvass suits, strait-jackets, and straps used on patients, and while there during his first confinement affiant was subjected to the same restraints. Has seen feeding tubes used through nostril unnecessarily, in his opinion.

In the general dining room, at Atkins Hall and connecting buildings, the food was very poor; meat so tough affiant frequently could not chew it; very seldom any milk for oatmeal or any other purpose; no decent tea or coffee, and weak, greasy soups; very seldom any sugar; no poultry or eggs except on Easter or other holidays. On Thanksgiving, 1904, old Captain Waters, being irritated because roast pork was served instead of the expected roast turkey dinner, called out after Doctor White, "Teddy in the White House eating meat and honey; White in the Ted House stealing turkey money." For this the captain's parole was taken away, and he was put in the bull pen and was there when affiant left. Affiant further states that, in his opinion, if they had more attendants and shorter hours conditions would be very much better.

GEORGE W. BASTIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of March, 1906. Marginal note added before swearing.
[SEAL.] CHAS. S. MUIR,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, Thomas L. McMurray, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, who, being first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says: That I was employed at St. Elizabeth as a laundry hand from September 22, 1901, until January 22, 1906, when I was discharged.

That during the last year of my employment I noted the following cases of abuse:

That a patient by the name of Obedie was kicked and cuffed time and time again by Millard Sidnor and Harry Satterfield; that cursing was common; that the patients in the wash house are overworked; that this was borne out by the action of one of the doctors in taking patient by the name of Hopper out of wash room.

That during the year 1904–5 I was told by J. V. Burroughs that he saw Satterfield have Joe Marlin, a patient, down beating him. E. L. Maenche, the foreman of the laundry, caught Satterfield in the act; said Maenche caught Satterfield beating and choking Alfonso Rollin, a patient. I saw this act myself. Maenche did not discharge or report Satterfield, who is still working there. This same Satterfield also abused, by kicking and striking, Mike Liston and William Crimmins, both patients. This I saw personally. On the 24th day of last January, 1906, J. V. Burroughs against E. L. Maenche preferred charges, setting up that Maenche knew of these abuses and made no report of same among the counts in the charges against the foreman of the laundry, which were, drunk while on duty and in hospital grounds, allowing the abuse of patients, etc. No suspension from duty or anything was done about this matter by Doctor White.

That last year $10,000 was spent in new laundry addition and machinery; that the machines they purchased they have had no use for them, and probably never will have. The food that the patients and employees get is bad, poorly cooked, and badly served; that twice a year, Thanksgiving Day and Christmas, the doctors come to the kitchen to look at the food.

THOS. L. MCMURRAY.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 8th day of March, 1906.
[SEAL.] JOHN H. KING, *Notary Public.*

That affiant has very frequently seen strait-jackets sent to laundry for washing.

T. L. MCMURRAY.

The originals of these affidavits I have here, sworn to by the people who make them, and under the solemn sanctity of their oaths they say that these charges are absolutely true; yet the Committee on Rules declines to report; yet the Committee on Rules takes no steps; yet the Committee on Rules, by their action, say if these things are true we do not propose to permit the House of Representatives to interfere.

Well, Mr. Chairman, after this resolution was introduced the gentleman from Ohio, my distinguished friend General GROSVENOR, introduced a bill. His bill was for an investigation. I want permission, Mr. Chairman, also to put that bill in the RECORD. It provided that the board of visitors of this institution should make an investigation. It armed them with the powers of a court. It gave them not only power to have witnesses subpœnaed, to administer oaths, to examine them, but it gave them the power to punish for contempt; it clothed them with every power possessed by any court of record in this land.

When that bill came up for action on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio for consideration I offered certain amendments to it, all of which were accepted except the last, and to that he raised no objection. These amendments were intended to, and did have the effect of, giving the persons who made charges against the management of this institution a "square deal" in the hearing. The bill of the gentleman from Ohio put them absolutely in the power of the board of visitors; put them absolutely at their mercy; put them where, if a witness or a complainant appeared before them, these men could, if they saw fit, send them to jail for refusing to answer improper questions.

These amendments changed that and made the bill a fair one, as far as any bill could possibly be made fair which provided for any body of men to examine themselves. I hold, Mr. Chairman, that if irregularities exist in that institution, if mismanagement is there, if wrong has invaded its secret precincts and taken up its domicile within its walls, then the board of visitors are responsible for it. Yet here is a bill proposing to give the people who are under charge, the people whose conduct is called in question, the power to investigate and pass upon their own shortcomings or wrongdoing. It gives them the power, further—the extraordinary power—of dealing harshly by process of contempt with those who dare to make the charge. The bill as originally presented reads as follows:

A bill to authorize the board of visitors of the Government Hospital for the Insane to summon and examine witnesses under oath, and making it a misdemeanor for any such witness to refuse to attend or testify or produce books and papers when summoned.

Be it enacted, etc., That the board of visitors of the Government Hospital for the Insane shall, as a part of the supervision now required of them by law, have power to make such public investigations from time to time as shall, in their judgment, be necessary for the ascertainment and correction of abuses and for the general well-being of the patients and the efficient and economical administration of the hospital in all its branches; and to that end the board of visitors are hereby empowered to summon witnesses and examine them under oath, such oath to be administered by the secretary of the board or any member thereof; and any witness who shall knowingly and willfully swear falsely as to any matter involved in any such investigation shall be deemed guilty of perjury, as defined by section 5392 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and on conviction thereof shall be punished as prescribed by said section; and any witness who shall refuse to attend any such investigation in obedience to a summons signed by the secretary of the board of visitors, or any member thereof, or who, being in attendance, shall refuse to testify or to produce any books or papers relating to any matter under investigation shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment for not more than sixty days, or by both; and the fees and allowances of such witnesses shall be the same as are allowed witnesses attending on the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and when certified to by the president or other member of the board shall be paid by the superintendent as part of the general expenses of the hospital and credited as such in his accounts at the Treasury.

SEC. 2. That whenever a witness summoned as aforesaid refuses to attend or testify or produce books or papers it shall be the duty of the board of visitors to certify such refusal to the district attorney for the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the grand jury for their action, and if an indictment be found he shall prosecute the same with expedition.

But after these amendments were adopted, Mr. Chairman, the bill went to the Senate. What took place then? According to a clipping in one of the Washington papers, which I have here, but I will not take the time of the House to read, but ask leave to print in the RECORD, the board of visitors of this institution addressed a letter to the Senate committee to whom the bill had been referred, protesting against the adoption of the House amendments. They insisted upon the passage of the bill as it was originally introduced, arming them with all this extraordinary power. The clipping is from the Washington Star of March 22, 1906, and is as follows:

HOSPITAL FOR INSANE—INVESTIGATION DISCUSSED BY BOARD OF VISITORS.

The proposed investigation of the Government Hospital for the Insane, on charges recently made by the Medico-Legal Society of the District of Columbia, was revived at a meeting of the board of visitors of that institution yesterday afternoon. Surg. Gen. F. M. Gunnell, of the Navy, retired, presided. Attention was called to the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives empowering the board to conduct the investigation and to summon witnesses, etc.

It was the sense of the board that the resolution in its present form was inoperative and would defeat the very object for which it was formulated—a thorough investigation into the affairs of the hospital and the methods employed there. It was explained that the resolution as at first presented in the House would have accomplished the desired object, but that it had been "loaded down with amendments, which would destroy its force and purpose."

One of the amendments is said to practically give the witness under examination the right to decide what questions are competent or irrelevant, and to decline to answer such questions until a decision as to their competency or irrelevancy is passed upon by a justice of the District supreme court. Another provides for the holding of the investigation in this city, and another that the investigating board shall summon from any place all the witnesses that may be called for by either side of the controversy.

The board, at its meeting yesterday, formulated a protest against these amendments, and it has been forwarded to the District Committee of the Senate, by which the resolution for the investigation by the board of visitors is being considered. It is the hope of the members of the board that the "unnecessary and killing" amendments will be eliminated from the resolution by the Senate and the resolution passed in its original shape.

Now, Mr. Chairman, from these interviews, which I shall have published in the RECORD, it will appear that this board of visitors were not proper persons to make an examination for another reason—because they had prejudged the case. In their interviews—in their statements which were published—they deny these charges; they hoot and scout the idea that any such thing could exist.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. SULZER. I am with the gentleman in regard to this insane asylum. My information regarding its mismanagement and conduct by the officials over there and the inhuman and barbarous treatment of the patients, and scandals, is a disgrace to the Government. This institution should be investigated, and investigated by a nonpartisan, impartial committee of this House. I want to ask the gentleman from Florida why it is that the committee refused to report his resolution which has been pending before the committee for a long time?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have just stated, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution had been before the committee for two months, and that ten affidavits, or copies of them, had gone to the committee. Why the Committee on Rules does not report I can not tell the gentleman. I have not the slightest idea on earth. There is no reason why they should not. There does not exist a single scintilla of a reason why the Committee on Rules should not report the resolution. They may have some good reason, and, if so, I would like for one member of that committee to give it to the House and the country.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman seems to have read a good deal from the newspapers; have not the people in charge of the institution made any reply through the newspapers?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; and I will publish them, too. The articles refered to are as follows:

[Washington Post, February 24, 1906.]

ASYLUM PROBE TO-DAY—BOARD OF VISITORS TO BEGIN THOROUGH INVESTIGATION—DEMAND IMMEDIATE INQUIRY—MEMBERS DECLARE THERE IS NO IMPROPRIETY IN PROSECUTING AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CHARGES OF GROSS MISMANAGEMENT BEFORE CONGRESS HAS AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK INTO THE CONDITIONS.

Impropriety on the part of the board of visitors of St. Elizabeth's Hospital in prosecuting an investigation of charges of mismanagement in that institution pending an investigation by the House, as suggested by Richard P. Evans, attorney for the Medico-Legal Society, is not conceded by Dr. F. M. Gunnell, president of the board of visitors.

The fact that the Medico-Legal Society has declared its intention to refrain from presenting any evidence to the board of visitors in support of its charges of gross mismanagement will not serve to postpone the investigation, declares Doctor Gunnell.

"The board of visitors will meet to-morrow at 10 o'clock in the administration building," said Doctor Gunnell, "prepared to hear all complaints against the management of the hospital.

"There is no one so much interested in proving the truth or falsity of the charges made against the hospital by the Medico-Legal Society as the board of visitors.

"The action of the Medico-Legal Society in asking for a Congressional investigation, carrying with it an imputation that the investigation to be made by the board of visitors would result in a whitewashing report, will not deter the board from probing into the charges made by that society or those emanating from any other source.

HITCHCOCK URGES INQUIRY.

"The determination of the board to conduct a searching investigation was communicated to Secretary Hitchcock, who expressed the opinion that it was its duty to make an immediate investigation.

"Even though the charges made by the Medico-Legal Society were such as to be easily controvertible by the board, yet they are so serious that it is deemed imperative a public investigation should be made, to be followed by a report analyzing each specific charge."

A copy of the correspondence passed between the board of visitors

and the Medico-Legal Society since the publication of the sensational charges against the hospital follows:

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1906.

RICHARD P. EVANS,
1403 New York Avenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The president of the board of visitors of the hospital directs me to inform you that there will be a meeting of the board held in the administration building at 10 a. m. Saturday, the 24th instant.

You are requested to be present at that time to give evidence touching certain statements which have recently appeared in the public press over your signature.

Very respectfully, WILLIAM A. WHITE, *Secretary.*

MR. EVANS'S REPLY.

The reply to this letter was as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1906.*

WILLIAM A. WHITE, M. D.,
Secretary Board of Visitors,
Government Hospital for the Insane.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your two letters of the 21st instant, addressed to Dr. Charles M. Emmons and myself, requesting our appearance before your board of visitors at the administration building on Saturday, 24th instant, at 10 a. m., to give evidence relative to subject-matter of our report as a committee of the Medico-Legal Society of the District of Columbia (Incorporated), I have to state, as attorney for the society, that, exclusive of other reasons, we would not be justified in participating in any inquiry by your board pending action upon the resolution now under consideration providing for such investigation by a committee of the House of Representatives. This would be forestalling the action of Congress.

In this connection I beg leave to ask whether the board of visitors has considered the apparent impropriety of conducting this investigation, in the course of which the secretary and other members of the board will be called upon to testify and in the result of which each member has a deep personal interest. Your board in arriving at a decision would necessarily have to pass judgment upon its own testimony and upon its own past official acts. The delicacy of the situation would be pronounced.

Under separate cover I mail you copies of the committee's report, which will be presented to the Secretary of the Interior to-day.

Very respectfully,

RICHARD P. EVANS, *Attorney.*

REFUSES TO MAKE COMMENT.

In discussing the communication of Mr. Evans, questioning the propriety of the board of visitors proceeding with the investigation under existing circumstances, Doctor Gunnell stated that he did not care to comment on the motives actuating the Medico-Legal Society.

"I will say, however," he said, "that any investigation conducted by Congress would undoubtedly be in conjunction with the board of visitors. Information secured by the board will at all times be at the disposal of the House committee deputed to conduct the investigation."

The charges made by the Medico-Legal Society were freely discussed by Doctor Gunnell. Referring to the accusations that patients are maltreated and are subjected to physical violence by the keepers, Doctor Gunnell stated that he could not credit the existence of such a condition.

"To strike a patient," he said, "is considered an unpardonable sin, and has always been followed by the immediate discharge of the offending attendant. Doctor White has gone even further than merely discharging the attendant. He has turned such hospital employees over to the police and prosecuted them on charges of assault and battery.

"In the investigation to be conducted by the board of visitors the hospital employees will be called in one by one and not only questioned as to their personal conduct, but will be required to answer such questions: 'Did you ever see an attendant strike a patient?' If so, 'Did you report it to the proper authorities?' 'To whom did you make the report and when?'

TRUTH WILL BE SOUGHT.

"In its investigation the board will shield no one, and the truth, no matter who is injured thereby, will be sought and embodied in its report."

In the printed copy of the report of the special committee of the Medico-Legal Society on "Care and Treatment of the Insane" an addendum is included presenting in part the following facts regarding the care of the insane in various asylums:

"In the Illinois Asylum for the Incurable Insane narcotics are never administered on the wards by day or by night. All such medicines are beyond the reach of inmate or attendant. Mechanical restraint has been absolutely abolished. There is no cell, cell room, barred or grated window. Methodical care and classification have made restraint unnecessary even in the most violent cases.

"The substitution of female for male attendants on male wards has gone on until 500 of male insane are cared for exclusively by women.

ELIMINATES ALL ABUSE.

"The elimination of all possible abuse alone makes the introduction of female attendants on male wards invaluable.

"From biennial reports of superintendent of the Arizona Asylum for the Insane: 'A kind word, a pleasant smile, an assuirng touch will almost invariably quiet the most excitable patient, convincing him that he has nothing to fear and no harm is intended him.'

"In the report of the Topeka (Kans.) State Hospital it is stated: 'The old methods of force and intimidation have been superseded by kindness, tact, and intelligence.'

"Doctor Drewry, of the Central State Hospital of Virginia, says in his report: 'For eight or ten years past there has not been a single patient in the hospital subjected to the cruelty of any form of physical restraint whatever.'

"The board of managers of the State Hospital of Missouri, No. 2, at St. Joseph, in their last biennial report declare: 'Idleness in hospitals for insane is as prone to evil and bad results as idleness among the sane.'

"Dr. H. B. Meredith, superintendent of the State Hospital for the Insane at Danville, Pa., expressed himself as follows: 'The care of insane criminals should have no part in the treatment of the noncriminal. The vicious by heredity or education, who have likewise become insane, form the worst type of degeneracy. To compel everyday association with this class tends to inflict irreparable injury upon those who have led correct lives, though unfortunately alienated.'

COST HIGHEST HERE.

"An examination of the per capita tables of seventy-nine insane asylums, which includes those in almost every State in the Union, shows that the Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia heads the list as to the cost of management; that it stands No. 27 in the column of recoveries and No. 5 as having the highest death rate.

"It appears also from this table of comparison that the institutions having a small number of inmates cost the State a greater per capita than those of large population. For instance, Dannemora State Asylum, New York, costs the State $202.80 per capita, and has only 260 patients, while Wards Island Asylum, in the same State, with 4,366 patients, costs the State but $167.71.

"We note that the average per capita cost for the twelve insane asylums of New York shows it to be $190. The average per capita cost for the five insane asylums of the State of Ohio is $101.04. The three Virginia insane asylums average $104 per capita, and when we consider that this State has the same climate and markets as our local institution at St. Elizabeth we see no reason for the per capita cost of $220 as against $104 for the State Asylum of Virginia.

"In the face of these comparisons the per capita cost of the Government Hospital for the Insane should never exceed $200 per capita. Anything in excess of this amount is needless.

"It appears that many of the State institutions include all expenditures in figuring their per capita cost. If this were the case with St. Elizabeth, the per capita cost would exceed $300."

[Washington Times, February 24, 1906.]

ASYLUM HEARING OFF TO WEDNESDAY—ST. ELIZABETH'S BOARD IN NEED OF WITNESSES—WISHES POWER TO SUBPŒNA—ADJOURNS TO LEARN IF IT CAN NOT FORCE MEDICO-LEGAL SOCIETY MEMBERS TO TESTIFY.

The investigation of the charges made by the Medico-Legal Society of the District against the administration and conduct of affairs at the Government Hospital for the Insane, which began at the hospital this morning, opened with an executive session and ended in the adoption of the following resolution:

"The board of visitors, having met this morning and having found that those who have published in the newspapers charges against this hospital have declined their invitation to appear before the board and give testimony in substantiation of these charges: Therefore,

"*Resolved,* That the board do now adjourn until 2 o'clock p. m. Wednesday, the 28th instant, in order to ascertain whether or not the board has power to compel the attendance of witnesses and to administer judicial oaths; and if it should be found that such power does not now reside in this board to take steps necessary to clothe the board with such power, in the interest of a full judicial inquiry into the charges lodged against this hospital and into its condition and administration."

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED.

Despite the reported announcement of the board's chairman, Dr. F. M. Grinnell, that it would proceed with the investigation under any circumstances, the actual investigation was not even begun. This failure was caused by the refusal of the Medico-Legal Society, by its officers, to appear and give testimony. The resolutions were adopted by a unanimous vote, and were offered by the Rev. Dr. Teunis S. Hamlin.

The refusal of the Medico-Legal Society to apear and give evidence was contained in a letter from its law officer, Richard P. Evans, to Dr. William A. White, superintendent of the hospital and secretary of the board of visitors. The letter was printed in the Times yesterday. This stand of the society necessitated a complete change of plans on the part of the board and was evidently the subject of much careful consideration at this morning's session.

NOT ALL PRESENT.

The members of the board present were Dr. F. M. Gunnell, president; Gen. John Moore, Gen. Walter Wyman, the Rev. Teunis S. Hamlin, William A. Maury, Mrs. A. M. Gangewer, and Mrs. Gardiner Hubbard. One of the absentees, S. H. Kauffman, is ill at his residence, and was unable on this account to be present.

A squad of newspaper reporters descended upon the administration building of the hospital at 10 o'clock, the hour announced for the investigation to begin. They were made very welcome, and given every facility to gaze out of the windows of the room in which the "investigation" was to have been held. There they meditated and cooled their heels in patience, and meantime the meeting of the board was in progress in the office of Doctor White. It continued in session nearly two hours.

At 11.45 the members of the board, accompanied by Doctor White, filed into the board room, where the reporters, representing the anxious public, were in waiting.

"MEETING" ACTUALLY BEGINS.

Doctor Gunnell called the meeting to order, and asked for the minutes of the last meeting. Doctor White offered to produce them if it were necessary, but it was decided finally that a summary would answer the purpose. The minutes were summarized by the chairman to the following cogent, precise, and remarkable effect:

"The board met and adjourned."

This weighty preliminary being disposed of, Doctor Hamlin then read the resolutions he offered, using for the purpose a typewritten manuscript.

The resolution adopted, the meeting stood adjourned, and carbon copies of the board's action were distributed to the reporters.

In the closed session it was decided that application for opinions as to the board's power should be made to the Attorney-General and the Secretary of the Interior. Until these are furnished, nothing further will be done.

[Washington Post, February 25, 1906.]

DEMANDS THE PROOF—ASYLUM BOARD WOULD COMPEL WITNESSES TO TESTIFY—INQUIRES ABOUT ITS POWERS—RESOLUTION IS ADOPTED WHICH SEEKS TO FORCE THE MEMBERS OF THE MEDICO-LEGAL SOCIETY TO APPEAR, AND UNDER OATH TELL WHAT THEY KNOW ABOUT ALLEGED MISMANAGEMENT—WILLING TO APPEAR.

The board of visitors of St. Elizabeth, the Government Hospital for the Insane, yesterday decided to attempt to force the members of the Medico-Legal Society of Washington to testify before it as to the charges of gross mismanagement made.

The board was in executive session for two hours, and this was the only conclusion reached. The stand taken by the board is that inas-

much as the charges made by the society are the only matter before it nothing can be done if the men who made the charges refuse to testify, unless the board has the power to summon them as witnesses and to administer oaths.

The resolution adopted follows:

"The board of visitors having met this morning and having found that those who have published in the newspapers charges against this hospital have declined their invitation to appear before the board to give testimony in substantiation of these charges: Therefore, be it

WOULD KNOW ITS POWERS.

"*Resolved*, That the board do now adjourn until 2 o'clock Wednesday, February 28, in order to ascertain whether or not the board has power to compel the attendance of witnesses and to administer judicial oaths; and if it should be found that such power does not now reside in this board, to take necessary steps to clothe the board with such power in the interest of a full judicial inquiry into the charges lodged against this hospital, and into its condition and administration."

Rev. Teunis S. Hamlin introduced the resolution, which was unanimously adopted, the following members being present and voting for it: Surg. Gen. F. M. Gunnell, United States Navy; Surg. Gen. John Moore, United States Army; Surg. Gen. Walter Wyman, United States Marine-Hospital Service; former Assistant Attorney William A. Maury, Rev. Teunis S. Hamlin, Mrs. Gardiner Hubbard, and Mrs. A. M. Gangewer.

Members discussing the postponement of the investigation until Wednesday say that in the interim the legal branch of the Department of the Interior will be consulted as to the power of the board to summon witnesses.

Those interested in the charges are making inquiry into the personnel of the Medico-Legal Society, which made the sensational charges a week ago. To those charges were appended the names of three men—Dr. C. M. Emmons, Dr. Robert Reyburn, and R. P. Evans, attorney.

SOCIETY IS INCORPORATED.

Parties most affected by the charges have sought to learn the membership of the organization, but claim they have been unsuccessful. Attorney R. P. Evans, of the Medico-Legal Society, stated that there were reasons why the list of members of the organization should not be published. He cited the fact that the organization was incorporated and that the list of incorporators refuted the accusation that the membership was limited to three men. The incorporation and the present list of officers show the following men as active in the work of the society:

Dr. Robert Reyburn, president; Dr. William D. Hughes, vice-president; Dr. C. M. Emmons, secretary; Dr. C. B. Robinson, treasurer; R. P. Evans, attorney, and James E. Padgett, associate attorney.

The articles of incorporation state that the object of the society is the enactment of such legislation as will promote the interests of the citizens of the District of Columbia, the discussion of all civic affairs of a medical or legal character, and the encouragement of a closer social affiliation among reputable professional men of the city.

"On Monday," said Mr. Evans, "we hope to get a report of a resolution now before the House for a Congressional investigation of the affairs of the asylum. We hope for this investigation, because we hold that the board of visitors, having the responsibility for any unsatisfactory conditions existing, would not naturally apply the probe as would outside investigators.

WILLING TO APPEAR.

"If Congress does not see fit to investigate, then we are willing to appear before the board, but conditionally. We will willingly appear if we are granted the privilege of calling witnesses to substantiate the charges we have made. We want the privilege of bringing out our side of the case and of putting even doctors and officers of the institution on the stand. Should we call an attendant, we want it understood that he is not to lose his position because of testimony he should give that would be damaging to the institution."

Upon these points there are likely to arise differences as to the manner in which the investigation will be conducted, and the probability is that its manner will be entirely changed when the issue comes.

When the matter is referred to the Interior Department for opinions as to the legal phases and the powers of the board of visitors, it is probable that the matter may be taken entirely out of the hands of the board and turned over to the investigating board of the Department, which has the service of skilled men and authority to summon witnesses and *administer* oaths.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What do they say about it—deny everything?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. Oh, hardly that, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee. I read one of their so-called denials the other day, and it was to the effect that they were investigating themselves and at some future time would make a report.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to one or two of these affidavits, and I want to ask permission to put these ten affidavits that were sent to the Committee on Rules in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and also two additional affidavits, which I have. I will not have the time to read them all. I hope the House will permit me to do that. Here is an affidavit which I desire to read, and I hope gentlemen will listen to this particular one. It is as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Milwaukee, ss:

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the county and State aforesaid, Daniel Oscar Hoffman, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, who, being first duly sworn according to law, deposes and says: I am the identical Oscar Hoffman who, on or about March 3, 1903, was seized at my home, 1513 Thirtieth street NW., Washington, D. C., by policemen without a warrant, confined in a filthy cell at a police station for six or eight hours, and then, without opportunity to consult counsel or my friends, I was taken forcibly to St. Elizabeth Insane Asylum, Washington, D. C., and there kept as being an insane person, and abominably treated. A day or so after, I was handed a paper of some sort, a writ, which an attendant took away from me and tore up, and I was never taken before a court for a hearing as to my sanity.

I remained in St. Elizabeth until about Christmas, 1903, when I was permitted by the hospital authorities to go home to spend Christmas, and I never went back. Shortly afterwards I visited Europe and spent some time in Berlin and Dresden. My experiences in St. Elizabeth were, briefly, as follows: Upon my arrival they took me to "center," and there I was scrubbed down with scrub brush, such as is used in scrubbing floors; my request for an attorney and examination into my mental condition was ignored. I was kept there one night, and then taken to the Toner Building in the morning, where I was under charge of a Doctor Logie. One of my first experiences there was being hit in back of neck by an attendant and knocked down, for what reason I know not, as at the time I was only trying to get out of the way of a patient who ran at me. Neither before nor since my confinement in St. Elizabeth have I ever used opium, morphine, or similar drugs in any form, but my flesh looked like a pepper box from hypodermic injections when I left there; other drugs were administered; I was cursed and damned, struck and choked, kicked in stomach and testicles, smashed in face, and the swelling caused an ulcer, and I was strapped down and four sound teeth taken out—to find the ulcerated one, I suppose. I grew somewhat restive under this treatment and was sat in the "saddle." The "saddle" was a contrivance of straps stretched across the bed in somewhat the outlined form. "A" is, I suppose, the part from which it received its name, as from it all the straps emanate. Upon one's introduction to the bed of torture it looked very much like the outline. The straps, after the patient was placed in the saddle, were secured around the side and head and front bars of the bed and brought tight over and around.

This is a delightful contrivance, where I was strapped and bound, hands, feet, legs, and neck, so that I could not move a muscle, and could only roll my eyes or head around, while in a reclining position; here I was left alone a whole day, without water or food, and no one paid any attention to my cries. It is a mercy of God that kept me from going raving mad. Dante's Inferno does not describe the torture I endured; the agony was indescribable; this was to subdue the spirits of the patients; it was frequently used upon others. The patients were frequently "wrung out," by throwing wet towels around the neck and twisting the ends from behind or before until they would become almost unconscious from slow strangulation. I underwent this experience several times; once in particular to the point of unconsciousness for several minutes. I saw young men—boys—choked by "wringing out" until they would fall senseless, frothing at the mouth. The attendants were for the most part ignorant, vulgar, cruel, and vicious. They were cursing and damning all the time, and upon slightest pretext would strike and kick me and others, "wring" us out, etc., although there were a few, in my experience, with good, Christian hearts.

I was struck on the side of head with broomstick by one of the attendant, and have a disfigured ear as the result of those blows; my nostril is distended, and my throat and voice injured by unnecessary use of the feeding tube, when I was willing and anxious to eat and drink. It was forced up my nostril and down my throat, and, to make it worse, they would frequently not grease it, but put it in dry. This feeding tube was a standing threat, and was frequently used, without reason or necessity, to discipline the patients. Drugs were administered to patients for the amusement of watching their funny actions while under their effects. The attendants had free access to the drugs. If any patient woke up in the night he was drugged to make him sleep. A watchman would go around every hour or so with flashing light; would wake some up; reported not asleep—more drugs. It was a common practice to tie the patients in bed with "restraining sheets," and keep them so for hours—sometimes all night. I was so tied down in bed a whole night by an open window, and caught cold and the inflammatory rheumatism in consequence. During my incarceration I had typhoid fever, when I was kept in restraining sheets. From typhoid my weight fell to 90 pounds, according to report. Wonderful that I should survive my treatment during and after such emaciation, when it is remembered my normal weight is from 170 to 180 stripped. My weight upon entrance was below par, about 140 stripped, I believe. Some one of the patients informed my mother of how I was being maltreated, and she complained to Doctor White, the superintendent. He had me brought before Doctor Logie and others, and asked me if I had any complaints to make; but I knew better than to complain, for if sent back to the ward I knew it would be unhealthy for me, so I refused to say anything, as Mr. Blimar was in earshot. They used the douche for treatment, throwing such a stream of cold water against me and other delicate patients that it would knock us down. Torture, tyranny, and abuse kept me and others in a constant condition of fear and apprehension.

I wish to say a word for the criminal insane. Constant imprisonment, and only a little courtyard in center of their building for their airing. I heard frequent cries of pain from there. They are human beings and should have humane treatment.

D. O. N. HOFFMANN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 2d day of March, 1906.
[SEAL.] H. SCHLOMOVITZ,
Notary Public.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I shall not take up the time of the House—I have not the time at my disposal—to read these affidavits. They are similar in character to the one that I have read. These affidavits are made by attendants, ex-attendants, and ex-patients. It will not do to say that they can not be believed because they are not now in the employ of the institution or that they are not now in the care of the institution. You can not get at the facts in any institution like this by any person other than those who are in a position to know the facts, and no person is in a position to know those facts except the inmates of the institution. Why, on state occasions, when the board of visitors go to make their annual visit, everything is in order for their reception, everything has been cleaned and prepared and made ready for the board of visitors, and doubtless they never see anything that is wrong or that indicates cruelty or mismanagement. Here are these people, a round dozen of them, whose affidavits I shall ask permission to put in the RECORD, and they detail a story of brutality, a story of mismanagement, that should bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every citizen of America. Here, within the very shadow of the Dome of the Capitol; here, in the very center of our boasted

American civilization, these people are treated like common brutes, worse than the dogs that roam your streets or bay in your back yards. I say, in the face of this, will the Committee on Rules, autocratic power that it is, continue to deny to this House the right to investigate this institution of the Government, this institution that ought to be the pride of every Member of this Congress, that ought to be near and dear to the heart of every citizen of America? I ask again, Will the Committee on Rules, accustomed to the exercise of autocratic power, accustomed to the denial of the right of the people to be heard, accustomed to throttling the voice of the people's representatives here on this floor—will the Committee on Rules, in the face of all these horrible facts as detailed in these affidavits, deny to this House the right to have the affairs of this sacred institution investigated? [Applause.] My God, Mr. Chairman, surely they will not carry their power to that length. Surely this is where they will call a halt and say that the representatives of the people shall have the privilege to investigate this institution and let the people know the truth.

In addition to all these charges of cruelty and mismanagement there is another charge which I have here, if gentlemen care to examine the court records of this District. Old soldiers and sailors are incarcerated there. I have before me the record of a case which shows this state of facts: Last year the superintendent of this asylum went into court by a petition asking for an investigation into the sanity of a soldier incarcerated there. That man had been there since 1883, the supposition being that when a man is incarcerated his insanity has been determined. Yet he had been there since 1883, with no determination, apparently, of this question, and last year the superintendent went into the court and asked for an investigation into the matter of his sanity. This old soldier had coming to him from the General Government $224 in arrears of pension. The attorney for the superintendent, who filed the petition, received as fees out of this old man's pittance of $224 the sum of $25. His law partner was appointed by the court as the committee in lunacy, and he received out of this money 10 per cent, or twenty-two dollars and something. Two physicians examined him as to his sanity, one of them being a physician in the asylum, who was paid a salary by the Government, and each got $10 for investigating and giving the certificate as to this man's sanity, and then with the court costs and other charges it cost this old soldier $80.10 to collect $224 due him by the Government of the United States. Insane, nearing the place where he would take passage for the other shore, faithful to his country, upon her pension rolls in recognition of his gallant services, tottering on to the grave, and his reason gone, in this humane institution that we have built for the care and maintenance of such as he—these people pounced upon him and took from him $80.10 out of $224, when it ought not to have cost him a cent. There ought to be some arrangement made by which it would be impossible for court costs and attorneys' fees to devour the small sums allowed by the Government to make easier the pathway of the old soldier as he journeys to his long home.

And I am told, Mr. Chairman, upon good authority, that this very same firm of lawyers average fifty to sixty of just such cases every year. An old soldier is in there; they find that he has got some back pension money coming to him; a petition is filed, and these enormous fees are taken out of his little pittance, he without reason and unable to complain. So you have, Mr. Chairman, charges of gross and most inhuman treatment; you have charges of pilfering the little pittance provided by a generous Government for the old soldier; you have these charges made emanating from respectable quarters, and yet we appeal in vain for an opportunity to test the truth of the charges made. Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word further as to the source of these charges. When I saw these newspaper accounts I investigated the people behind the charges. I found, Mr. Chairman, that they were made primarily by what was known as the "Medico-Legal Society." I found the president of that society is Dr. Robert Reyburn, a citizen of this city for more than fifty years, a man of large property interests, a man who is prominent in his profession and among his people, and who was one of the attending surgeons, if not the chief one, when the lamented Garfield was stricken with the assassin's bullet. I found that the attorney for the society was Mr. Richard P. Evans, an attorney at law in good standing, who has lived here for twenty-five years. I found that the secretary of the society was Dr. Charles M. Emmons, a physician in good standing in his profession, who has lived here all his life. These are the sources from which the charges emanated. These are the people who preferred them. These are the people who say they are ready to prove them. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the man with the "muck rake" is not so dangerous to our republican Government as is the man with the whitewash brush. [Applause.] He is the more dangerous of the two; he is the more despicable of the two. The man with the whitewash brush, ready at all times to smear over the muck and to hide it from the public, to conceal it from the public gaze, is infinitely worse than the man with the "muck rake" who would expose it to the public view in order that affairs might be remedied. I am putting these facts before this House, Mr. Chairman, to appeal to this Congress to at least investigate this institution. If the charges are not true, no harm can be done. If they are true, then in God's name let us wipe out of place every official in any manner responsible for these things [applause], and at least have clean and humane officials in charge of our unfortunate fellow-beings who, owing to the decrees of Providence, can not help themselves. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to ask consent to put these newspaper articles in the RECORD and also to put into the RECORD these ten affidavits and the two others which have not been sent to the Committee on Rules, and I thank the House for its very close attention, trusting that my remarks may ultimately result in good to this institution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CRUMPACKER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8997) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. BURKETT, and Mr. MARTIN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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. 4886) to simplify the issue of enrollments and licenses of vessels of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 16133. An act to simplify the issue of enrollments and licenses of vessels of the United States; and

H. R. 18334. An act making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for bringing home remains of officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who die abroad.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5533. An act to appoint an additional judge for the southern district of New York;

S. 5489. An act to provide for sittings of the circuit and district courts of the southern district of Florida in the city of Miami, in said district; and

S. 5297. An act providing for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Washington, D. C.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes, or more, if he desires—I believe he said ten minutes—to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, it is possible the comments that I desire to make upon the highly impassioned speech of the gentleman from Florida may occupy more than ten minutes of time. For myself, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I never heard until the statement was made here to-day that the gentleman from Florida had introduced any resolution in regard to the subject-matter about which he has been speaking, and since his very violent attack upon the Committee on Rules I have investigated the whole subject so far as the action or nonaction of the Committee on Rules is concerned and will show to the gentleman from Florida and to the House how easy it is for a man who does not understand what he is trying to do to fail to do anything, and then of course he feels disappointed and disgusted and insulted and outraged by the failure of somebody else to do something that he thinks they ought to do and which they were never invited to do. I suppose that the Members of the House, most of them, understand the processes by which a proceeding of this kind is usually carried on, and I want to make a statement of the exact facts so far as the Committee on Rules is concerned. Some time in February the gen-

tleman from Florida introduced a resolution suggesting and providing for a special committee to investigate the asylum over here. At that time, bear in mind, so far as any official knowledge was concerned, there was no information or suggestion to the Committee on Rules that there was any complaint against the asylum. Of course there were newspaper articles, but the Committee on Rules has not been in the habit of appointing an investigating committee every time there is a charge in a newspaper against somebody.

As I have said, the resolution was sent to the committee. I did not know it was there, nor did the other members of the committee. It took the usual course, and lay in the hands of the secretary of the committee waiting for such action as is usually a requisite to putting the matter into some kind of activity. And until to-day not one word has made its appearance, not a sound has come from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asking any action by the committee. A few days ago—the exact date is not ascertainable, because the action was non-official—a bundle of papers was handed to the clerk of the Committee on Rules. The first time I ever heard of that fact I heard here to-day by the gentleman's impassioned attack upon the committee, and I have inquired of the other two members—Republican members—of the committee, and they both say they never heard of these affidavits or any other paper in connection with the transaction. When I come to examine the papers I find there is nothing before the committee to-day upon which any committee would act under any circumstances whatever. There is a lot of papers purporting to be copies, but not an original paper, not a substantial allegation of any fact, but a lot of copies in the hands of the secretary, and that is all there is of it. Now, then, who is to blame? If the gentleman from Florida had come to the Committee on Rules, if he had understood the processes that he was invoking, he would have come to that committee and asked their consideration of his resolution. But he has not seen fit to do that, so far as I am informed.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if it is not true that those ten copies of affidavits, which he says were dumped in there, have not a letter attached to them from an attorney of standing in this city, Mr. Richard P. Evans, and does not he in that letter say to you that he is ready at any time to produce the originals and urge action upon the report?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the Committee on Rules feel obligated, when some attorney wants to be heard, to thereupon put the processes in motion? That is more absurd than anything else the gentleman has suggested. But that fact was not known. If the gentleman had come to the Committee on Rules and said, "I have these affidavits, and I desire action," he would have had it, and he would have had it instantly. He would have been deprived of nothing whatever except the glory, whatever there was in it, of this fearful raid he has been making upon the Committee on Rules of this House.

I do not know who Mr. Evans is, and I never heard of him until within the last thirty minutes. I did not know there was such a man on God's footstool, nor did any member of the Committee on Rules know it, or ever hear of him, or ever hear that he had written a letter. The whole thing is simply a miscarriage because of the gentleman's failure to understand the processes by which this action could have been taken. The clerk of the committee has acted with absolute propriety. He is the custodian of the papers, that is all. And whenever the Committee on Rules had been invoked by the gentleman from Florida to take action the papers would have been produced at once and action would have been had.

Mr. RUCKER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. As I understand, the gentleman has explained thus far why the Committee on Rules has not up to this time taken action—namely, that it had no knowledge of the serious character of these charges?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have not said that.

Mr. RUCKER. That is the purport, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not at all. It is not the purport, either.

Mr. RUCKER. Then let me ask the gentleman this: Having now heard from the declarations of the gentlemen on the floor, will you, as a member of the committee, take this matter up in the committee and report to the House?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will not take it up; no. But I will——

Mr. RUCKER. May I ask the gentleman if the committee will take it up?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will come before the committee, the committee will act with absolute promptness.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] comes before the committee?

Mr. GROSVENOR. And satisfies the committee that there is anything in these charges, then there will be no difficulty about action.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the committee will give me notice when they are going to meet, I will be there.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman can always find the Committee on Rules. There is never any trouble about that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you see what has come of all this. The country has been lashed into a fury, when the whole of it is absolutely stolid ignorance of the processes by which action might have been had. The gentleman asked the Committee on Rules to take some affidavits, uncertified to by anybody as being competent, and act upon them. The committee certainly will not do that; the committee ought not to be asked to do that. If the gentleman's proposed action should be taken, why did he copy the originals and carry these copies and place them in the hands of the clerk of the committee?

I do not know that would have sufficed; but if the committee was to act in his absence—and that seems to be the burden of his cry, that we did not act in his absence—if he did not profess that, did he ever come and seek any action? He never has exhibited one of those affidavits to anybody connected with the committee. He simply sent what purports to be on their face copies of certain statements. Of course, there were charges made in the fall, early in the session, against this organization over here, and for one I sought to put in motion an investigation, and the gentleman from Florida put amendments into a bill which I had in hand, and the bill was passed with his amendment. Now, whatever became of that bill I do not know; I do not know whether the Senate shelved it or did not shelve it. I do not know anything about that. But I had heard as a current rumor, in the air, that some action had been taken by the board of managers, and there was little or nothing in the charges that had been made, and so I dropped following up that bill, and know nothing whatever about any attempt to investigate their action by the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman desire any further time?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; that is all.

Mr. BURLESON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio is begging this whole question regarding an investigation by the House of Representatives of the mismanagement of St. Elizabeth's Insane Asylum. His defense of the officials of that institution, to say the least, is disingenuous, and his reasons, as a member of the Committee on Rules, for not reporting the resolution for an investigation are hardly worth serious attention. This matter can not be whistled down the wind.

The charges and the statements made by the gentleman from Florida are not new and are not without substantial foundation in fact. They have been made over and over again by reputable citizens of the District of Columbia, in the newspapers of this city, and by several Members on the floor of this House; and the members of the Committee on Rules must have knowledge of these matters, and they should have taken action in the premises long ago by reporting this resolution for a rigid and impartial investigation without waiting for the introducer of the resolution or Members of the House to appear before the committee and beg the committee to do something.

Considering these grave charges, I say the delay in this matter on the part of the Committee on Rules is indefensible, and explanations only make the matter look worse. We know the practice of the Committee on Rules. Whenever it wants to do anything, it promptly does it, and does it in the most arbitrary and expeditious way; and whenever it does not want to do anything, nine-tenths of all the Members of this House can go to the Speaker's room day in and day out and plead and plead and use all their influence with every member of the committee and it is as impossible to get the Committee on Rules, if the committee does not want to do it, to do what a great majoriy of the Members of the House are anxious to have done as it is for the members of that committee to be translated. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a short time ago I made a speech on the floor of this House regarding the alleged cruelties and inhumanities that are going on, and have been going on for a long time, in St. Elizabeth's Insane Asylum. I knew then, and I know now, whereof I speak. I said then, and I say now, that these grave charges should be investigated by a committee of the House

of Representatives. I have in my possession copies of the same affidavits to which the gentleman from Florida has referred, and one of which he read to the House; and I have other information regarding the terrible stories which come to us about the inhuman and the barbarous treatment of the poor afflicted insane patients in that institution. These affidavits were prepared by Richard P. Evans, esq., attorney for the Medico-Legal Society of the District of Columbia. Mr. Evans is a well-known and prominent lawyer of the District of Columbia, and the Medico-Legal Society is one of the most reputable societies of its kind in this country.

These terrible accusations come to us from sincere, disinterested, and reputable citizens, and they will not down, and they can not be smothered or suppressed. If the statements are true, or only partially true, the condition of affairs in this asylum is a disgrace to the country; if they are false, a great injustice is being done to the officials of this institution, and the wrong should be remedied as soon as possible. The citizens of this city want an impartial investigation to get at the facts, and all the facts, and the only way that the people will ever know the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth is by a rigid investigation of this whole asylum administration by a nonpartisan Congressional committee. [Applause.]

The witnesses who make these frightful charges want to be heard, and they should be heard. The people demand this investigation, and it must come. The House of Representatives must do its duty, and do it now. The people expect us to act quickly in this matter and find out the truth. We should have an impartial investigation. Let in the light of publicity and get at all the facts.

If these charges of cruelty to the unfortunate patients in this asylum are true, the officials who are guilty of the barbarities should be criminally prosecuted. We demand the truth. We want publicity in this matter—no star-chamber proceedings, no whitewashing, no favoritism.

The gentleman from Ohio has ridiculed these charges, and in a facetious way has asked: "Where are the original affidavits?" I will answer the gentleman from Ohio, and say to him that Mr. Evans, the attorney for the Medico-Legal Society of the District of Columbia, informed me that the original affidavits were in a safe-deposit vault in this city, and if the gentleman wants to see the originals I suggest that he send for Mr. Evans, and I have no doubt Mr. Evans will produce the originals and show them to the gentleman from Ohio and give him other data and further information regarding the charges of graft and mismanagement and cruelties in St. Elizabeth's. The Medico-Legal Society of this District, I have no doubt, will produce all the proof necessary to convince the gentleman from Ohio that the conditions existing in St. Elizabeth's are a disgrace to the enlightened civilization of the twentieth century.

This Medico-Legal Society is composed of some of the most reputable and best-known physicians in this city, and they are familiar with the horrible conditions in St. Elizabeth's. These doctors and other reputable citizens have begged Congress for an investigation, and what answer did this House give to their appeal? It turned them away with a soft answer and said: "Go back to your homes; don't get excited; content your souls in peace; don't worry about the inhuman treatment of these poor lunatics over in St. Elizabeth's. We are looking after the matter, and we will let the officials of the institution investigate themselves, and when they bring in their report you can rest assured that these frightful charges of cruelty will be disproved and dissipated like mist before the rising sun." And I am informed the officials of the institution, taking their cue from the leaders in this House, are now investigating themselves. What a farce! What a spectacle is presented by these officials, charged with these barbarities, these cruelties, these inhumanities!

What a farce, I say, is presented to the people of the District of Columbia and to the country when the House of Representatives allows the very men charged with these offenses to investigate themselves and bring in a report whitewashing themselves. It is, indeed, to laugh. What a spectacle is presented when the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the District of Columbia refuse to give the members of the Medico-Legal Society and the reputable citizens of the District of Columbia an opportunity to prove their case and are told, as they are turned away: "Nothing can be done at present. We can not do anything for you. There will be no investigation by an impartial committee on the part of the House of Representatives. We know these officials out at St. Elizabeth. We do not believe these frightful accusations of cruelty and barbarism and inhumanity to the unfortunate insane. We have the most implicit confidence in the officials of the institution.

"We, or some of us, have been out there and looked over the whole situation. We have been wined and dined by the superintendent. We know what is going on, what he is doing, and we think he is all right, and everything else is all right; but in order to satisfy you and satisfy the people of the country, we are going to let these officials investigate themselves, and when their report comes in we have no doubt it will be a complete refutation of all these horrible stories." Wait for this whitewashing report. That will settle the matter. What a farce it all is. The country has had an exhibition of officials investigating themselves, and the difference between officials charged with mismanagement and other offenses investigating themselves and being investigated by an impartial committee. We know the whitewashing results of officials investigating themselves, and we know the sad and melancholy results of officials being investigated by impartial investigating committees. This investigation can not be suppressed by a wave of the hand.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Who does the gentleman say has been over to that asylum and been wined and dined?

Mr. SULZER. Members of this House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What Members of this House?

Mr. SULZER. I do not know their names, but they are Members of this House. I read it in the newspapers. I can easily ascertain the names if the gentleman is insistent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. How do you know they were Members of this House?

Mr. SULZER. Because the papers said so.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, there was a certain paper once said that a certain——

Mr. SULZER. Never mind what a certain paper once said. My recollection is they were members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and they were over there very recently and treated sumptuously, and it was reported in all the newspapers.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What has that got to do with this question?

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman asked the question.

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

Mr. BURLESON. How much further time does the gentleman from New York desire?

Mr. SULZER. Five or ten minutes more.

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

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that it may or may not have a great deal to do with this question. We will find it out later on. But why does not the Committee on Rules take action on this resolution? That, after all, is the real question now before us. This Committee on Rules is a sort of a self-constituted affair; a one-man committee, with more power than all the other committees in the House.

I was asked my opinion about it the other day for a great Republican newspaper, the New York Tribune, and I promptly said, with all due respect to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] who now occupies the chair, and with all due respect to my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who has endeavored to defend these officials and justify the nonaction of the committee—both members of this Committee on Rules—I said very frankly—and every Member here knows I was telling the truth—that the Committee on Rules was composed of one man, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That whatever he wanted the committee to do the committee would promptly do, and whatever he did not want that committee to do the committee would surely not do.

Now, I do not think that this resolution of investigation should have been referred to the Committee on Rules. It belongs to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The Committee on the District of Columbia has this institution practically in charge, and there are a great many things in connection with it, outside of these cruelties, outside of this hocus-pocus business, by which the attorney for the institution goes into court and secures a writ de lunatico inquirendo, and the judge appoints his partner as the commissioner to take testimony as to the person's insanity, and one of the doctors of the institution is called, and another doctor who is, I am informed, a relative of the attorney, is called to examine the unfortunate patient and testify to the insanity; and between them they always find that the man is insane, and if he has any money they get the major portion of it for fees and services.

I have been told of cases where men have been sent to this asylum who were perfectly sane and rational, and lived there for years. Not soldiers nor sailors, but others. And it has been charged in some cases that people with money and other valuables in their possession were committed, and when they came out they could not get back a dollar, and in the opinion of some

of these unlucky inmates it would be a good thing for the Committee on the District of Columbia to write over the gateway to the entrance to that insane asylum "Leave valuable goods behind, all ye who enter here." [Laughter.]

Recently I was told of a case where a poor woman from the District, a woman who was not insane, was sent to this institution, and she was fed by force through her nose, in a very cruel and inhuman way, without any reason or justification. The woman lives here in the District, and if this investigation is allowed I have no doubt this woman will be glad of an opportunity to appear and testify to the outrageous, the cruel, the inhuman, and the barbarous way she was treated.

Mr. Chairman, all experience, I think, teaches us that too much care can not be exercised over officials having the care and custody and treatment of the unfortunate insane. Years ago, I was a member of a legislative committee that investigated the conditions and treatment of the insane in the county institutions of the State of New York. In nearly every one of those county institutions—and I say it with great regret—the insane patients were treated cruelly and with a great deal of inhumanity, and a great many things were done which never should be allowed.

The consequence was that the report of this committee, when it came into the legislature, created suc a decided change in public opinion that the legislature promptly passed an act for the State care of the insane, and all these county insane patients were transferred to State institutions, and to-day, as the result of that law, all insane people in the State of New York are now sent to State asylums, where they are treated in the modern, up-to-date, scientific way—and with kindness, not cruelty—with humanity, not barbarism—and the result is——

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

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from New York five minutes more.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the House but a few minutes longer. I hold in my hand a statement, which has been prepared by the attorney for the Medico-Legal Society, in regard to the expenditures for the farm at St. Elizabeth's and the value of the farm products. In the report of the board of visitors and the superintendent for the year 1905, relating to farm operations at St. Elizabeth's, they give, on pages 12 and 13, a table of the products of the farm, garden, hennery, and dairy, and place the value of the same at about $33,000. From all other sources $9,000, making about $42,000. The expenses of maintaining this farm are about $73,000 a year, leaving a deficiency from this one experiment of over $30,000.

I have no doubt, and others have no doubt who have looked into this matter, that, as far as the appropriations go to maintain the farm, the appropriations are accurate, but so far as the value of the products of the farm is concerned, it is entirely too high. As a matter of fact, there is a greater deficiency than $30,000 yearly in this one item.

Let us take, by way of comparison, the superintendent's report of the Central State Insane Hospital of Virginia, where they have a farm of about 500 acres, about the same size as this farm at St. Elizabeth's, and that farm shows a profit down in Virginia of over $4,000 a year. I desire to print in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, this statement regarding the discrepancy so far as this farm business is concerned.

This is a matter, Mr. Chairman, that should be looked into in the interest of economy. I think, as I said here a week or so ago, and repeat it now, that this is not a question that ought to be treated in an offhand way. This is not a question that ought to be treated as if the gentleman from Florida should continually be knocking at the door of the Committee on Rules. This is a great question of humanity, afflicted and unfortunate humanity. I say that any man, official or keeper or citizen, I care not who he is, that will illtreat a poor, unfortunate lunatic is a contemptible scoundrel, destitute of a spark of true humanity. Prison bars are none too good for the wretch. Let us have this investigation, and find out if there are any inhuman wretches in St. Elizabeth's. Nothing more and nothing less will satisfy the people.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing this statement in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What is it the gentleman asks to print?

Mr. SULZER. It is a statement signed by the attorney of the Medico-Legal Society, Richard P. Evans, regarding the amount of money annually appropriated for the farm at St. Elizabeth's, and the amount of money, according to the report of the superintendent, that is realized from the value of the farm products.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If we are going into an investigation of this institution, would the gentleman regard that as evidence?

Mr. SULZER. I would not; but the facts can be proved.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What has the gentleman got to show that it is correct?

Mr. SULZER. The report of the superintendent, which shows exactly how much money is appropriated for this farm and how much is derived from it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. We know what that is without that statement.

Mr. SULZER. Very well; so much the better. Then this statement of the officials of that institution as to how much money is annually appropriated for this farm and how much is derived from the products of the farm will do no harm to anyone if printed in the RECORD. It shows a deficiency of about $30,000. I shall put it in the RECORD to show the deficiency.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And yet the gentleman says he would not consider it as evidence.

Mr. SULZER. I would not, if I were trying a case. I am not putting it in the RECORD as evidence, I am putting it in the RECORD to show exactly how much money is appropriated every year for the farm at the asylum and how much money, according to the statement of the officials, is derived from the products of the farm.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And the gentleman wants people to infer that they ought to make good the difference between the appropriation and the value of the proceeds?

Mr. SULZER. I do not want anybody to infer anything of the kind. I am putting this data in the RECORD because in other States where there are farms connected with these insane institutions the farms pay for themselves, but in this institution there is a deficiency of over $30,000 a year.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That involves several factors; it involves the kind and condition and quality of the soil.

Mr. SULZER. It involves the question of intelligent and honest management.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman think that the Maryland soil of red clay will produce much of anything in the way of agriculture?

Mr. SULZER. Oh, yes; I have seen the Maryland soil produce good crops season after season.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The kind of soil that there is out there at St. Elizabeth's?

Mr. SULZER. I don't pretend to be as familiar with soil as the gentleman from Ohio, but my idea is that the soil of Virginia and Maryland and here in the District is very much the same.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, well, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. SULZER. No, I am not; nor about other things going on at St. Elizabeth's.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ST. ELIZABETH.

Farm products and expenditures, 1905.

The report of the board of visitors and superintendent for the year 1905, relating to the farming operations at St. Elizabeth, gives the following information and apparent results:

On pages 12 and 13 appear a list of table and farm products from the farm and garden, which include dairy, hennery, etc., but which does not state the cash values of the same. From best information, figuring on a basis midway between wholesale and retail prices, so far as obtained, it appears that the following is a liberal estimate of value of the products to the hospital:

VALUE OF PRODUCTS.

Table products from farm, garden, dairy, hennery, etc	$33, 893. 00
Feed products (hay, fodder, ensilage, etc.—1,128 tons)	9, 425. 00
Total estimated value of products	43, 318. 00

EXPENDITURES (P. 30 OF REPORT).

Expended on farm (garden and stable)	$27, 287. 01
Expended on wages (farm and garden, hauling, etc.)	46, 529. 08
Total expended	73, 816. 09
Deficiency in value of products to balance	30, 498. 09

NOTE.—The report of Dr. William F. Drewry, superintendent of the Central State Hospital of Virginia (Petersburg), for 1905 shows a profit of $4,358.79 from a 500-acre farm (same size).

Comment might be made upon the fact that while the report (p. 11) shows an average of about 225 head of stock (cows, horses, and mules on farm), and that 1,128 tons of hay, fodder, etc., was raised, there was also expended (p. 30) $12,204 for feed and $8,866.71 for hay and straw—a cash expenditure of $21,070.71; this amount added to the value of the feed products—$9,425—makes a total cost of $30,495.71 for feed and bedding of 225 head of stock, an average of $135.58 per head per annum, or $11.29 per month. The average cost for horse feed in the city appears to be about $90 per annum, or $7.50 per month, with no assistance from pasturage. At this average cost of $11.29 per month at St. Elizabeth is included about 160 cows, whose feed cost is considerably less than that of horses.

To the "stable" cost should be added the expenses of several electric vehicles, kept for the accommodation of the officials of the insti-

tution, one of which is said to have cost $2,500. The repairing of these autos is said to make quite an item of expense.

It appears that some fifteen hands are regularly employed on farm, garden, etc., at an average of $20 per month and "found."

A number of the assistant physicians and others, it is stated, have their families, nurses, etc., with fine suites of rooms and separate tables. The report of the board of visitors does not appear to indicate whether these families are entertained at the hospital expense or otherwise provided for. There may be an unnoticed provision of law authorizing such entertainment and support.

The report of the board of visitors requests further appropriations for new cow stable, piggery, etc. (p. 29), amounting to $51,080; new entrance and gate house, $8,600; new iron fence, $14,900; new assembly hall, $90,000; a total of $164,580; also other sums for improvements. These are undoubtedly all worthy of consideration, but it is questionable whether they should take precedence of provision for more nurses and attendants, at less hours of labor and increased compensation, looking to better care and treatment of the patients, to whom considerable additions seems to be anticipated (p. 26).

There does appear opportunity for large economy in some lines of administrative detail, and application of the saving to better conditions for the attendants and employees and the insane patients.

RICHARD P. EVANS,
Attorney at Law.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that that very distinguished committee which controls the proceedings of this body, the Committe on Rules, will be surprised to see rising from among the hosts of Baal, if they choose to call us such, a champion, however feeble and inefficient; but I want to say on behalf of that committee that it is just as consistent, just as liberal, in matters of legislation as the party which it represents will permit it to be, and that it is the most brilliantly and at times humorously inconsistent body of men that ever got together on the face of this earth. I wish now to divert the attention of this body from the consideration of the pauper and criminally insane (the committee having just heard the speeches of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] on the management of St. Elizabeth's Asylum) to a consideration of the criminally neglectful and unmindful—the Republican party in the Fifty-eighth and Fifty-ninth Congresses.

Recently a farmer member of a Southern State legislature, after continuously attending the sessions of that honorable body and listening in silence to the expressions of wisdom and patriotism of his associates, arose to address the assembly on a subject of great interest to him. His colleagues refused to listen, and the speaker indifferently failed to preserve order. The member grew indignant and said:

Mr. Speaker, for two months I have sat here silently and listened patiently to whirlwinds of eloquence and tornadoes of oratory from others, and now I'll be d—d if I don't want you fellows to give attention while I talk some myself.

A sense of propriety and a knowledge of the futility of much speaking here has prevented me from often imposing my views on this House, but I respectfully ask the attention of this assembly while I briefly discuss—

THE FAILURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TO REDEEM ITS PLEDGES MADE TO THE PUBLIC.

For many years it has been the boast of Republicans that the party to which they belonged was an aggressive, active organization, not a mere party of negation. It has been repeatedly asserted here that the Republican party is peculiarly fitted by experience to govern the affairs of this great nation; that its leaders are men of such preeminent wisdom and learning as to inspire public confidence. Every blessing which the providence of God has bestowed upon our country has been declared the direct result of your party policies, Mr. Chairman, and of its Administrations, while the misfortunes that have come in the course of our country's progress you have magnanimously attributed to the wickedness and foolishness of the Democratic party. If in the past you have governed liberally and well, my sense of patriotism would not permit me knowingly to withhold the credit which may be due you as a party. For, let us hope, the welfare of the public and the glory of the Republic is, and must ever be, paramount to the fame of individuals and the renown of organizations. It is not my purpose now to attempt a review of the many mistakes which the Republican party has made during the past save to show from the record made in the Fifty-eighth and Fifty-ninth Congresses that this machine, intrusted with the control of every branch of the Government, has failed and now refuses to do what it has repeatedly promised, and what it unquestionably has the power to accomplish if it chooses.

On every matter involving questions of great importance your attitude, gentlemen of the majority, has been that of weakness, indetermination, vacillation. Although pledged to many reforms in the public interest,

NOT A SINGLE EFFECTIVE MEASURE OF GENERAL IMPORTANCE

has been enacted during the Fifty-eighth Congress and that period of the present Congress which has passed. The majority seems not to have addressed itself to the subject "how to do it," but rather to the inquiry "how to seem to do it and yet leave everything important unfinished." In all the political history of the country this record for incompetence can not be excelled.

The machine in this body is all-powerful. It can make and unmake, do and undo. Under the rules prevailing here consideration can not be had of any measure without the approval of the Committee on Rules or the consent of the very amiable and able gentleman who, fortunately for the country, wields the gavel so impartially—at times. Legislation of vital importance dies in the committee rooms or goes to sleep forever on the Calendars. I am perfectly aware of the futility of these oft-repeated attacks upon the rules. I know that the responsibility is upon the majority for legislation enacted or defeated here. But in all earnestness, considering the Congress as a whole, what has been accomplished of general and great importance to the country either in this Congress or the last? If we are fortunate and good, we secure recognition for unanimous consent for the consideration of local bills and measures of trivial importance, but no important bill is ever discussed here until a few gentlemen have determined whether it shall pass and in what form. Then, with a show of magnanimity, the House is given several hours, or perhaps several days, in which to debate it, and with assinine humility we assume the ponderous task of discussing a measure when its fate is predetermined and universally known among us, when we all understand that neither the wisdom of Solomon nor the eloquence of Demosthenes, nor both combined, could affect the final result.

There was a time when this Chamber was the great forum of national debate and political controversy, when the champions of contending factions and parties met here and fought out great questions confronting the Government. These battles, fought hand to hand and face to face in the open, promoted the intelligence and welfare of the country at large and intrenched the membership of this body in the affections of all American citizens. Now our proceedings present the anomaly of never permitting debate over real controversies. The real issues here are determined behind closed doors, in committee rooms, or at secret conferences, where, to say the least, the public interest is subsidiary to considerations of political expediency. The live question before the majority now is not "how to do anything," but "how not to do it," and yet make believe that you have.

Far to the west, in the glow that gilds the broad expanse of beautiful prairies, lie the domains of Oklahoma and Indian Territory.

YOU PROMISED TO GIVE THEM STATEHOOD.

Did you not? Why have you not done so? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Every Member of this body and almost every member of the Senate agrees that these two Territories should be admitted to the Union as a State. Nobody objects to it; everyone wants it. In population, in commercial enterprise and activity, in every material respect, they meet the full standard of statehood. Year after year they have knocked at the doors of Congress and asked admission to the Union. The citizens of these Territories have earned in the good, old-fashioned way the right to a place among the States. They have converted the plains into fertile fields and founded prosperous cities. They have maintained order and attained social refinement under great disadvantages. The right of Oklahoma and Indian Territory to admission, their fitness to become a State, in no wise depend upon Arizona and New Mexico. Why couple a proposition that all indorse with one that many oppose? Why make the admission of Oklahoma and Indian Territory dependent upon the admission of Arizona and New Mexico? For political and sectional purposes, without right or reason, you have withheld statehood from Oklahoma because Arizona does not want to be united with New Mexico. Why not keep your pledge and admit Oklahoma and Indian Territory now? The people there feel that they are entitled to this consideration. You promised it to them. They are not responsible for the attitude of Arizona toward New Mexico. Can it be, Mr. Speaker, that your party will persistently attempt to coerce the consciences of gentlemen here and in the Senate by refusing to do what you and everyone else knows to be right in order to compel some one to do wrong?

A few moments ago the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] criticised the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] for not coming before the Committee on Rules and asking action on his resolution to investigate St. Elizabeth's Asylum. Strangely consistent in its inconsistency, that committee should remember that for months and years citizens of the Territories of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory have been coming before that committee and begging them to bring in a rule to let us make one new State at least in this Republic,

and they have refused to do it. The result is the same, whether you will or not and whatever one does. There is an iron band bound around the proceedings of this committee, and no matter how much ability a Member here may possess, no matter how much conscience he may have to serve his country, he can not do anything unless he gets the eye of the very able gentleman who cracks the whip above the backs of the majority of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What power, I ask, has disregarded public opinion, overridden official conscience, and denied statehood to Oklahoma and Indian Territory? Will any gentleman answer? Why not, I repeat, admit Oklahoma and Indian Territory and fight it out over Arizona and New Mexico? Is that not the fair course to pursue? Is it not the rational course?

Mr. Speaker, I can see but one possible reason for longer denying statehood to Oklahoma and Indian Territory. So long as a Territorial government is maintained there, Federal officers will have to be appointed to administer the government, and some one will dictate or suggest those appointments. But considerations of this nature can not influence Representatives in Congress or Senators! Besides, Mr. Speaker, your supply of available Rough Riders, I am informed, is about exhausted!

Seriously, no one can justify a longer delay in this matter. It is an injustice to the citizenship of two great Territories who look to this Congress for statehood. Have they not the right to expect that you will keep your promise.

Not only has the majority failed, so far, to keep its pledge as to statehood, but it has met with signal and

HOPELESS FAILURE IN THE DEFEAT OF THE PHILIPPINE TARIFF BILL.

The President and the Secretary of War, who assumes to act as foster father to all the Filipinos, treated this measure as of great importance. They kept pressing the matter until finally a bill was reported which the majority leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] supported with zeal, as did the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The latter, with other Democrats, favored the measure, I think, because they regarded it as a recognition of the Democratic doctrine on the subject, and a substantial "step in the right direction." The gentleman from New York supported the measure, I think, because it would not, in his opinion, lessen the price to the consumer, but would probably cheapen the cost of raw material to the manufacturer. In any event, the measure was brought into the House under a rule that made amendment impossible, after its provisions had been agreed on in the committee, and it was thein passed with a flourish of trumphets, after a "long and interesting debate." But what pitfalls line the pathway of seeming triumph! Loving hands bore it tenderly to the other end of this Capitol and committed it to the keeping of its enemies, who pumped its frail form full of dope, and in the monotony of a never-ending debate on the rate bill, rocked it to sleep—eternal sleep; while the President, in bitter disappointment, leaned his head on the delicate shoulder of the Secretary of War, and wept aloud at the failure of his plans because of his party's refusal to do his bidding.

Yet might not the result have been foreseen? The most inconsistent of individuals sometimes esteems the quality of consistency in others above all other virtues. For many years you have had a "white elephant" on hand in the form of the Philippine Islands. You have never had the courage, as a party, to tell the world, to inform the people of the United States, whether you intend to retain these islands permanently, grant them independence, or to announce what policy you will pursue in regard to them. Manifestly, if they are to become or remain a part or possession of the United States, you ought to remove all tariff restraints on trade with them. On the other hand, if you intend to give them independence, you would perhaps be under no such obligation. The defeat of the Philippine tariff bill is the natural result of your inconsistency, as a party, on the Philippine question. Yet all the while you are expending vast sums for military purposes and kindred objects in various portions of the archipelago, thus tying them closer and closer to the United States. For my part I believe that these islands have already cost the United States more blood and more money than they can ever yield. Speaking for myself, I would not give one drop of the blood of a brave American boy meeting his death on the spear of a Filipino savage, as thousands of them have done and many will yet do—I would not give one cry of anguish from the heart of his mother as they brought back dead her boy and laid him at her feet, for the whole archipelago! It's a sorry business, this governing oriental savages. Tell the people what you are going to do about it. Let them know what you believe should be done. Understand this: So long as there is a boy there, wearing the uniform of my country and following its flag, my voice and my vote will be heard and cast in supplying him with all the necessities of life! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Not only has the Republican party broken its pledge on statehood and suffered an ignominious defeat of the Philippine tariff bill, but it has persistently failed and refused to revise the tariff. In the beginning of his Administration the President announced his purpose to consummate the policy inaugurated by President McKinley. It was decreed that the old order of things had passed away; that schedules must be adjusted to meet the ever-changing conditions of this country and our relations in trade matters with foreign countries. During the first two sessions of the Fifty-eighth Congress we grew familiar with the term "tariff revision" on that side of the House, although it was frequently coupled with the limitation, "tariff revision by the friends of the tariff." From a Republican leader in Iowa—stalwart, if insurgent—came the cry, "Reciprocity and tariff reform!" And the call was heard and echoed back from New England. The President's views on the matter were well and generally known. The press discussed his attitude, and declared that it was his purpose to force consideration of tariff revision on Congress. "Ah, then and there was hurrying to and fro!" Day and night messengers sped from this Hall to the White House. Frequent conferences were held. The result we all know. For the time being, in order to secure the enactment of what the President deemed more necessary legislation in railroad rate regulation, for the sake of unity and in a spirit of harmony, tariff revision was displaced. Not a word on the subject in the President's message to this Congress. Nearly five months of the present session have passed. Already we have piled up in the Senate enough work to keep that slow-going body busy until the middle of June.

Shall we look for a message from the President recommending tariff revision just before this session closes, or will he wait until after the November election? We all know that such legislation will not be seriously considered now. But out in the country districts of many gentlemen who sit on that side of the Chamber is gathering a storm of wrath which will break in fury above their heads and make impossible their reelection next November if some word of promise be not held out by the Administration that the tariff shall be reformed. I understand perfectly well that the greater number of the majority in this House does not favor tariff revision. They subscribe to the doctrine "stand pat." "Let well enough alone." But the American people believe in progress. They have observed the strained relations existing between China and the United States on account of trade relations and other conditions. They have heard the threats of Germany and Russia and other European powers to retaliate against us for alleged wrongs imposed by existing schedules. Still Republicans here worship the Dingley rates as if they were of divine origin, and speak of Providence as a junior partner with the Republican party in bestowing mercy and blessings on the American people.

EXTRA SESSION TO BE CALLED FOR TARIFF REVISION NEXT YEAR.

The New York Press of the 18th (yesterday) contained a long article in its first column, sent out from this city, in which it is asserted that the President has decided to call an extra session of Congress soon after March 4 to consider tariff revision. If this statement is well founded, it is apparent that this promise is to be used as an inducement to Republicans who favor and deem necessary tariff revision to continue their support of that organization. When the November election has been held and the strength of revisionists has been definitely ascertained, we will see what will happen.

No substantial revision of the tariff will be made by the Republican party. Its leaders here are opposed to such action. It would be impossible to pass through this body a measure of this kind over their opposition. But the promise to revise the tariff may again serve its purpose. It may help the majority to fight its battles in the coming election. Is there a gentleman here who professes faith in the purpose of the Republican party to materially revise the tariff? It is but another promise made to be broken. I publish the article referred to in the New York Press:

EXTRA SESSION WILL BE CALLED FOR TARIFF REVISION NEXT YEAR—ROOSEVELT GIVES INTEREST TO FALL ELECTIONS BY MAPPING OUT WORK TO BE UNDERTAKEN SOON AFTER MARCH 4—INHERITANCE TAX PUTS FORAKER IN OPPOSITION—PRESIDENT PREPARING NEW NATIONAL PLATFORM FOR REPUBLICAN PARTY IN 1908 TO INCLUDE WIDER FEDERAL CONTROL OF CORPORATIONS DOING AN INTERSTATE BUSINESS.

[From the regular correspondent of the Press.]

WASHINGTON, *April 17, 1906.*

What is perceived to be the outline of a new national platform for the Republican party is being formulated by President Roosevelt and his Administration advisers. It had been the President's intention to refrain from discussing his new policies until after the enactment of traffic rate regulation, fearful that if public attention were diverted

from concentration on this mandatory legislation the effort to obtain a remedial law would suffer and perhaps fail. Confident now, however, that this cause is won and that all remaining to be done is to frame the rate bill in the exact phraseology in which it will be enacted, the President and his advisers are looking ahead and planning for further successes.

Expressions of prominent individuals who have talked with the President recently indicate the chief planks which the doughty Roosevelt is striving to hew into proper form for presentation and indorsement. It is known, of course, that he intends to enlarge legislation for the Government regulation of all corporations carrying on interstate business. His plan relative to a suggested income or inheritance tax is yet in embryo, as also are several other ideas which he is cogitating. Tariff revisionists, however, who have talked with the President confidentially, are emphatic in their statement that the President is again squinting toward revision, and has a plan under serious consideration, if not already decided on, in this connection.

EXTRA SESSION TO CUT TARIFF.

They say he has given assurances that while he agrees with the stand-pat advocates that the tariff issue should not be brought into this year's Congress campaign, to divide Republican strength, after a new Republican Congress is elected, which he believes is assured with proper management of the campaign, and after the present Congress shall expire on March 4, next, he will call an extra session, to which he will recommend thorough consideration of the tariff schedules before the national campaign opens. While it is understood the extra session will be called for tariff revision especially, other questions may be suggested to Congress at that time. There seems to be no doubt that the men who ask for tariff revision have obtained a distinct pledge from the President. He has promised an extra session, and has indicated that the stand-pat doctrine must be modified.

To the party at large nothing which has come from the White House recently can be of more vital interest than the statement that the President favors tariff revision next year. Revisionists stick to this statement, and say that is the only assurance which will keep them quiet on the tariff question in the coming campaign. They have agreed, it is said, to work in harmony with the Republican Congress committee on the campaign, and this committee in turn is represented as desiring to work in cooperation with the American Protective Tariff League in the distribution of tariff literature and other Republican doctrine. Evidences accumulate, however, that there will be many a sharp contest over the nominations for Congress in districts where it is asserted sentiment of tariff revision exists.

ARDENT REVISION CAMPAIGN.

Revisionists everywhere are seeking to gain as many nominations as possible for their advocates, so that when the extra session of the new Congress is called next year they will have a better representation than at present. It is ventured by stand-pat believers that the programme as outlined by the President and his advisers, if correctly stated above, is fraught with great danger, and also suggests the companion character to the "man with the muck rake"—"Mr. Facing Bothways."

They point out that if the Republican party is for the maintenance of the Dingley protective tariff law there should be no quibbling or bargaining with revisionists. On the other hand, they say if the sentiment of the party is for tariff revision it should begin immediately, without procrastination or any attempt to deceive the people.

Whether Mr. Roosevelt shall be renominated as a candidate for the Presidency again or not it is evident to all politicians that he has undertaken to write and prepare his party's platform for 1908. There are many misgivings as to the result. It is suggested by prominent, experienced politicians that the best time to write the national platform would be when the national convention of the party assembles two years hence. One of the first contests over party issues and policies will come in the Ohio State convention.

Senator FORAKER to-day wired his opposition to the proposed inheritance and income tax of his party's national leader. Ohio also is strongly for protection.

With its pledge on statehood unfulfilled, its Philippine tariff bill dead in the Senate, its promise to revise the tariff shelved, this party which boasts of past triumphs only has further demonstrated its unfitness to govern by

LACK OF EXECUTIVE ABILITY AND MISMANAGEMENT IN THE AFFAIRS OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

This is an enterprise of such vast importance to the commerce and military power of the United States that all Democrats and Republicans should unite in sincere efforts to speedily consummate it. After four hundred years of interrupted but repeated enterprises on the part of various nations to construct the canal, the world was made to think, when our Government undertook the task of constructing the canal, that within a few years it would be open to the commerce. Never were the American people more universally in favor of any project. Never were they more united in a hearty wish to see any purpose accomplished. It must be admitted that the task is a great one, and that it presents scientific difficulties not readily discerned by the unskilled, that climatic conditions and labor troubles there have added to the embarrassments naturally incident to so great an undertaking; but if the Administration had been trying not to build the canal it could not have succeeded better. Millions of dollars expended and no definite conclusion yet reached as to the kind of canal to be constructed.

The Commission that reported, recommending the Panama route as the most practical, said that one year would be required for preparation, and five years, certainly not more than ten, for completion. Two years have elapsed since the ratification of the treaty, and still the work of preparation goes on. Little actual work has been done. Everything seems to be in confusion. It is evident that some changes must be made in the administration of affairs on the Isthmus. It was unfair in the beginning to impose the task of overseeing this work upon the President. His duties are certainly numerous and burdensome enough already. But, in my humble judgment, until some master spirit be chosen and intrusted with the responsibility in the construction of this canal, the work will never be completed. If it requires three years to decide upon whether the canal shall be a sea-level or a lock and dam canal, it will probably require fifty years to complete it. By good management, I believe, it will take fifteen years to open up this canal to commerce. This is, of course, but a rough estimate. These delays that have occurred have been calculated to discredit the undertaking in the mind of the public. There are many railroads in this country, having interests which might be detrimentally affected by the construction of the Panama Canal, which desire to beget distrust in the public mind and cause the project to be abandoned. But this canal must be built. Built as quickly and as cheaply as possibly, but whether it costs much or little, whether it takes a decade or a quarter of a century, it must be completed. The public interest demands it.

The expenditure of vast sums will be legitimately required. Democrats will cooperate with Republicans in suppressing extravagant and useless appropriations. The sum required to complete this great work will exceed, I fear, by many million dollars the greatest amount now estimated. With the citizenship of the entire country indorsing and supporting the enterprise, with both parties united in an earnest effort to open to the commerce of all the world this great canal, may we not hope that a quickening of the officials in charge will cause a prompt fulfillment of our promise to provide this great waterway between North and South America?

Determined, it seems, to maintain throughout the Congress its record for inefficiency, the Republican party has not only violated its pledge to give statehood to Oklahoma and Indian Territory, Arizona and New Mexico, suffered helpless defeat of the Philippine tariff, refused to revise the general tariff schedules, mismanaged the construction of the Panama Canal, and wasted millions of dollars of public treasure, but, with singular consistency for incompetence,

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS FAILED TO PASS ITS PET MEASURE, THE RATE BILL.

The paramount issue before the Fifty-eighth Congress was the so-called "rate bill." After much consideration this body passed the Townsend-Esch bill, which was understood to embody the principles indorsed by the President, and sent the measure over to the Senate, where it was promptly and with all due ceremony buried beneath mountains of "unlimited debate."

In the early days of the present session we were told that an effective measure extending the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and authorizing that body to fix rates under certain conditions to remain in force until declared to be unjust or unreasonable by a court of competent jurisdiction upon final hearing, would find easy passage through the Congress. Accordingly we submitted to a rule which forbade amendments, and with our usual credulity believed all we were told. Notwithstanding the bill has been before the Senate for many months, that great body is slowly crucifying it between "limited and unlimited court review" on the one hand, and "jurisdiction and judicial power" on the other. The country anxiously awaits the issue. What its determination will be no tongue can tell. "Prophets may prophesy and captives pray;" autocracy mocks at them all and, surrounded by its instruments of power, bids defiance to public weal or will.

The Constitution, designed to be a bulwark of liberty behind which an oppressed people might entrench and defend themselves against the aggressions of tyrannical power, is invoked by learned and able lawyers throughout the country and elsewhere representing the railroads to defeat this legislation.

Sir, I do not claim to be a constitutional lawyer in the sense of the term as now commonly applied. I hope I may be pardoned for suggesting that gentlemen truly eminent and devoted to their profession do not need to assert their devotion to the principles of our national Constitution which they have sworn to support. If to be a "constitutional lawyer" means that one must espouse unjust causes and apply hair-splitting distinctions to the detriment of the public, I confess I do not desire the appellation. But if to be a constitutional lawyer means a lawyer diligent and studious in his profession, who professes and has, in fact, firm and unshaken confidence in the fundamental principles of his Government and the great instrument expressing them; who believes that the public, yielding a part of its sovereignty to a corporation, does not so divest itself of power as to become unable to direct and control its creatures and prevent injustice and abuse; if to be a constitutional lawyer means one who, possessing an enduring faith in the per-

petuity of republican government, the patriotism of American citizenship, would not invoke technicalities to defeat the ends and aims of justice, then, sir, I might humbly hope to claim that proud distinction. With rare diplomacy and admirable skill, with magic words and witch-like methods, the greatest legal talent in this country has been bought by transportation corporations with a view of finding some defect in the statute we may enact and in the end defeating the purposes of our deliberations. It behooves us to be careful; yet we must also be aggressive.

The public has suffered long and patiently at the hands of its own creatures. It now demands redress of wrongs, remedies that will prove effective and complete. The railroads have made the singular mistake of conceiving that it is really no part of the public's business what they charge, or how, for transportation. They have disregarded the primary consideration that they, by public grace, are exercising public functions and must be fair and impartial in their operations. Willful and often repeated violations of law, committed in a spirit of open or covert defiance, has brought about the necessity and demand for this legislation. The public will not be deceived. No makeshift, no ineffective compromise can or ought to be accepted. The battle is now on. The citizens of this country are enlisted heart and soul. Are we in earnest? Do we mean to stand for the right as our consciences command, or shall we avert the continuance of the conflict by accepting an amendment to the House bill which will give substantial victory to the railroads? The contest is already long drawn out. It remains to be seen whether this House will yield to the Senate when the Senate is wrong, or whether it will stand firm for the rights of the people, whom we assume to represent.

In the Senate, gentlemen of the majority, your leaders have styled rate regulation legislation as Democratic in principle. In order to avoid responsibility for results they have manifested a willingness to yield the glory of a promised victory to their political antagonists. For my part, heartily indorsing and approving those declarations in favor of this legislation contained in the national platforms of my party, I am willing to bear my share of the responsibility attaching to this legislation. My only fear is that cunning and intrigue will work so effectively against the cause of the people in this matter that in the end we will "give them a stone for bread, and a serpent for fish." [Applause on Democratic side.]

There are yet other important particulars in which the party in power has disappointed the country. With the Dingley rates still in force, you have so lavishly and extravagantly expended the public moneys that an appropriation for public buildings has been held back.

I sincerely hope that it will be found practical and consistent to pass a reasonable omnibus buildings bill at the present session, and thus evidence to the country the readiness and willingness of the Government to conserve the general welfare. Have we millions for fortifying island possessions and not a dollar for adding to the comfort of our own citizens in building suitable court-houses and post-office buildings?

Moreover, gentlemen of the majority, you profess to be the friend and champion of organized labor. Have you not totally *failed and refused to recognize the demands of organized labor throughout the Fifty-eighth Congress and up till the present?*

What legislation of general importance have you passed or tried to enact in the interest of labor? On this subject, as on many others, you have either intentionally refused to comply with any petition of organized labor, or you have been so hopelessly divided that you dared not undertake to consider and discuss important issues relating to this subject. Dozens of bills indorsed by labor organizations and vital in importance you have denied consideration. And yet, is not labor entitled to its fair reward? Does its strength not support all our institutions? What has it not done for the progress and betterment of mankind? In the language of another:

> Who can adequately describe the triumphs of labor urged on by the potent spell of profit? It has extorted the secrets of the universe and trained its myriad powers into forms of use and beauty. From the bosom of the old creation it has developed anew the creation of industry and of art. It has been its delight and its task to overcome obstacles. Mountains have been leveled and valleys have been exalted before it. It has broken the rocky soil into the fertile glade, crowned the hilltops with verdure, and bound round the feet of ocean ridges of golden corn. Up from the sunless and hoary deeps it drags its spotless marbles and rears its palaces of pomp. It marches steadily on over the swelling flood and through the mountain clefts. It fans its way through the winds of ocean, tramples them in its course, surges and mingles them with flakes of fire. Civilization follows in its pathway. It achieves grander victories, weaves more durable trophies than the conqueror. His name becomes tainted and his monuments crumble, but labor converts his red battlefields into gardens and erects monuments significant of better things. It rides in a chariot driven by the wind. It writes with the lightning. It sits crowned as a queen in a thousand cities and sends up its roar of triumph from a million wheels. It glistens in the glossy fabric of the loom, rings and sparkles in the steely hammer. It glories in shapes of beauty and speaks in words of power. It makes the sinewy arm invincible with might, the poor man's heart rich with content, and crowns the swarthy, sweaty brow with dignity, with honor, and with peace.

[Applause on Democratic side.]

It appears from the record the Republican party has made that it has added to its many other violated pledges the crime of continued disregard of the appeals and entreaties of those who toil. What, I repeat, has it accomplished?

The Administration has been unfortunate in its prosecutions under the antitrust law. In the great Northern Securities suit it was the means of enriching those who had violated the law. It failed to prosecute these violations of law.

It undertook to prosecute the packers for repeated offenses against the antitrust statutes. The court held them immune from prosecution because an agent of the Government in the discharge of his duties had obtained information which was voluntarily furnished by the packers or their agents. Certainly the Administration is not to blame for this decision. It is merely unfortunate. The able and efficient Attorney-General was mortified at the decision, and the President indorsed his opinion of the case. His message to this body on yesterday leaves no mind uncertain as to what are his views on this subject. Among other things, he said:

> In offenses of this kind it is at the best hard enough to execute justice upon offenders. Our system of criminal jurisprudence has descended to us from a period when the danger was lest the accused should not have his rights adequately preserved, and it is admirably framed to meet this danger. But at present the danger is just the reverse—that is, the danger nowadays is not that the innocent man will be convicted of crime, but that the guilty man will go scot-free. This is especially the case where the crime is one of greed and cunning perpetrated by a man of great wealth in the course of those business operations where the code of conduct is at variance not merely with the code of humanity and morality, but with the code as established in the law of the land. It is much easier, but much less effective, to proceed against a corporation than to proceed against the individuals in that corporation who are themselves responsible for the wrongdoing. Very naturally outside persons, who have no knowledge of the facts and no responsibility for the success of the proceedings, are apt to clamor for action against the individuals. The Department of Justice has, most wisely, invariably refused thus to proceed against individuals, unless it was convinced both that they were in fact guilty and that there was at least a reasonable chance of establishing this fact of their guilt. These beef-packing cases offered one of the very few instances where there was not only the moral certainty that the accused men were guilty, but what seemed, and now seems, sufficient legal evidence of the fact.
>
> But in obedience to the explicit order of the Congress the Commissioner of Corporations had investigated the beef-packing business. The counsel for the beef packers explicitly admitted that there was no claim that any promise of immunity had been given by Mr. Garfield, as shown by the following colloquy during the argument of the Attorney-General:
>
> "Mr. MOODY. * * * I dismiss almost with a word the claim that Mr. Garfield promised immunity. Whether there is any evidence of such a promise or not I do not know and I do not care.
>
> "Mr. MILLER (the counsel for the beef packers). There is no claim of it.
>
> "Mr. MOODY. Then I was mistaken, and I will not even say that word."
>
> But Judge Humphrey holds that if the Commissioner of Corporations (and therefore if the Interstate Commerce Commission) in the course of any investigations prescribed by Congress asks any questions of a person not called as a witness, or asks any questions of an officer of a corporation not called as a witness, with regard to the action of the corporation on a subject out of which prosecutions may subsequently arise, then the fact of such questions having been asked operates as a bar to the prosecution of that person or of that officer of the corporation for his own misdeeds. Such interpretation of the law comes measureably near making the law a farce; and I therefore recommend that the Congress pass a declaratory act stating its real intention.

Your party, Mr. Chairman, by every test has been found wanting. It has become a negative organization, torn and distracted by factions, and is either unwilling or afraid to carry out its policies. Many solemn pledges it has openly violated. It has failed to keep its most sacred obligations. It yet has the opportunity to keep faith with the country. The hour has arrived when Republicans must make good their promises to enact important legislation or suffer overwhelming defeat next November. Our people, without regard to party lines, are patriotic. They love the institutions founded by our fathers. They are devoted to the principles of government which make them free. This is a common ground on which we all may meet. Confessing my own ignorance, but professing sincere faith in the courage, the allegiance to conscience of my associates in this Chamber, I look forward to an early day when the public may realize their hopes in the fulfillment of the promises made to them; when Oklahoma and Indian Territory shall be crowned with the full glory of statehood; when justice shall be meted out to the Philippines; when every thief shall be scourged from the temple; when the railroads shall be made to recognize the equal rights of all the citizens who created them; when tariff schedules shall be so readjusted as to meet every reasonable demand for revenue, but not repel and antagonize foreign governments with whom we trade; when toil shall have full recom-

pense, and honesty its just reward. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WANGER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, the announcement of the Speaker's signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title was received:

S. R. 48. Joint resolution for the relief of sufferers from earthquake and conflagration on the Pacific coast.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, during the long session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, approaching as we were our last Presidential and Congressional election, the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], said, in this House, in substance, that he was "too smart to meddle with the tariff approaching an election," although the Democrats were then, as now, urging the Republicans to reform the tariff. A few days ago the same gentleman, speaking for his party, again gave in substance the same excuse for deferring tariff legislation, and close behind him the distinguished Speaker of this House, in a published letter, took the same position and said, in effect, if not literally, that if the people wanted tariff reform they could elect a Democratic House.

I was not aware that any tariff was made to perpetuate any party in power. I have always understood that our Constitution and our laws were made for the benefit of our people—our forefathers and their posterity.

By the very words of the Constitution the fathers declared that sacred instrument was, in part, ordained to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." But nowhere do I read that the Constitution or our tariff laws say they were framed to continue in power either the Republican or the Democratic or any other party. But it seems in this day of frenzied finance and of frenzied party duty that a different construction is placed upon the Constitution and our tariff laws by the Republican party.

The present tariff was enacted in 1897. Later its rates were raised because of the Spanish war under the usual promise that this Spanish war tax would be "temporary," but in the main it has remained permanent. This tariff is, then, nine years old. It has existed and remained fixed amidst rapid changes in economic, public, and private conditions. Always oppressive, it has grown so burdensome and its offspring, the trusts, have become so gigantic and dangerous, that the people demand "justice," they demand "domestic tranquillity," they demand that the "blessings of liberty" be secured to "ourselves and our posterity," but the Republicans "stand pat," although they indirectly confess that the tariff should be reformed if they could find a time not before but after some Congressional election. When will that time come?

Was the Dingley tariff fixed by and to be perpetuated for the benefit of those who control elections? If so, can not the same parties again control the election? Were the managers of the election the people? Maybe so; it seems not. If the tariff is to be reformed by its friends, surely the Republican party is the friend of the present tariff, but its stand-pat policy demonstrates the Republican party is also the enemy of the people, for they demand tariff reform. The Republicans not only enacted the present tariff, but stand by it to the present moment, and by their acts, if not words, say it shall not be reformed before an election and they neglect to reform it after an election. When, then, can it be reformed? The Speaker says, "Elect a Democratic House."

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to make to-day any new suggestions on tariff reform. My object is the very opposite—that is, I propose to uncover some of the old suggestions and thereby remind the Republicans that their stand-pat policy is new and that they are making and not repeating history; to remind them, if you please, that the stand-pat party of to-day is not the Republican party of Lincoln, who in a speech delivered at Pittsburg February 15, 1861, in discussing the tariff in part said:

> Every varying circumstance will require frequent modifications as to the amount (of tariff) needed and the sources of supply. So far there is little difference of opinion among the people. * * * We should do neither more nor less than we gave the people reason to believe we would when they gave us their votes.

Mr. Lincoln was not a stand-patter, as these, his words, indicate, and the many tariff acts he approved, the very titles of which, often literally, stated that they were to be "temporary," while repeatedly Mr. Morrill, who had these bills in charge in the House, stated they were war tariffs, were "temporary," and were levied for revenue purposes to better prosecute our unfortunate civil war.

TARIFF ACTS APPROVED BY LINCOLN.

The tariff act of July 14, 1862, was entitled "An act increasing *temporarily* the duties on imports, and for other purposes."

The act of April 29, 1864, was entitled "Joint resolution to increase, *temporarily*, the duties on imports."

The act of June 30, 1864, was entitled "An act to increase duties on imports, and for other purposes." The title to this act, not using the word "temporarily," Mr. Morrill, in urging its passage, felt called on to say:

> This is intended as a war measure, a *temporary* measure, and we must give it our support *as such*.

The very first tariff act approved by President Lincoln—the law of August 5, 1861—was entitled "An act to provide increased revenues from imports, pay interest on the public debt, and for other purposes."

NO "PROTECTION" HERE.

Mr. Blaine says, in his Twenty Years in Congress, that the people had become so satisfied with the happy results of the revenue-tariff policy, inaugurated by the Democrats in 1846, that not one of the three great political parties in the campaign of 1856, in their platforms, even "winked" at the tariff question; and after speaking of the prosperous low-tariff era—from 1846 to 1860, and the first nomination of Mr. Lincoln, in 1860—he alludes thus to the tariff plank framed by that convention:

> The convention therefore avoided the use of the word "protection," and was contented with the moderate declaration that "sound public policy" requires such an adjustment of imports as will encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country.

It is then very clear that Mr. Lincoln was not a stand-patter, and that he did not believe in prohibitory tariffs, in time of peace particularly.

I shall make it clear that Mr. Garfield was not a stand-patter. That he was a tariff reformer and urged, with force and effect, a reduction of our war tariffs enacted because of the needs of the civil war. He repeatedly stated, as I shall show, that he believed in a tariff which permitted fair foreign competition to prevent monopoly, and said "I am for a protection which leads to ultimate free trade."

With as little comment as possible, I shall proceed to show, from Republican authority in the main, that we can not have free trade in this country as long as we levy a tariff to meet the necessary expenses and obligations of the Federal Government. I shall show that the old leaders of the Republican party commended the revenue tariff of 1846, enacted by the Democrats, but that they, yielding to the wishes of the people, and to stop a dangerous amount of revenues from accumulating in the Treasury, voted for the very low tariff of 1857—the lowest since 1812—and that these Republican leaders, with manly frankness, confessed in this House and elsewhere that from 1846 to 1860 there was an era of general prosperity.

I shall further show that Republican leaders, some living today, have spoken and voted for laws placing the "monopolized article" on the free list, not only to free the article monopolized but to restore to the oppressed people their right of absolute free trade within and throughout the several States. In recent years the Republicans have defeated all such propositions offered by Democrats.

In 1867 Mr. Sherman, who was often thereafter honored by his party, said:

> It is therefore simply absurd to talk about free trade, and to talk about a protective tariff is unnecessary, because the wit of man could not possibly frame a tariff that would produce $140,000,000 in gold without protecting our domestic industries.

It was about this time that some of the considerate Republicans were trying to reduce our civil war tariffs. In 1867 our customs revenue was $176,417,810, and our total imports were valued at $378,158,683. So Mr. Sherman saw that under these circumstances there was room for tariff reform and still give protection to our domestic industries. The last report of Secretary Shaw states this:

> The revenues of the Government from all sources (by warrant) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905 were:
> From "customs," $261,798,856.91, and our total "receipts" from all sources last year were $697,101,269.95.

So you can see there is room here for tariff reform along the lines suggested by Mr. Sherman.

In 1883 Mr. Samuel J. Randall, a protection Democrat, from Pennsylvania, uttered these words:

> In my judgment the question of free trade will not arise practically in this country during our lives, if ever, so long as we have to raise revenues by duties on imports; and therefore the discussion of that principle is an absolute waste of time. After our public debt is paid in full, our expenditures can hardly be much below $200,000,000, and if this is levied in a businesslike way and in an intelligent manner

it will afford adequate protection to our industrial interests in the United States.

Secretary Shaw, in his last report, states that "the outstanding principal of the public debt of the United States, June 30, 1905, was $2,274,615,063.84," and that our total expenditures (not "public debt," mind you, but "expenditures") during the last fiscal year were $720,105,498.55, "showing," says he, "a deficit of $23,204,228.60," under the highest tariff, I may add, we ever had.

Surely at this day and time neither Mr. Sherman nor Mr. Randall would be stand-patters in the face of such burdens as these, and surely there is here shown plenty of room to levy a tariff that would avoid actual free trade, as well as the evils of protection, "the mother of trusts." Surely there is room for tariff reform at the present day along the lines suggested by Mr. Randall or Mr. Sherman.

I now ask the committee to let me read much in little. On March 24, 1870 (Appendix Globe, p. 192), will be found the tariff-reform speech delivered in this House by Mr. ALLISON, now Senator, a leading and much-respected Republican. After stating our obligations to be, "annual interest, $125,000,000; sinking fund required, $25,000,000," Mr. ALLISON said:

So that good faith requires at least $150,000,000 from imports.

Nevertheless, he demanded a reduction of the tariff, and proceeded, and in part argued, as follows:

The practical question is, How shall these duties be proportioned among the various articles imported so as to take out of the pockets of the people the least possible sum over and above the actual amount placed in the Treasury, meanwhile discriminating in favor of articles of necessary consumption, and against articles of voluntary consumption, commonly denominated luxuries?

Impost duties thus levied, with an annual importation of about $450,000,000 in value, will certainly require an average rate of duty sufficient to give our producers of manufactured products greatly the advantage over the manufacturers of similar products in foreign countries.

In brief, Mr. ALLISON, in 1870, argued that to raise from customs $150,000,000 would give our manufacturers "greatly the advantage over" the manufacturers of similar products in foreign countries. Mr. ALLISON continued his great speech in the following language:

It is claimed that the high rates of our present tariff are necessary because the revenue to be obtained therefrom is essential to the Government, and that if we reduce the rates at all the effect will be the depression of all the industrial interests of the country.

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any that we have ever had. If any interest was depressed under the tariff of 1846, it was the iron interest.

I do not believe that this interest, as compared with other interests, had sufficient advantage under that tariff; yet when we compare the growth of the country from 1840 to 1850 with the growth of the country from 1850 to 1860, the latter decade being entirely under the tariff of 1846 or the amended and greatly reduced tariff of 1857, we find that the increase in our wealth between 1850 and 1860 was equivalent to 126 per cent, while it was only 64 per cent between 1840 and 1850, four years of which decade were under the tariff of 1842, known as a high protective tariff, but the average rate of which was about 70 per cent below the existing rate, or 27 per cent under the tariff of 1842, as against 44 per cent upon all importations under the present tariff. Our industries were generally prosperous in 1860, with the exception, possibly, of the iron industry.

This was the statement of Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, on this floor during the discussions of the tariff in 1864.

With regard to the condition of the steel industry in 1860, the steel manufacturers in 1866, memorializing Congress for increase of duties on steel, stated that "it was reserved to Pittsburg to bring about the first substantial and enduring success in the year 1860; and, encouraged by our example, numerous establishments have sprung into existence, as already indicated in this paper."

This shows that under the revenue tariff of 1857, which imposed only an ad valorem duty of 12 per cent on steel, a substantial success was achieved in the steel manufacture in 1860. I have read the language of the memorial.

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, in part thus speaks of the revenue tariff of 1846:

Moreover, the tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition at the time his administration was organized. Money became very abundant after the year 1849; large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine.

As a further evidence that the people were wedded to the principles of a revenue only tariff, even of the lowest of all our "tariffs (act 1857) since 1812," I quote now from Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, afterwards Vice-President, who, in speaking of the act of 1857, in 1861 said:

It is very easy for a gentleman of the Northwest to rise on this floor and talk about protection to Pennsylvania and New England and to say that his people have no protection; but, sir, standing here to-day, I express it as my deliberate judgment that there are not half a dozen States—and I doubt whether there be among them all one—so little interested in changing the tariff as the State of Massachusetts. I say further, as the representative of that State, I know that in voting for this bill I am voting against the wishes of a large portion of the people of my State, who believe the present tariff better for us than your proposed tariff; and I vote, too, against my own deliberate judgment, for I had rather stand on the tariff of 1857 than take this bill.

Several SENATORS. Then, why vote for it?

Mr. WILSON. I vote for it to increase the revenues of the Government. * * * I want no man to vote for this bill in order to protect the interests of Massachusetts; for the tariff of 1857, precisely and exactly as it stands upon your statute books to-day, so far as the productive industry of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is concerned, in all its various departments, amounting to $350,000,000 annually, is the best tariff ever put upon the statute books of this country. That is my judgment; and by passing this bill we shall gain nothing as a State. I shall vote for the bill, but I vote for it to raise revenue; I vote for it as a revenue measure.

It is true that we had a panic in 1857, and the stand-patters insist, therefore, that we should not reduce the tariff at the present day. But I insist that we have had panics also under protective tariffs. Examples—panics of 1873 and 1893.

Representative JOHN J. GARDNER (Republican), in a hearing before the Industrial Commission, 1901, put the usual Republican question to Edward Atkinson, to wit:

Q. You have studied this question in all its lines, and particularly historical. Is it or is it not historically true that ever since we have been maintaining a tariff that when the tariff was highest our manufacturers were most busy and our country most prosperous, and that the periods when our tariffs were lowest marked—by coincidence, if you please—the periods of idleness and depression in this country?

Mr. ATKINSON. My direct experience and personal knowledge begins in 1842 and goes down through the tariff of 1846, which, being a horizontal tariff, *putting up* the duties on wool while it put down the duties on goods, had a very disastrous effect. It was attributed to free-trade, but it was really due to the *advance* in duties on wool.

I then come down to the tariff of 1857, the lowest ever known in this country, with the largest free list. The period from 1857 to the beginning of the civil war saw the most steady and constant development of the textile manufacturers of this country that I have ever known. I do not think there has been any such historic coincidence as you suggest.

Q. As a matter of history, was not the year 1857 the year of the great panic, from which we never recovered until the outbreak of the war?

Mr. ATKINSON. It was the year of the great bank panic, in which two of the commission houses to which my goods were consigned suspended payment. That lasted but a few months and was purely a *financial* panic. It did not interfere with the progress of arts and industries, *and in 1858 great prosperity had returned.*

We were building the Lewiston mills and the Indian Orchard mills, and I was familiar with the whole business. From that time until the beginning of the war we saw the most steady progressive condition of prosperity in the textile art that I have ever known.

In 1870 Mr. Garfield repeated in this House his utterances on tariff reform made in 1866, in which he said:

I stand now where I have always stood since I have been a Member of this House. I take the liberty of quoting from the Congressional Globe of 1866 the following remarks, which I then made on the subject of the tariff:

"We have seen that one extreme school of economists would place the price of all manufactured articles in the hands of foreign producers by rendering it impossible for our manufacturers to compete with them, while the other extreme school, by making it impossible for the foreigner to sell his competing wares in our markets, would give the people no immediate check upon the prices which our manufacturers might fix for their products.

"I disagree with both these extremes.

"I hold that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best gauge by which to regulate the international trade. Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign products, *but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy the monopoly of the trade, and regulate the prices as they please.* This is my doctrine of protection.

"If Congress pursues this line of policy steadily, we shall, year by year, approach more nearly to the basis of free trade, because we shall be more nearly able to compete with other nations on equal terms.

"I am for a protection which leads to ultimate free trade.

I repeat that afterwards, in 1880, the Republican party made Mr. Garfield President of the United States. Now, gentlemen, let me go a step further. I will show you in a few words from statements of Mr. Henry O. Havemeyer, president of the sugar trust, to the Industrial Commission, what these high tariffs do. He said:

The mother of all trusts is the customs-tariff bill. The existing bill and the preceding one have been the occasion of the formation of all the large trusts, with very few exceptions, inasmuch as they provide for an inordinate protection to all the interests of the country, sugar refining excepted.

In fact, the tariff bill clutches the people by the throat, and then the governors and the attorney-generals of the several States take action, not against the *cause*, but against the machinery which the people employ to rifle the public's pockets.

In support of this statement I again remind you that under the revenue-only tariff of 1846 we had no trusts and no multimillionaires, but had an overflowing Treasury and general prosperity for our forefathers and their posterity.

Mr. Garfield (June 14, 1878, Forty-fifth Congress, Appendix, p. 293) demanded tariff reform, and evidently feared the uprising of these "captains of industry" to oppress the people. He said:

What is that point of equilibrium? In my judgment it is this: A rate so high that foreign producers can not flood our markets and break down our home manufacturers, but not so high as to keep them altogether out. Enabling our manufacturers to combine and raise the prices not so high as to stimulate an unnatural and unhealthy growth of manufacturers.

In other words, I would have the duty so adjusted that every great American industry can fairly live and make fair profits; and yet so low that if our manufacturers attempted to put up prices unreasonably the competition from abroad would come in and bring down prices to a fair rate.

Such a tariff, I believe, will be supported by the majority of the Americans. We are not barred from having such a tariff in our present law. In some respects we have departed from that standard. Wherever it does, we should amend it, and by so doing we shall secure stability and prosperity.

FREE LISTING THE MONOPOLIZED ARTICLE.

I now take a step further and will show that great Republican leaders have insisted on placing the monopolized article on the free list to free the article and give the tariff-taxed people an open chance to procure substance to maintain their homes and families and at prices as reasonable, *as low as they should be, under the circumstances.*

October 15, 1899, Mr. Sherman said:

The primary object of a protective tariff is to invite the fullest competition of individuals and corporations in domestic production. If the individuals or corporations combine to advance the price of a domestic product to prevent free result of open and fair competition, I would without a moment's hesitation—

Mark that, gentlemen—

I would without a moment's hesitation reduce the duties on foreign goods competiting with them, in order to break down the combination. Whenever this competition is evaded or avoided by combination of individuals or manufacturers, the duty should be reduced and foreign competition promptly invited.

And on March 21, 1890, Mr. Sherman said:

If the combination is aided by our tariff laws they should be promptly changed, and if necessary equal competition with all the world should be invited in the monopolized article.

Thus spoke the late Governor Mount (Republican), of Indiana, in 1899:

I am against trusts. Remove the protection from the article controlled by trusts, thereby permitting open competition, and see how quickly these trusts will come to their senses.

Again, Senator Washburn (Republican), of Minnesota, in 1899, said:

The Republican party has got to disconnect itself from trusts, and wherever they find the trust is depending for its exorbitant profits largely on protective duties it will be the duty of Republican Congressmen and Senators to remove the duties at once. This should be done with the duty on steel rails and tin plate.

Repeatedly have the Republicans in these latter years defeated Democratic propositions in this House to free list the monopolized article. You will not dispute that.

On June 6, 1870, by vote—ayes 112, noes 78, not voting 40 (Globe, vol. 43, p. 4101)—the House passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means is hereby instructed, at the earliest moment practicable, to report a bill to this House to abolish the tariff on coal, so as to secure that important article of fuel to the people free from all taxes.

Among those voting "aye" were Messrs. ALLISON and CULLOM, now Senators; the late Senator Hawley; John A. Logan, afterwards Senator and the nominee of his party for Vice-President; B. F. Butler, afterwards governor of Massachusetts; Mr. Dawes, and others—all Republicans.

But this is not all of the record of the Republican party before it wandered away from the path of political rectitude, I may charitably say. I go a step further.

Mr. HALE, now Senator, while a Member of this House, in 1871, denounced the salt monopoly, protected by our tariff, as he said, by 18 cents a hundred pounds and 24 cents in sacks, and then said:

The best Turks Island salt can be purchased at the place produced at 9 and 10 cents per bushel. I believe there is no one question about which the reflection of millions of people day by day is so decided as it is in declaring that there should be no tax upon this article of salt. I have been asked to amend the bill introduced by me, so as to cut down the duty 50 per cent. I do not consent to that. I believe this article should be put upon the free list; that the monopoly which has obtained heretofore for the Onondaga Salt Works—as great and complete as any monopoly ever planted by the Tudors in England's most despotic times—ought to cease.

He said, to break down this monopoly, salt ought to be placed upon the "free list."

Again, a little later, May 18, 1872, Mr. Garfield took the same position. He said:

American salt for two years past has been sold in Toronto, Canada, at a dollar less per barrel than on the New York side of the lake. That is—

He said—

we produced it, shipped it across, paying whatever portage, freights, and transportation were required, and then sold to our Canadian neighbors at a dollar per barrel less than it was sold to people on our shores. Certainly gentlemen will not want a duty continued that enables that thing to be done.

Again, gentlemen, Senator ALLISON, on March 25——

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman pardon me for a minute?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I was out in Michigan a few years, a good many years after the date of the statements read by the gentleman, and I found salt selling there at 75 cents a barrel, and the barrel costing 25 cents. What was the occasion of that?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If you will turn back, my dear and distinguished friend, you will find that in the State of New York in 1855 the railroads of that State charged $1.95 per mile per passenger, and now the rate all over the country is down to about 2 cents per mile, and you have voted in this Congress to regulate railroads in order to make the charge even less than that when, *under the circumstances,* that rate of 2 cents a mile is shown in a suit to be *unreasonable.* The average freight rate in New York in 1855 per mile was $2.02. It is now less in the country at large than 8 cents.

The gentleman knows the cause of low rates and prices is improved machinery, improved artisans, better educated labor. In the main, these things combined have wrought this change. It is not a question of whether or not a thing is cheaper now than it was when you were a boy or a soldier. That is not the question. The crucial question is: Is the product or toll as *cheap under the circumstances as it should be?* And I say that when our manufacturers sell products to foreigners cheaper than they do to your home folks, which they boldly admit, they are doing for our people at home a great injustice. I want to say to my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that if he will read the speeches of Henry Clay, as I dare say he has—for I have never heard anything good that he has not read—or if he will read some of the leading speeches of some of the great founders of his party, he will find there an expressed or implied promise made to the American people that, "If you will bear this protective tariff tax for a while, we, your manufacturers, will make and sell you the cheapest and best products in the world." But the manufacturers have not kept their promise. They have not kept the faith. They sell, and admit they do, the foreigner cheaper than they sell the same article to our own people.

In speaking about salt, Mr. Allison, March 25, 1870, said:

I only wish to add that I believe the duty upon that article is unnecessarily burdensome to the consumer and ought not to remain, even upon the theory of the protectionists themselves. A duty of 18 to 24 cents per hundred pounds is imposed on salt. This heavy duty was imposed to compensate for the internal tax of 6 cents per 100 pounds. This internal tax was one of the first repealed, and yet this heavy duty remains. In the name of protection we are told that if a reduction is made the effect will be to destroy the industry of the salt manufacturer.

Mr. Allison then showed that the salt industry had prospered in 1858 under a low tariff and made a favorable comparison of the salt business of that year with the same business in 1868 and 1869, and then said:

It is an indisputable fact that in most instances the price is enhanced to the full extent of the duty. The duty in 1869 was from 18 to 24 cents. In 1858 it was 15 per cent.

Mr. MAHON. In the Fifty-third Congress the Democrats passed the Wilson bill. How did you get along?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. MAHON. I say that you followed Garfield and Sherman, and all these people, in the Fifty-third Congress, and passed the Wilson bill. How did you get along?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will tell you. If the Republicans had not enacted the McKinley tariff bill, which produced a deficit in the Treasury and broke down the credit of the Government and compelled President Cleveland to issue bonds, and a Pennsylvania judge had not outraged his high office and destroyed the income tax, included in the Wilson Act, that law would have gotten along all right.

Mr. MAHON. I wanted to know what did it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is certainly my judgment; that is the way I think about it. And I want to say about the Wilson Act that was not a purely revenue act; it was a step in the right direction. It was a Democratic act that I did not in all its parts indorse, but I did indorse the income-tax proposition, and I hope the President will get the members of his party to be as good Democrats as he has proven of late to be about a great many matters, and we will have before long some kind of a justifiable tax on incomes and inherited property.

Mr. MAHON. If we put the Democrats in power for four years there will be no income.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am satisfied that if there occurs any "income" anywhere at any time, the Republicans will be sure to claim it. [Laughter.]

In 1880, Mr. Gear, late Senator from Iowa, demanded that the tariff be reduced to destroy the monopoly in Bessemer steel rails, saying that a proper reduction would remove the monopoly. He said:

The manufacturers of this class of rails in the United States are controlled by a combination of not exceeding, I think, ten firms. This combination is protected by high and specific tariff, which prevents the

importation of foreign rails to any extent, thereby increasing the cost of the rails to the country.

He further said that the existing tariff put immense profits into the pockets of the monopoly, composed of but few persons, at the expense indirectly not only of the farmers of Iowa, but the whole West.

Mr. Chairman, in 1880 the tariff, ad valorem, on steel rails was $28 per ton. The home price of rails was $67.50, foreign price $23.12; difference, $32.22. (Industrial Com. Rept., Vol. XIII, p. 625.)

Let me recur for a moment or two to what Seantor Gear said in 1880. He said steel rails were in the hands of a few manufacturers, and wanted the tariff reduced, that railroads in the West might purchase and build railroads cheaper, for the betterment of the farmer.

On May 11, 1901, Mr. Schwab, of the Carnegie steel concern, before the Industrial Commission, said this :

Q. Is it a fact generally proved of all exporters in this country that they do sell at lower prices in foreign markets than they do in the home markets?—A. That is true, perfectly true.

Q. Would you say that when business is in a normal condition the export prices are regularly somewhat lower than home prices?—A. Oh, yes; always.

Q. Suppose you take the case of steel rails. Could you give about the difference between the export and domestic price?—A. I would have to make a guess; I do not know exactly. The export price is about $23 a ton.

Q. And the price here?—A. Was $26 and $28.

Q. At the same time?—A. At the same time.

The Republicans and the manufacturers may think that it is right, a proper "trick" in trade, to oppress our people, who have been tariff taxed for a half century to build up manufactories under the promise that the tariff would be temporary and that soon they would sell to our people the cheapest and best goods in the world, and yet to-day they sell the cheapest and best goods in the world to only foreign markets; but I think it is an outrage and an abuse that the American people should not stand, and I do not believe they will, when they are advised of these facts.

Mr. Havemeyer, before the Industrial Commission, said this:

Without the tariff I doubt if we should have dared to take the risk of forming the trust. It could have been done; but I certainly should not have risked all I had, which was then embarked in the sugar business, in a trust unless the business had been protected as it was by the tariff.

* * * * * * *

Steel rails were exported at the time the steel schedule was under discussion. They were being sent to England and Scotland. They can be produced for $15 a ton; they are worth $24 a ton. Now, the reason they are worth $24 a ton is because the people, under the tariff, are mulcted for the difference. I am not talking about things that are ancient history; I am talking about things that exist. I am not talking as to whether 100 per cent was necessary or not. I am talking about the effect of the tariff to-day, which is the mother of these trusts which are mulcting the people, and there is not a line of it free from this abuse to-day.

But, gentlemen, Mr. Schwab in his testimony made a statement that I bring home to you to-day, seriously as I can, as honestly as I know how, and I ask you to give particular attention to his words:

Q. Do you think that men of limited capital can start in business and become large owners as readily now, under this system, as they did formerly?

Mr. SCHWAB. I do not quite understand that.

Q. Has a person or a company with limited capital the same opportunity to start in business and become large proprietors or owners under the consolidated system as there was formerly?

Mr. SCHWAB. Well, if you put the question that way, I think the man with exceptional ability to-day has a better opportunity of becoming a large owner or a large director in one of these great companies than ever before. *If you say the man with capital at the start—small capital at the start—I doubt it.* (Vol. 13, Rep. Ind. Com., p. 459.)

What natural chance, if you please, has the poor boy, honest, industrious, and intelligent, to make a "start in the world," under these circumstances, and maintain his self-respect and independence? What chance has he to start at the ground and remain a free man, with these immense corporations and dangerous fortunes to crush him out, or prevent him from even starting in in the race of life? This is a serious question, I submit in all candor, and is a condition which is undermining the manhood of our citizens and is not slowly attacking the very corner stone of our Republic. Here is a condition that we should not permit to exist under any law.

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

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Can the gentleman from Texas yield me a little more time?

Mr. BURLESON. I have promised to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WEISSE], who wishes to speak to-night.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I understood the gentleman to say I could have a little more time.

Mr. BURLESON. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WEISSE].

Mr. WEISSE. Mr. Chairman, while it has been the policy of the Government from the first to protect leather and its manufactures by a tariff, hides have been admitted free the greater part of the time. The first tariff on hides, which also included skins, was enacted in 1842, when a duty of 5 per cent was placed on them. This was reduced to 4 per cent in 1857 and raised again in March, 1861. In December, 1861, it was made 10 per cent at which figure it remained until 1873. In the tariff bill enacted that year hides and skins were placed upon the free list, remaining so until the enactment of the Dingley tariff bill in 1897, which puts a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on hides. It is claimed that the western Senators, believing that this duty would be for the protection and benefit of the cattle raisers in their sections, favored and supported the law. No doubt they did, but in doing so they probably expected that there would be a duty of 15 per cent on all hides, as the bill provided. But this clause was inserted in a shrewd and cunning way, engineered undoubtedly by the packers, who knew full well that hides are classified by the trade as follows: Small, unborn calfskins, called "slunks;" those weighing from 2 to 7 pounds, "deacons;" those weighing from 7 to 15 pounds, "calf," and those from 15 to 25 pounds, "kips." After the bill had become a law, the custom-house appraisers passed upon this classification and ruled that all skins under 25 pounds were not hides, within the meaning of the act, including calf, goat, horse, and hog skins, and all other skins used for tanning purposes, and should be admitted free of duty, and that only hides weighing 25 pounds and upward were dutiable. I will read you the ruling of the Board of Appraisers:

[Circular No. 173.]

CLASSIFICATION OF CALFSKINS AND HIDES.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *September 23, 1898.*

To collectors and other officers of the customs:

In G. A. 4052 the Board of General Appraisers held that raw calfskins are not dutiable as "hides of cattle" under paragraph 437 of the tariff act of July 24, 1897, but are free of duty under the provisions in paragraph 664 for "skins of all kinds, raw (except sheepskins with the wool on)." They found as a fact that "the term 'hides' in trade covers skins of the larger animals weighing 25 pounds and over, while the term used in trade to describe the skin of a calf is 'a calfskin' weighing 25 pounds or under, and that the dividing line between dried skins and dried hides is 12 pounds—that is to say, dried hides weigh 12 pounds and over, while dried calfskins weigh 12 pounds and under."

While the Department concurred in the decision that calfskins were not dutiable as cattle hides, it desired to have the question of the line of demarcation as to weights between skins and hides further considered, and therefore instructed custom officers to make up another case to submit to the Board of General Appraisers for their determination, with a view of having the matter reviewed by the courts if deemed advisable. After a further hearing the Board found as a fact, in G. A. 4215, "that commercially the dividing line between raw cowhides and calfskins in weight is 25 pounds, the term 'calfskins' including all so-called 'hides' or 'skins' which weigh less than 25 pounds. When dry the dividing line is 12 pounds, and all weighing 12 pounds being commercially known as 'skins' and all weighing 12 pounds or over as 'hides.'"

In order that this question might be further reviewed, the Department directed an appeal from this decision to the circuit court, and on the recommendation of the conference of local appraisers recently held in New York adopted a table of weights, which are promulgated in circular 165, of August 27, 1898, to be followed by customs officers in classifying skins and hides.

At the request of tanners and shoe manufacturers the Department has further considered the subject and carefully reviewed the testimony taken by the Board of General Appraisers, which was substantially unanimous in fixing 25 pounds as the dividing line between hides and skins in a green, or wet, condition and 12 pounds when dry. The counsel for the Treasury Department in cases before the Board of General Appraisers reports that he thinks no trade testimony can be obtained to controvert the dividing line as decided by the Board.

The Department concludes, therefore, to accept 25 pounds in weight as the dividing line between calfskins and hides when green salted and 12 pounds as the dividing line between dry hides and skins. You will be governed accordingly, and hereafter assess duty as hides on such skins weighing 25 pounds or over and 12 pounds or over, respectively.

Circular No. 165 is hereby revoked.

W. B. HOWELL, *Assistant Secretary.*

After this ruling it was reported to me by a Chicago hide dealer that calfskins did not decline in our home market, but did advance in foreign markets, showing that the duty of 15 per cent only compelled the foreigner to sell his calfskins 15 per cent cheaper than ours and did not raise the value of the American product. Hides sold in 1892 as low as $0.04¼, in 1905 as high as $0.13¾, down to $0.12 in January, and are to-day selling at $0.13. Calfskins that come in free of duty sold as low as $0.06¼ in 1892 and as high as $0.16¾ in 1905, and to-day are selling at $0.15. Why did the calfskins, which are on the free list, advance? Was it the Dingley tariff?

Then, for the first time, did the western Senators who had supported this duty discover that they had been handed a gold brick, as under this ruling 80 to 90 per cent of the hides sold by the farmers are imported free of duty, and, notwithstanding the continued claims and contentions of the leaders and spellbinders of the opposition that that party stands for and advocates the protection of the infant industries of the country, it is a plain and uncontrovertible fact that the duty on hides provided for in the Dingley bill affords no advantage or protec-

tion to the infant industry of the hide and leather producer, as this industry in the hands of the farmers and cattle raisers may properly be called. On the other hand, the only protection or advantage acquired through the 15 per cent duty is enjoyed fully and only by the packers, the kings and dictators of the hide business, to the detriment of the farmers, cattle raisers, and also to the tanners and exporters of manufactured leather goods and to the laborers and all users of leather, including every industry in the United States.

According to the census reports of 1900, there were taken off by the packers 6,281,952 hides, at a value of $33,925,911, and we imported $19,408,217 worth on which duty was paid, and the tanners used about $77,000,000 worth. We also probably used of the 10 to 12 pound dry hides, called "skins," which come in free of duty, several million dollars' worth. The farmer take-off was from two million to two and a half million hides, at an average price of about $4 apiece, or 8 cents per pound, according to the tables herein annexed.

Our friends say that the duty adds to the price of beef on the hoof, which I am willing to admit to a certain extent. It may add a little. I find that we exported in 1904, according to the official figures I now have before me, 593,409 head of cattle, at a total value of $42,256,291, which was at an average of about $72 per head, and on account of the 15 per cent duty on hides we certainly must have sold these cattle for less money than we would have received had the hides been admitted free of duty, in order to make up for the increased cost in bringing the hides back to this country. The hides of these cattle were worth no less than $6,000,000 in Chicago, as the price averaged during the year about 12 to 16½ cents per pound, and would have meant a loss to the shippers of at least from $900,000 to $1,000,000, on account of the 15 per cent duty to import these hides, less the difference in freight rates against the farmer. This more than equals the profit that the farmer would make, if he got it all, on the hides marketed direct by him in this country.

I will insert a table showing our exports and imports of hides for a term of years, which will be interesting in considering this matter.

In 1904 there was imported $52,000,000 worth of hides. On $10,000,000 worth, or about one-fifth of which, duty was paid. This would give the Government a revenue of about $1,500,000.

In 1905 we imported $64,763,146 worth of hides, and exported hides valued at $3,246,887 in 1904. Of the amount imported, duty was collected on $14,949,518 worth. But by exporting an amount of leather claimed to have been made from imported hides equal to the amount of hides upon which duty was paid to the Government a rebate of 99 per cent of the 15 per cent can, under this provision of the bill, be recovered. At the end of the year we may be in debt to the United States Leather Company. In fact, according to the last statement of the company, a copy of which I herewith insert, they report $590,000 received as cash rebates or drawbacks. The duty on imported hides which they are compelled to pay will be returned to them in the shape of rebates upon exported leather claimed to have been made from imported hides. And the Government derives no revenue whatever from this protection or graft of the large packers.

In 1895 we exported 45,364,349 pounds of sole leather, valued at $6,919,272, against 36,830,717 pounds in 1904, valued at $6,978,497, which plainly shows that there was a decrease of 20 per cent in the amount of sole leather made from South American imported hides. This means a loss to the American laborer and tanner, as these hides, on account of the difference of the 15 per cent duty, went to foreign countries to be tanned. It takes about a year to tan this class of stock, and on account of the additional investment, including interest and insurance, amounts to more than the profit made out of the leather. Whereas all leather made out of free hides has increased over 50 per cent, as there was exported in 1895 $6,435,590, and there was exported in 1904 $16,189,996, which plainly shows that if we had free hides the heavy leather industry, as stated before, would increase in the same proportion, as we have better advantages here, with our forests of bark, than they have in any foreign country, and it is only to the detriment of the tanners and laborers. The Government derives no revenue, as we exported more heavy leather than we imported heavy hides.

The Dingley tariff can not benefit the farmer to any great extent, because the prices of his crops depend upon export demand and price. For instance, the duty of 25 cents a bushel on potatoes does not make the price, as last year, in my State, in Waushara County, potatoes sold for 6 cents a bushel to a starch factory, there being no shipping market. After hauling them 10 to 15 miles, a great many of them were thrown on the land to rot, after being carried all winter, and dug and hauled into the cellars at a cost probably of no less than 10 cents a bushel. In 1900, according to the Census Reports, the total value of all farm products, including forest products, amounted to $4,717,069,973, and the total valuation of all farm property, including buildings, was $20,439,901,164. The average rate of interest was 7.07 per cent. Figuring this on his investment, which he is entitled to, as it is only an average rate of interest, would give him a net income, after deducting the interest, of $3,286,276,891. I find, according to the reports also, that there were engaged in agricultural pursuits 10,381,765 workers. This would give them an average annual earning of $316 each, and after paying taxes, repairs, and other incidental charges, which I would estimate, for the sake of argument, at from $10 to $100 per year, it would give them an average income far less than the manufacturing laborers receive. It is estimated that there are 28,500,000 people on farms, and this would give a net income of from $80 to $115 to each person on the farm—an amount below the cost of feeding the soldiers in the United States Army, to say nothing about buying their clothes and the other products of labor needed by them. All this in such a prosperous country as ours, where about 35 per cent of the people are on farms; where the railroad, interest charges, and taxes exceed the value of the products of the farm. How much do they consume of the products?

The expenditures of the National Government, less pensions, were, in 1882, $111,292,693; in 1890, $136,356,739.80; in 1900, $448,850,287; in 1904, $583,425,680. The estimate for 1906 is about $740,000,000. This no doubt causes prosperity for those connected with the system. I bring these facts out to show the dissatisfaction of the people with the conditions existing under the distribution of the products of the farm and labor.

If the Dingley tariff is so great a benefit, and causes prosperity, why did the farms in New York State decline about 12 per cent from 1880, and lands in Ohio from 1880 to 1900 decline 8 per cent, where the large increase in manufacturing in these States should add to the value of the farms? There were about the same number of acres in farms in Ohio, but 29,500 more farms in 1900 than in 1880, and in New York about 14,000 less farms, with about 1,000,000 less in acreage. If the decline under this system in these States is not due to the Republican policies, but to natural conditions, then why should you claim the increase in the farms of Nebraska, Kansas, and Wisconsin? If this system of graft, and protection, and tariff robbery is good for the farmer, it must include the farmer in New York as well as the farmer in Kansas and Nebraska. You have been preaching that they have all been prosperous during the last years under the Dingley bill, but you can not produce the figures to show it.

The gentleman from Minnesota has stated on the floor that the reason our forefathers landed in New England was because they got seasick and couldn't go any further. But they landed, and they are now making us in the West certainly sick by continually asking us to contribute to the tariff, railroad, Wall street graft, under this system, and to the prosperity of the increased officeholders who sit in chairs and do nothing, and for the maintenance of which we pay the taxes. Is it constitutional?

I endeavored to obtain from the Treasury Department the net revenue received by the Government from this duty on hides, but was informed by the Secretary that it would not be furnished, as no account of it was kept.

Whatever benefits the farmer derives from the 15 per cent duty on hides he more than loses on the cattle he exports and the leather he uses. The price probably would be as high if hides were on the free list, as supply and demand the world over regulates the price, the same as it does in calfskins, and would put the American tanner in competition with the world to obtain his raw material as cheap as his foreign competitor. There is also a difference to him, and to his disadvantage, in the leather goods he uses, such as heavy shoes, in which the leather, at the least calculation, according to the statement hereto appended, costs about $1, and there is a difference on these, as they are almost all coarse leather, of at least 10 to 12 cents per pair, notwithstanding the statement that on the average of shoes it is from 2 to 6 cents, heavy plow boots, in which the leather that pays duty costs about $1.50, making a difference of about 20 cents on a pair of boots. In every set of harness that the farmer buys it makes a difference to him of at least $1.50 to $2.50. On every set of horse collars that he buys it makes a difference of from 40 cents to $1. It also makes a large difference on his buggy tops, buggy cushions, the belting he uses on his farm machinery, his furniture, his grip and traveling suit case, of which very few are used, however, by the farmer; on all of these articles, and in addition numerous others he uses, are made from hides upon which is levied the 15 per cent duty, and which he pays as a bounty

direct to the packers. On the other hand, you will find that he uses the leather from hides, or, as classified by the customs appraisers, "skins," etc., which come in free, on his hatband, razor strop, maybe his suspenders, on his pocketbook, and the tops of his Sunday shoes, as well as the kid gloves he may wear, as the heavy gloves that he uses every day while at work in the field are made from hides that pay a duty; and he may use hides for his preserves, as most of the preserves are made out of gelatine, which is made out of hide scrap trimmings, on which there is no duty. Therefore he pays directly a bounty to the packer on about four times as much leather as he produces hides. He pays this, not to the Government as a revenue, but as a bounty to the packers.

This duty on hides gives the foreign leather manufacturer an opportunity to come over to this country and buy leather at 10 to 12 per cent less than our manufacturers, as the law provides, as stated before, that where leather made from imported hides is exported 99 per cent of the 15 per cent duty collected upon the hides when they come in should be paid back to the tanner who exports the leather, and therefore, of course, all exported heavy leather is claimed, for the purpose of collecting the drawbacks, to be made out of imported hides, and the Government derives no revenue from this tariff on hides. The foreign manufacturer buys at from 10 to 12 per cent less than our home manufacturer of leather goods, and can sell his product in foreign markets so much lower in competition with our manufacturer, and we, in this case, actually pay a bounty to the foreign buyer of leather, who manufactures the same over there into boots, shoes, harnesses, and belts. Under these circumstances the foreign farmer and manufacturer are given an opportunity to buy their shoes, harnesses, and belts for less than our farmer and manufacturer, and this discrimination against the farmer and manufacturer of the United States is made possible and paid for directly by the United States Government. The United States shoe manufacturer can not avail himself of the rebate, because his shoes are made from so many different small pieces of leather that it is impossible for him to go to the custom-house and state exactly in an affidivit, under oath, just what parts are made from imported hides and what parts from domestic hides. The foreign manufacturer, therefore, has an advantage of about 12 per cent on the manufactured goods over the American manufacturer. Even though the American manufacturer could prove to the satisfaction of the custom officials that certain parts of his shoes were made from imported hides, and thereby be entitled to the rebate, there would be no money in the Treasury to pay these rebates, because it would be exhausted by the exportation of heavy leather. The existing law, however, provides that under the circumstances mentioned he could collect the rebate if there was any money left.

Finally, and I think the facts above cited prove it, this 15 per cent duty goes entirely into the hands of the packers, to the detriment of the shoe manufacturers and tanners, as well as to the detriment of all manufacturing establishments that have to pay this additional price for their leather goods, and it gives the foreigner a chance to buy his material, as stated before, at much less than our own people. According to the census of 1900, it makes a difference in the sales of hides by the farmer. But one out of every ten sells one hide during the year that pays a duty. If he gets 60 cents more for the hide he sells, he is able to get 15 per cent more than the foreigners are getting for their hides, and the only advantage for the farmer would be, if he did this, to get a small additional price for his cattle. My men at home recently sorted several carloads of hides that came from the South, picked up in original lots, and less than 10 per cent of the total lot of dry hides contained hides that would have been subject to the duty, and these were all taken off by the farmer.

How does this duty help the laboring people who constitute the bone and sinew of the Republic? There is no argument in the contention that they are protected, as the following facts will show: The laborers working in the packing houses in 1890, according to the census reports, averaged $550 in wages per year. In 1900, under this great prosperity cry of a subsidized press, they are only getting $500, or a cut of 10 per cent. It certainly costs them more to live at the present time than it did then. Besides the reduction in wages, the cost of living and taxes have increased, and the laboring men now receive still less of that which they produce than they did in 1890 or 1893.

Neither do the laborers in tanneries receive any benefit from this duty on hides, nor can you call it a protection to the laborers, as I find that in 1890 there were employed in that industry 42,392 laborers, earning on an average $501 per year, and in 1900 there were 52,109 laborers at an average annual wage of about $433. Wisconsin produces about one-tenth of the leather produced in the country, and employs 5,262 laborers at an average of about $432. The decline was caused no doubt by this general prosperity and advance in wages that they tell about in the newspapers and on the floor at different times. This could no doubt be analyzed and explained from a lawyer standpoint, and I understand there are 249 lawyers in this House; but it would be pretty hard for a business man to get up and say they are better off now, when they were getting on an average $70 less than they were in 1890. It would also be hard for anyone to get up here and state that they are able to consume as much of the farmer's products, which have increased in value, according to reliable reports, from 1 per cent to 300 per cent since 1890.

In 1890 there were employed in the shoe manufactories of the United States 133,690 people, at an average annual wage of $464, and in 1900, that great and prosperous year, there were employed 142,922, and received an annual wage of $414, or $50 per year less than in 1890, or about 9 per cent less. With the cost of living increasing, as it did, through the tariff and the trusts, the wages of laborers in shoe manufactories were reduced so that the shoe manufacturers could compete with foreign manufacturers who buy their leather 10 to 12 per cent cheaper in the American market than do our home manufacturers.

In the coal mines of Pennsylvania the miners receive, according to the report of the Coal Strike Commission, 1902, and the Pennsylvania Coal Company, on an average of $307 per year for mining coal, mostly all of them being men. This means that after paying a rent of $85 to $120, and fuel bill, they have less than $200 to support a family of five, clothe and feed them, or an average of 55 cents a day for the five, or 11 cents a day for each person, which is 3⅔ cents per meal, not enough to buy milk for the infant. If it were all used for food, which is impossible, as shoes and clothing must be bought, how much of the farm products or the products of their fellow-laborers can they buy? Are they prosperous? This was in 1902. You say they were; they voted that way. How can you represent these people if this is prosperity?

Take the earnings of the average tannery laborer, which were $433 per year, according to the reports of the last census. The census shows that there are only a few, if any, boys and girls, and about all able-bodied men in the tanneries. No doubt 80 per cent of them are married men, living in large cities, where they are unable to rent a house for less than $120 per year, where their fuel and lights cost them not less than $40 per year, and the chances are they live a distance from the manufacturing plant, and are compelled to use the street cars, which will cost them $30 annually. These are fixed charges that are absolutely necessary, and may be varied in one way or another a little, but not a great deal for the sake of argument, leaving him $263 with which to buy clothing and food and the products of the soil that are not completely controlled by the corporations, and also pay the protective tariff. Where the average family consists of five persons, at a low estimate, and I know a great many have ten, it would give them about 70 cents per day, for every day in the year to live on, which would mean 13 cents apiece, figuring on five persons in the family, for every day. If they are to buy eatables for the table, it would bring them down to 4½ cents per meal, and this does not include clothing.

I find, according to the reports of the Army, that they allow 23 cents a day for the commissary department; in other words, they allow 23 cents a day, or about 8 cents per meal, to a man for his eatables, which are all bought in large quantities at the very lowest price.

In my home county, where we have an asylum for the incurable insane, and have several hundred acres of land connected with it, the average cost of maintenance is $2.31 per week, or about 33 cents per day per person, which is two and one-half times as much as the average laborer has to support his children, and the same holds true of the men fed in the United States Army. Now, this cost of $2.31 per week, or 34 cents per day, of maintenance of each individual in said asylum does not allow anything for rent and other incidental charges, and also gives them the free use of 200 acres of land on which they are able to raise, without any outside help, a great deal of the produce they consume. This goes to show that the average laborer is unable to earn, under this system, by working ten hours per day, enough to supply him with the necessities of life, to say nothing of the luxuries, through this unequal distribution of what he produces, whereby some of the highly protected tariff trusts and other combinations are able to rob him of his products.

As stated before, the shoe manufacturing laborers receive no benefit by reason of this duty, as they are hardly living at the wages they are now receiving; and, in this connection, I wish

to refer at this time to a statement appearing on page 1312 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, inserted by the great and noble general from Ohio, no doubt for the purpose of stopping revision talk by the western Congressmen, which shows the wages paid in certain shoe manufactories and certain leather manufactories, and which statement, in part, is as follows:

Milwaukee—A prosperous year—Increases recorded in every line—Manufacturers and wholesalers jubilant.

Well, there is jubilance. "Number of business houses, 33." Nothing about the laborers being jubilant. Well, let us see. According to the table they may be the other way. It then goes on with these words: "Leather establishments, 13; employment, 3,800 people; wages, $926,780; product, $20,000,000. Boots and shoes, 20 establishments; employment of labor, 5,000; wages, $1,489,643; product, $9,876,489."

Now, this statement shows that the 3,800 leather workers average in wages $244 per year. This is no doubt Ohio stand-pat Republican prosperity for the laboring man. What does it mean? I know that if a person wants any kind of board at all in Milwaukee it will cost $3.50 per week, and the washing of his clothes will cost 50 cents per week. Board and washing of their clothes are, as we all know, absolute necessities of existence. Neither the boarding-house keeper nor the wash woman would be able to make more than a living at these rates, which amount to $4 per week, or $208 per year to the average laborer. Now, according to this table, the laborer earns $244 per year. He would, therefore, have left $36 at the end of the year to pay for his clothing, boots and shoes, tobacco, and what else he may consume. Now, in case he should live a mile or two from the factory, which is entirely possible, and has to take the street car every morning to his work, and return at night, working on an average three hundred days a year, it would cost him 8 cents a day, or $24 per year. He would then have $12 left to pay for his boots, shoes, and clothing, and other articles he may consume during the year. This may be Republican prosperity, but it is doubtful if this laborer would be able to buy more than one pair of the shoes that he produces during the year, and the table shows that he would be able to produce from seven to eight hundred pair. How many men would it take to produce the total output of shoes of this country; and, under these conditions, how much of the farm products, in the line of clothing and the necessities of life other than the food, could they consume? If this laborer was a married man, with one or two babes in his family, what means would he have to resort to in order to keep them alive and prevent death by privation or starvation? It is such conditions as these that breed anarchy and lawlessness in the land, where about 80 per cent of the laboring people die in debt and less than one-tenth own their homes. How can you represent these people when you will not admit their condition?

If this table is true, could the conditions be any worse than in the Philippines, where we hear about the people working for 8 and 10 cents a day, and where they can live for 2 and 3 cents a day, and die free of debt? According to this statement, they are actually better off than the people living in this country. There is no doubt that the American laborer, according to tables furnished time and time again, receives less for the amount he produces than any other laborer in the world, and by taking the statement referred to and following it out in detail we have a fair sample of what his condition is in this land of plenty. I doubt the truth of this statement, but it certainly must have been made by some one connected with the manufacturing establishments, for the purpose of showing to the shoe and leather manufactory wage-earners in the East that they are far better off than in the West, and to keep them from coming out into our country, where they can live for much less than they can in the East; where they can enjoy the free and fresh air and water in a climate where the death rate for children under 5 years of age is only 168 per 1,000, as compared with that of the high-protected corporation cities of the East, where it runs up, as at Fall River, Mass., to 403 in 1,000—cities which have upon them the curse of tariff graft and railroad graft, creating conditions which compel children from 5 to 16 years of age to go to work in order to exist.

In 1900, in the city of Fall River, Mass., there were employed in the factories 32,780 people, at an average wage of $358 per year, where the leading industry is the manufacturing of cotton goods, on which the tariff collected amounts to more than the cost of the goods bought in foreign markets. Who does this duty protect? The people who use this class of goods to wear, no doubt, from buying them in larger quantities, as it certainly can not protect the laborer.

You will find that wages are generally lower in high protected industries than in unprotected ones, as in the building trades.

In the manufacture of woolen goods the average wage in 1890 was $350, as well as $350 in 1900 where the tariff has been increased.

There were employed 5,314,439 wage-earners in the manufacturing establishments, according to the census of 1900. They received $2,327,295,545 in wages, or an average of about $440 per laborer, or about $5 per year less than they did in 1890, which shows that the Dingley bill did not raise laboring wages. Also, living has increased, according to the statement of Carroll D. Wright and others, from 25 to 45 per cent, and wages, on the whole, according to these figures, have decreased. Dividends on railroad stocks have increased from 80 to 120 per cent, and no doubt they are in favor of the system.

We employed in the leather trade, according to the last census, 233,496 hands, and paid them in wages $107,978,195, or less than it cost to maintain the United States Army, to say nothing about the Navy, and they produced $529,311,269 worth of goods. The cost of labor in the tannery, on sole leather, is from 5 per cent to 7 per cent of the total cost of production, and the cost of labor in the production of other leathers in the tannery will run from 9 per cent to 15 per cent, showing that a duty of from 20 to 45 per cent on these different goods is not necessary to protect the American laborer or manufacturer, provided you give him free raw material, low taxation, and reasonable railroad rates.

The duty is of no benefit to the tanning industry, as it has been on the decline. I find, according to the last census reports, that in 1880 there were 5,628 tanneries; in 1890, 1,787, and in 1900 1,306, or a decrease of 30 per cent in the last ten years, and less than one-fourth of what there were in 1880. This is easy to account for on account of the discrimination of the railroads in shipments of carload and less than carload lots, as no small tanner can exist under the present classification and difference in rates, of which I wish to submit some figures by way of illustration. I find that the rate on dry hides from Butte, Mont., to Chicago, on carload lots is $1.80, and on less than carload lots is $3.10. The rate from New York to Chicago on less than carload lots is 70 cents, and from Calcutta, India, to Chicago, $1.75, which goes to show that it isn't the 15 per cent duty alone that makes the price of hides, but the difference in freight rates of carload and less than carload lots charged the shipper, and the foreigner is protected by the railroads against the tariff. It compels the small shipper and butcher in the western country to sell his hides to the agents of the packers and trusts, who can wait until their accumulations amount to a carload before sending them to market.

The duty does not benefit the tanner, according to the appended statement, taken from the tanning corporations. These combinations produced about $45,000,000 worth of leather in 1900, but were unable to control the hide and leather market. There has recently been a reorganization of several of these companies into the Central Leather trust of which the Armours and Valentines are considered by the trade large holders, which reorganization was made necessary by the poor management, as shown by the statements of these companies.

In considering this subject it would be well for the gentlemen from Pennsylvania to look out for the leather industries of this State, as Pennsylvania ranks first in the Union in the production of leather (Pennsylvania produced in 1900 $55,615,009 worth of leather and employed 14,000 hands); also the gentlemen from Massachusetts, which State ranked second in this industry and produced in 1900 $26,067,714 worth of leather, by 7,010 employees; and the gentlemen from New York, which State with a production of $23,205,991 worth of leather, by 6,530 laborers, closely followed Massachusetts.

My colleagues from Wisconsin should bear in mind the leather industry of the Badger State, which ranks fourth, with a production in 1900 of $20,074,373 worth of leather, the product of 5,262 wageearners, which is three times as much as our exports to the Philippine Islands, for the protection of which trade there is required 119 officers, 5,096 men—the Philippine Scouts—and about $20,000,000 Navy investment. I would like to ask them if they are in favor of removing the tariff on hides and leather on a basis of the difference in cost of production? In 1890 there was in Massachusetts 1,057 shoe manufactories, employing 67,374 laborers. In 1900 there was 640 shoe manufactories, employing 58,645 laborers, the ages of some of whom, according to the census reports, were under 5 years. No doubt this decrease in Massachusetts was Republican prosperity for the shoe manufacturer, and the Republicans must appeal to them to continue this great prosperity. If the same proportion of factories, under this Republican prosperity howl, continue to go out of business as did in the last ten years, it will only take fifteen years to exterminate all the shoe factories in Massachusetts. If these manufacturers who are suffering under this high-tariff tax on hides, and the laborers connected with them, will go to the polls this fall and vote their convic-

tions, no doubt they will be able to elect Democratic Members of Congress, who will, with our Members, revise the tariff.

The New York Post, in a recent issue, says:

The Central Leather Company, sometimes called the "leather trust," will, according to the statement of A. Augustus Healy, vice-president, cooperate with the National Shoe Manufacturer's Association in a movement for free hides. The manufacturers are ungrateful wretches, not content with the generosity of the protectionists who offer free goat skins, and they shamefully demand free hides also. They want what they want, even if they take the bread out of the mouth of the hungry Armour Packing Company. They offer the feeble pretext that the tariff on raw materials seriously cripples their business. So much the worse for their business. The Dingley tariff bill is a sacred institution. To pull out one stone may bring down the whole edifice. A manufacturer who asks for free raw material is therefore no patriot. The Central Leather Company is as shockingly selfish as the manufactures. "It is to our interests," says Mr. Healy in an interview, "that prices for raw material shall remain low."

I also find that by reason of this duty there was a great loss suffered by our oak-leather tanners, who had a large export trade built up in fine grades or oak sole, union crop, and Texas sole leather; also for our rough leather, and butts, used for belting and harness leather. All these grades require a fine texture of leather, and are made from domestic green salted hides, which are generally considered the best hides in the world, because they are well taken off and free from all blemishes. No rebate or bounty being allowed by our Government on leather made from domestic hides, this valuable foreign business was almost entirely destroyed, because the foreigner can buy his hides for from 10 to 15 per cent less, and buy oak bark and tanning material, and produce this class of leather much cheaper than we can.

All oak tanneries located in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and other oak-bark regions of the South and West suffered severely, also many of the tanneries in Louisville, Cincinnati, and Milwaukee, which made that class of leather a specialty to supply the foreign market. They were compelled to give up this trade at a great loss. This state of affairs also existed along the Canadian frontier, and it has been reported that some American tanners were compelled to move over into Canada in order to hold their foreign business, and tanning industries in that country have steadily increased. This militated against the American workman, and is a clear case of where protection doesn't protect. The present duty on hides is a positive injury to our trade, which, according to statistics, is the seventh ranking industry in the country in the amount of capital invested, and ranks tenth in the amount of wages paid.

It will thus be seen that a tariff ostensibly designed to protect labor becomes, in its practical operation, an injury to every one in the United States employed in the manufacture of shoes and other articles made wholly or in part of leather.

The conclusions to be drawn from the tables which I hereto annex are that the domestic supply of hides is inadequate and that large quantities of foreign raw material are absolutely necessary to continue in successful operation the shoe manufactories and tanneries of the United States and to provide employment for American labor.

The demand for free hides is not a sectional issue. The trend of shoe manufacturing and tanning is westward, and the most vigorous opposition to the hide duty comes from the States of the Middle West. The hemlock bark of Michigan and Wisconsin, the oak bark of the Southern States, and the immense forests of Oregon and California have caused a westward movement of tanning and shoe manufacturing to those States. In view of the development of trade with China and the Philippines, there would be much promise of a large extension of the export trade in shoes and leather from the Pacific coast if our ports could be open to the free entry of hides.

There is no civilized country on the face of the earth that produces hides enough to supply the demand and consumption of leather. Therefore, we must look to barbarous or semi-civilized countries for our supply of hides, such as South America and other countries. The supply of hides in this country comes from all over the world. No doubt we are tanning a great many from the European countries which they are buying from foreign markets, and which, were it not for the duty, would have originally been shipped here. Different kinds of hides in different parts of the world make different kinds of leather. We use for our sole leather the branded hides taken off in the western part of our country, and the Texas hides make the very best of sole leather, selling for a cent to 2 cents a pound more than any other hides, and they would sell for more if the people would protect themselves against the bad brands on them, and the grubs and ticks. In South America land is so cheap, and the herds of cattle so large, in proportion to the population, that hundreds of cattle are killed for their hides. The tanners and shoe manufacturers of the United States want these hides to come in free in order to afford labor to American workmen who will convert them into leather and shoes for the export trade.

The hide duty benefits the packer, the last one that needs it, according to good Republican authority, oft quoted in the newspapers and on the floor, as is shown by the following extract from a letter from Blaine to McKinley, dated April 10, 1890:

It is a great mistake to take hides from the free list, where they have been for so many years. It will benefit the farmer by adding 5 to 8 per cent to the price of his children's shoes. It will yield a profit to the packer only, the last man that needs it. The movement is injudicious from beginning to end, in every form and phase. Pray stop it before it sees light. Such movements as this for protection will protect the Republican party into a speedy retirement.

And in this connection I wish to give you, at this time, a few figures in regard to Swift & Co. The surplus on hand at the end of the year was $9,996,005 above the capital stock of $35,000,000, which represents a profit of over 25 per cent on the capital stock, not taking into consideration the investments they have in concerns to which they furnish the raw material, selling it to them for much less, so reported, than they will sell it to an outsider, and they intend to increase their capital stock another $15,000,000 this coming year.

When I was home in November, a farmer brought a hide to the tannery, for which I paid him $10.80. He had two quarters of beef with him and sold them in the village at 4 and 5 cents per pound, and told me that the two quarters of beef and the hide brought him more money than the butcher would pay for it. I asked the butcher if he could not afford to pay more for such cattle on the hoof. He told me no, that if he shipped it to Chicago there would not be over $2 profit on it, which would merely pay the expenses of taking it down there, and the risk attached to it, and he would come out whole if he had good luck. At the same time an agent of one of the large packing companies came up there to sell us stearine, a product of the packers, and I asked him what price he got for about this class of meat, and he told me about 6½ to 7½ cents, dressed. While here at Washington, I had the opportunity to go to the market for my own information and ask the price of meat, and I discovered that they were charging from 6 to 30 cents a pound for the different cuts. And still the Government report shows that the packers are doing business at almost a loss, and it surprises me that they don't ask for the 15 per cent duty to be continued on hides in order to keep them operating.

I annex prices showing the range of the price of steers in the Chicago market from 1885 and tables showing the price of beef and corn, which show that at no time in the history of the country have the feeders of heavy steers—a great many of whom are located in the district represented by the gentleman from Iowa—received as little for their cattle, in proportion to the cost of production, as at the present time, most of them being produced by feeding corn. Even during the extreme low prices during the "panic year," so called, of 1893, corn was selling for from $0.33½ to $0.44 per bushel, and it sold in 1894, which was a Democratic year with this terrible panic on that the gentlemen speak about, as high as $0.60½, and in the same year native steers, weighing from fifteen to nineteen hundred pounds, sold for $5.35 per hundred. In 1897 corn sold at $0.18½ to $0.31, and in 1900, the year in which he claims the farmers were so prosperous, the same class of steers sold for $5.55 and corn for from $0.30½ to $0.45¼. Was it the Dingley tariff of $3.75 per head on cattle, or 27½ per cent ad valorem, that made these prices and protects them so they receive these prices for their cattle now? I will append a table showing the price of "canner" cows, of which he knows that we in Wisconsin, Iowa, and other Northwestern States ship a great many to market, and see how the figures in this great and prosperous Republican period compare with the figures in the Democratic years, based upon the prices for grain and other products, showing what it costs them, and he will easily see, after he studies these tables a minute, that the farmers in this country are getting no protection for this class of farm products, but are paying more taxes. The United States expenditures in 1895 were $433,178,426; in 1905 about $725,000,000. No doubt all were properous connected with this expenditure, which increased 90 per cent and the population about 10 to 15 per cent.

Hon. Ben Butterworth said, May 14, 1890:

The manufacturers and trusts get the protection and profits of the tariff; the farmer gets the husk and the humbug.

I would include in this, with the farmers, the tanners, shoe manufacturers, and laborers.

Low duties worked so well for fifty or sixty years that no party advised protection. This period was, as James G. Blaine called it, "the most prosperous in our history." The civil war was responsible for the return to the curse of protection, and it is the war's worse heritage.

Mr. Charles M. Schwab, the president of the billion-dollar steel trust, told the Industrial Commission in May, 1901, that

all kinds of manufactured goods were always sold much lower for export than in the home market.

"Protection will make any nation that adopts it a nation of thieves." (Richard Cobden.)

"The truth is always the strongest argument." (Sophocles.)

"It may not be sentimental, but it is true that we have grown greater by staying at home and attending to our own business," said Senator JOHN C. SPOONER in 1898.

We may go further into this system and state that it is injurious to the manufacturers, laborers, and farmers of the country, as they produce everything and consume about 98 per cent of the products that are consumed by the people of this country; but through the iniquitous workings of this system less than 2 per cent of the people of this country are able to monopolize and come into possession of what the other 98 per cent produce. The presidents of three of the large life insurance companies, by withdrawing $50,000,000 of their money from the New York banks and putting it in safe-deposit vaults, could at once cause a panic such as this country never had in its history, and no law to-day could stop them from doing this. Homer, in English history, once said that no one man possessed power over another without abusing it.

You will find that we imported $17,000,000 more hides and skins last year than ever before. Again, I find, on looking over the Government reports, that there was, December 1, 1904, 17,572,464 milch cows in the United States, and on January 1, 1906, 19,793,866, an increase of about 15 per cent, caused on account of the high price of dairy products and the good crops of hay and other fodder that we have had for the last couple of years. There were very few shipped out, on account of the low prices of canner cows in Chicago during the year, which ranged from $1 to $2.75 per hundred, and at times were so low that the hides would bring as much as the packer paid for the whole animal. We ask, then, what has the hide to do with the price of cattle on the hoof, and how much profit is there on the meat when sold as embalmed beef to our Army and to our public at from 7 to 12 cents per pound when it costs the packer practically nothing?

We had of milch cows and other cattle over a year old January 1, 1905, 61,241,907. On January 1, 1906, we had 66,861,522, or an increase of 5,619,615 of cattle over a year old, or about what the packers killed in 1900. Now, what does this mean to the tanner and to the farmer and to the supply of hides?

First, if we have a good grass year this coming season, a heavy decline in butter and cheese will take place, unless we find a foreign market for our surplus or the wages of our laboring men are increased so they can consume more of these products (which, no doubt, will not happen), as, under the present condition of wages, they can't use much creamery butter made in my country at from 20 to 40 cents per pound retail, or cheese at 15 to 20 cents a pound, and if the farmers can't get somewhere near the present prices for these products they can't produce them at a profit and will not produce them; and hence a large run of canner cows into the Chicago market at a low price and a large supply of hides.

Should we have a dry season, they will be compelled to sell these cows for what they will bring. No one can tell what this will be, but I venture to state that it will be from 75 cents to $1.25 per hundred, or they will get for the cattle a price at about which the packer could sell the hide for to-day, with the 15 per cent duty, out of which he robs the tanner. The reason that he can get more for the hide than the farmer is because he skins and cures them, and handles them better in every way, and pays more attention to getting them in the best possible shape for market. It is claimed that the farmers of this country lose from 25 to 35 per cent of the value of the hides by negligent and careless handling and taking off, but are willing to ask Congress for a 15 per cent duty to cover them on the waste, and forget the fact that they don't get a profit and pay for it to the packer in the consumption of leather, as they consume more leather that pays duty than they produce hides that sell with the duty on.

Now, with these conditions existing, should we have a dry summer, the farmers won't have grass enough for these cattle, or should we have a large crop of grass and a heavy yield of dairy products, they will be lower. Either event will cause a good many farmers in my county, one of the greatest dairy sections in the United States, to reduce their herds of cattle, and force a large supply of hides, regardless of what the packers or the leather trust can do, until the low prices of leather will increase the use of that commodity, in different articles, to take care of this surplus which we are bound to get in a year or two, as it takes that long to put leather on the market out of the hide.

This will not be due to the 15 per cent duty, or because the Republicans have increased the expenditures of this country from $433,178,426 in 1895 to $720,105,498 in 1905, or about 80 per cent. In the Army and Navy the expenditures were $83,106,439 in 1895 and $222,864,803 in 1904, or an increase of about 170 per cent, which certainly did not benefit the manufacturing industries. Your expenditures for the last eight years, under this prosperous Administration for officeholders and everybody connected with the system, and with the high-protected industries, who no doubt furnish campaign funds to keep the voters greased and educated to protect the system under this boss rule, have been as follows: For the four years from 1898 to 1901, inclusive, $2,444,141,682; for the four years from 1902 to 1905, inclusive, $2,679,552,397, and you have increased the interest-bearing indebtedness from $716,202,060 in 1895 to $895,157,440 in 1904.

And in considering this question I find that you not only ask the tanners to pay a bonus to the packer trust, but also a bonus of 5 cents per pound to the borax trust, from the revenue on which the Government derives little or no revenue. I find, according to the census reports, that there was sold about $2,000,000 worth of borax, the manufacturers of which paid less than $114,000 for labor. They charged the American tanner 7¾ cents per pound for borax, where the foreigner is able to buy it at about 2½ cents. We collected $36,000 from the duty on borax last year, a small amount compared with what the tanners are robbed of through the high tariff. Who pays the tax and who gets the benefit? The present price of our borax in England is obtained from Mr. Ernest L. Fleming, a manufacturer and importer and exporter of borax, of Wareham, England, who says:

The duty of 5 cents per pound enables the borax trust to charge 7¾ cents here, while selling freely at 2½ cents in England.

We are compelled to pay the tariff, not only on this raw material, but on acids, of which we used $2,500,000 worth, and the duty on which is from 25 to 100 per cent ad valorem. On ammonia and other carbonates three-tenths of a cent per pound; on blackings of all kinds, 25 per cent; on bleaching and chloride of lime, one-fifth of 1 cent per pound; on coal tar and dyes, 20 per cent; on extracts, dyewood, of which we used $700,000 worth, and sumac, of which we used $434,447 in 1900, five-eighths of 1 cent per pound; on olive oil, 50 cents per gallon, and fish oil 8 cents per gallon, to protect the trust and Standard Oil Company, as they need the money; on barytes, $2.50 per ton; on blacks, 25 per cent ad valorem; on chromes, 4½ cents per pound; on lead, 2¾ cents per pound; on bichromate and chromate, 3 cents per pound; on nitrate of saltpeter, one-half cent per pound; on fire bricks, 35 per cent ad valorem; on cement, 20 per cent ad valorem; on fire glass, $3; on glass used for windows and tables, 40 per cent; on marble in block, which is also used for tables, 65 per cent; on grindstone, 75 cents per ton; on steel beams, 1 cent per pound; on pillar iron, 25 per cent; on all different iron products, table knives, and other steel used in tools for working leather, 50 per cent; on tacks and brads, 1½ cents per pound; on timber and other lumber, a great deal of which we are compelled to use from foreign countries, $2 per thousand; tallow and stearine, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound, so the packer can sell the foreigner cheaper than at home; on paper, of which we use a great deal for wrapping up the leather, 1 cent per pound; coal, 20 cents, on which we pay not only a duty, but also a bonus to the trust, and the coal bill represents as much as 25 per cent of the labor employed. The tanner is protected, so he has free air, water, smoke, odor, and ashes, and skins for his raw product.

We are protected against all leather products, as enumerated in the bill, with a duty of from 20 to 40 per cent on all manufactures of leather, of which we import a very small amount, and the class that we do import being only the finest leather, and can only be used by the city trade, and does not enter into the consumption of the farmer and country trade at all. This makes no difference to the tanners of this country, and a great many of them have put themselves on record as being in favor of having this tariff on leather removed if the duty on hides was also removed. With this duty removed the tanning and leather industry, which is about the tenth ranking industry of the country, according to the census reports of 1900, and which is steadily on the decline, would be one of the greatest and foremost industries in the United States. We would be, within a few years, supplying all the leather consumed in the world, and would be using, no doubt, the bark that now comes off the log in the northern woods and is often burned up as waste, as there is no market for it on account of the surplus.

I hope that this Congress will see fit to remove these heavy burdens placed upon the leather manufacturers of this country. We are patriotic American citizens. We do not ask for the protection of the Stars and Stripes for nothing, and are willing to pay our share toward the maintenance of the Government; but we demand a system of equal taxation and honest competition,

as we believe in that good old Jeffersonian doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and we don't believe the packers should be allowed to rob us consumers of leather of 15 per cent on all hides purchased from them, by reason of the duty.

Is it constitutional to destroy our property this way—all done by the Ways and Means Committee, who devise *ways* to tax you and adopt some *means*, through the subsidized press, to educate you that you don't pay the tax?

The Government receives no revenue from this at all. If we paid it direct to the Government, we would not protest so hard, but we do now, and openly, protest against this unjust system of taking our property, according to law, when we have no chance to defend our rights. Is it constitutional? I hope that all tanners and leather manufacturers who are being robbed by this system will go to the polls next November and protest against it, as I can not see a single thing in the whole system whereby the Dingley tariff bill or any other tariff bill ever created a dollar's worth of property. It has certainly taken it from some and given it to others, as the matter goes, and as I have endeavored to make plain in this speech. It is only a case of robbing one for the benefit of the other, and the only difference between this system of robbery and the old method in vogue in the early days in the West of holding a man up at the muzzle of a gun and demanding his property is that they now go and pass legislation and take one's property according to laws so passed by the bosses. And we protest against this unjust and unequal system of taxation, and, as stated before, we are not here asking for the support and protection of the American flag for nothing, but demand a "square deal" and freedom from boss rule.

I believe we are in favor of an income tax, notwithstanding that it was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court by a decision of five judges against four. By appointing two more judges to the bench of the same opinion as the four, it would no doubt be constitutional. Now, I ask to be informed—and I know there are many good, able lawyers over on the other side—if it is constitutional to charge a man who smokes a 5-cent cigar the same tax as a man who uses a 50-cent cigar, or a man who buys a gallon of whisky at $1.50 the same as a man who buys a gallon of whisky at $10? Is this constitutional? It is only a sample of this unjust system of taxation by which you raise all your revenues, the burden of which is carried by the poor man, who never enters court to contest this, because he never has money enough to hire a lawyer to do so.

By an income tax and the repeal of the tariff graft conditions would be remedied. Everyone should pay according to his income, and there is no oppressing any single individual by the present unjust system of taxation, which even goes so far as to drive them out of business. In February, 1903, according to the Boston Commercial Bulletin, a Republican for protection paper, 311 out of 375 boot and shoe manufacturers of New England declared in favor of giving up the tariff on shoes if hides were free, and of the New England tanners, 29 likewise declared in favor of relinquishing the duty on leather if hides were free, while only 11 opposed such action, because protection is a curse to the whole leather industry. According to the profits of the tanners in 1905, they probably didn't make to exceed from five to ten million dollars, and if they paid an income tax of 2 per cent on this, they would pay from $100,000 to $200,000, or at least $3,500,000 less than the packer trust is robbing them of to-day, and which, in the last eight years, has cost $30,000,000, or one-sixth what tanners have invested now, and could not sell their plants for $85,000,000, through the 15 per cent duty on hides. With the duty removed, they would have the free markets of the world to operate in, as competition is the life of trade, and free competition, low taxes, and low expenditure are what we are looking for, as with this we can control the leather markets of the world.

It is useless to state here at this time the manufacturer's position in this great strife for wealth, as less than 5 per cent of them are successful, and why? It is very easily explained, and I will endeavor to explain it in a few words, but could go into it in detail much further if necessary.

The average manufacturer begins business with a small amount of capital. He builds up a factory, which, when completed, is a monument to the city or village and a beehive for the people of that particular locality in which to secure a living, as he can not get more than a living out of it personally himself, and if he dies the plant still exists. He is then confronted with the proposition of securing raw material to operate his plant. This, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, requires more capital than he has. He goes to the bank, puts up his buildings and all his material as collateral for funds to run the business, thereby having only an equity interest in them, so to speak. He then starts in to manufacturing, and is forced to carry insurance on his buildings to cover the money he has borrowed and protect his equity, if he has any left. He is also forced to take out a line of life insurance, thus giving the McCurdys and others an opportunity to rob him, to protect his wife and family, as all of his property, in the event of his death, will go to his creditors, and ninety-five times out of a hundred will not pay the indebtedness. He then begins operations with these charges of interest and premium fixed upon him. Then he is put on the assessment roll by the city or village assessors and assessed and taxed for city, county, State, school, and all other home improvements at a valuation often far more than the property will sell for at any time, except to a trust, which is able to water the stock, no telling how much, and squeeze the public, if they control the production. He must then supply work for his laborers, who are dependent upon this industry for a living.

He is now ready to begin business, and is compelled to sell his product in the open market, and although he must pay cash for his raw material and pay cash for his labor and operating expenses, he must trust largely to the faithfulness of his laborers and the honesty of his customers for the payment of his goods. I have known of cases where we have shipped from our plant in Wisconsin a consignment of goods worth over $100, on which the profit was not over $2, to a man in California who was a total stranger to us, relying simply on the accuracy of the commercial reports as to his credit. If he wanted to be the least dishonest, he could refuse to accept the goods, and in order to adjust the matter he would have to have them returned to us at our expense, and we would have lost $2.50 on the transaction, as the freight charges would equal that amount.

We are compelled to help pay the railroads interest and dividends of about $800,000,000 per year, not including additional improvements and officers' salaries, on an actual investment claimed by some of the very best authorities not to exceed $6,000,000,000, of which $2,000,000,000 has been donated in land grants, leaving a net investment of $4,000,000,000, after the water is squeezed out, and this property is now capitalized and listed at about $14,000,000,000. It would suit the manufacturers of this country if a railroad rate was made by four commissioners appointed by the Government and four appointed by the railroads, who could get together and fix up an equal and just rate, fair to the shippers, as well as giving the railroads a reasonable return on the actual money invested, and not pay three or four prices on the watered stock. But this would be unconstitutional. Rather have the property of the manufacturers destroyed and call it constitutional.

In 1890 the total amount of capital invested in the manufacturing industries of the United States was $6,525,000,000. In 1900 it was $9,831,486,000. The increase in the capital invested in ten years was not as great as the expenditures in the last five years of the United States Government under this Republican prosperity.

I sat here in 1904 and listened to the great speeches made in regard to prosperity, and what the Republican party had done for the country through this high-protective Dingley bill. It is always necessary for a business man to take an inventory of all matters, and find out how he stands, as everything that we do is done for a commercial purpose, the same as the Government, for you can't show me a particle of legislation that doesn't almost always involve a money consideration of some kind. So it is a commercial proposition with the financial and political bosses all the time. I find that the failures in 1893 were not as many as they were, in proportion, in 1873, and I also find that the failures in the first quarter of 1904, in proportion to the wealth, were much greater than the failures in the first quarter of 1893, so-called "deplorable and panic year," but it was given out to the people in a different way through the subsidized press, to make them believe they were better off as to the conditions.

I find that the failures from 1872 to 1876, Republican years, aggregated $775,855,000, when we had a population of 50,155,789, and in 1880 the aggregate wealth given by the Census Bureau was $42,642,000,000, or the failures in proportion to the wealth were 1.8 per cent; per capita, $15.50, or 80 per cent more than in 1893 to 1897, in those so-called "panic years" of the Democratic Administration, when the total failures amounted to $934,364,629. The population was 76,303,387 in 1900; valuation, $94,300,000,000. Percentage of failures to valuation was 1 per cent. Per capita was $12.50, or about 80 per cent less than in 1873. Which panic was the greater? It can easily be stated by anyone who can figure. I also find that the failures in the year 1873 aggregated $228,499,990; wealth, census of 1870, $30,068,518,000. Failures in proportion to wealth about

0.76 per cent, which was 50 per cent greater than in 1893, so-called "panic year," when the failures were $346,779,889, and the wealth in 1890 was $65,037,091,000; proportion of failures to wealth, about one-half of 1 per cent. I find that the failures for the first quarter of 1904 were 3,344 in number, and the amount was $48,067,721. The wealth in 1900 was $94,300,000,000, and the proportion of failures to wealth was one-half of 1 per cent. This goes to show that the failures were greater, in proportion to wealth, than in the first quarter of 1893. And still they declare upon this floor about the great prosperity of the country. No doubt all manufacturers were very prosperous, with the total failures of the year amounting to 12,000 or 13,000. During the last eight years of this so-called "Republican prosperity" there have been 92,433 failures, or about 8 per cent of all the firms engaged in business, and a great many of them were undoubtedly caused by the unequal distribution of wealth, and being taxed to keep up the trusts and special favored industries which are allowed to rob them through the protective tariff and other legislation.

Now, I wish to state that I am part owner in a tannery established by my father in 1867, and we pride ourselves on being successful. I have been active in business ever since 1880—and am one of the eleven manufacturers in this body—having been taken out of school at that time to work in the tannery. I have lived and worked, slept and dined all my lifetime with the laborer, and I think I am more familiar with his conditions than most men upon this floor, and I am absolutely frank in regard to my statement of his conditions. I trust him on all matters quicker than I would the insurance presidents, some bankers, and other high financiers who were talked about so much in the 1896 campaign, a great many of whom are to-day, by reason of their violations of public trust and other crimes, confined in penitentiaries throughout the land, and especially one in our State, who was once president of the National Bankers' Association, and who is now serving time in a United States prison for fleecing his associates out of $2,000,000, and who was sentenced by one of his former personal friends, Judge Quarles, ex-Senator from Wisconsin. If I were to leave my home to-morrow morning I would gladly leave my tannery in the hands of my laborers, knowing that upon my return the plant would be there and still running, that every citizen, as well as my men, would be interested in seeing that it was carried on successfully, as we all, jointly, receive our living through it, and our success is due to our ability to go out and compete, with the small margin of profit that there is in the business at times, in the open market of this country. We jointly have the use of it to exchange our products with the farmer and the manufacturers for those of their products that we need, but some of which we are compelled to buy from these high-protected trust concerns, and at times it is hard to make both ends meet. How different it would be if it were left in the hands of these high financiers and trust promoters of Wall street—and there are as many honest manufacturers and shippers in New York as there are in any part of the world. If they could make more money out of it for themselves by closing it down, they would do so at once, and after robbing the men of their homes and their property would let them starve or walk to some other city to find work. One trust promoter, when organizing and attempting to persuade us to join him, told me that the trust would have the advantage of having more plants than they could operate, which would enable them to shut them down in different towns, thereby destroying the value of the laborer's property, and they could then come back later on and buy it for little or nothing, operate the plant, and in this way make considerable money. For a man who has been brought up with his laborers, knows them all by name, and would be willing at any time to sit down and keep their company or stand up and defend their rights, what inducement would this be to join one of these soulless corporations where they do not intend to know their men by name, but let them go by number or tag; where the laborer never sees the owner, and where a man's life is figured on the commercial basis? It was reported by the president of one of our great railways that improvements to guard the life of the laborers were never made until the death rate got so high that there was more money in making the improvements than in paying death claims, as the life of the average laborer killed in the performance of his duty is figured, in most of the States, at $5,000. I do not know what the price of slaves was in the early days, but if reports are correct their lives were valued much higher by their owners than the life of the laborer is valued by the average corporation to-day.

I have been fair and honest in these statements, made from a business standpoint in every way, and I want you to enact legislation so that the man who produces the wealth can enjoy the fruits of his labor.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says he is for tariff revision on a basis of the difference in cost of production. So am I, but I ask him if he intends to again vote for the rule established at this session of Congress, for which he has voted several times, I believe. If he does, how can he vote for tariff revision? Will he go home and tell his people that he voted for the rules and was compelled to stand with his party, of whom the bosses, of which there are practically but three, will always see that he will never have an opportunity to vote for revision of the tariff on anything as long as the party receives large campaign contributions? Is it not a fact that a man always serves his paymaster first and others second? So with the bosses. They must first serve the favored high-protected indutries and railroads who contributed large campaign funds and whose names the Democrats on the committee have endeavored to secure, but up to the present time have not succeeded, and will not, as none of them invest money for any other purpose than to make money, and after the campaign seek special privileges, which are never denied them. Ask them for a donation for the poor and suffering in Japan, Russia, or India, and see how much they will contribute, but consider how much, during the famine in India, was contributed by the farm and laboring people of this country. There was no money for the trusts in such contributions and they did not interfere with the business of the trusts in taxing other people.

I warn you to grant the people the relief they are entitled to. In case you do not, you do not deserve the support of any man who is not connected with this system and controlled by the bosses. I hope that the people of this country will demand a vote on all important questions, and especially on all questions that appertain to the distribution of wealth, and I assure you that if you will grant it, you will not have the special privileges in existence longer than the time it takes to finish counting their ballots. If this is a country where the majority rules, I ask you to give the majority a chance. But I deny that the majority rules under this system. Not even a majority of the Members of Congress rules in this House under the present system, as has been so ably stated by my friends and fellow-Members here within the last few months, who could not be recognized by the Speaker at any time, and I hope that every Member who is returned to the next Congress will be absolutely and unqualifiedly opposed to, and vote against, this rule, which must be defeated in order to maintain our representative form of government.

APPENDIX A.

EXHIBIT A.

LEATHER SCHEDULE IN THE DINGLEY TARIFF BILL.

437. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That upon all leather exported, made from imported hides, there shall be allowed a drawback equal to the amount of duty paid on such hides, to be paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

438. Band of belting leather, sole leather, dressed upper, and all other leather, calfskins tanned or tanned and dressed, kangaroo, sheep, and goat skins (including lamb and kid skins), dressed and finished, chamois and other skins, and bookbinders calfskins, all the foregoing not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem; skins for morocco, tanned but unfinished, 10 per cent ad valorem; patent, japanned, varnished, or enameled leather, weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen hides or skins, 30 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; if weighing over 10 pounds and not over 25 pounds per dozen, 30 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; if weighing over 25 pounds per dozen, 20 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; pianoforte leather and pianoforte action leather, 35 per cent ad valorem; leather shoe laces, finished or unfinished, 50 cents per gross pairs and 20 per cent ad valorem; boots and shoes made of leather, 25 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms, suitable for conversion into manufactured articles, shall be classified as manufactures of leather and pay duty accordingly.

GLOVES.

439. Gloves made wholly or in part of leather, whether wholly or partly manufactured, shall pay duty at the following rates, the lengths stated in each case being the extreme length when stretched to their full extent, namely:

440. Women's or children's "glace" finish, Schmaschen (of sheep origin), not over 14 inches in length, $1.75 per dozen pairs; over 14 inches and not over 17 inches in length, $2.25 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $2.75 per dozen pairs; men's "glace" finish, Schmaschen (sheep), $3 per dozen pairs.

441. Women's or children's "glace" finish, lamb or sheep, not over 14 inches in length, $2.50 per dozen pairs; over 14 and not over 17 inches in length, $3.50 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $4.50 per dozen pairs; men's "glace" finish, lamb or sheep, $4 per dozen pairs.

442. Women's or children's "glace" finish, goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin, not over 14 inches in length, $3 per dozen pairs; over 14 and not over 17 inches in length, $3.75 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $4.75 per dozen pairs; men's "glace" finish, kid, goat, or other leather than of sheep origin, $4 per dozen pairs.

443. Women's or children's, of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed, by whatever name known, not over 17 inches in length, $2.50 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $3.50 per dozen pairs;

men's, of sheep origin, with exterior surface removed, by whatever name known, $4 per dozen pairs.

444. Women's or children's kid, goat, or other leather than of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed, by whatever name known, not over 14 inches in length, $3 per dozen pairs; over 14 and not over 17 inches in length, $3.75 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $4.75 per dozen pairs; men's goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed, by whatever name known, $4 per dozen pairs.

445. In addition to the foregoing rates, there shall be paid the following cumulative duties: On all leather gloves when lined, $1 per dozen pairs; on all pique or prix seam gloves, 40 cents per dozen pairs; on all gloves stitched or embroidered with more than three single strands or cords, 40 cents per dozen pairs.

446. Glove tranks, with or without the usual accompanying pieces, shall pay 75 per cent of the duty provided for the gloves in the fabrication of which they are suitable.

447. Harness, saddles, and saddlery, or parts of either, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, 45 per cent ad valorem.

EXHIBIT B.

THE DINGLEY TARIFF CUSTOM RATES UNDER ACT OF 1897.

Alcohol, amylic, or fusel oil, ¼ cent per pound.
Barley, bushel of 48 pounds, 30 cents per bushel.
Beads, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Beef, mutton, and pork, 2 cents per pound.
Beer, porter, and ale, 20 to 40 cents per gallon.
Bindings, cotton and flax, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Bindings, wool, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.
Blankets, 22 to 23 cents per pound and 30 to 35 per cent ad valorem.
Books, charts, maps, 25 per cent ad valorem.
Bronze, manufactures of, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Brushes, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Butter, and substitutes for cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Button, sleeve and collar, gilt, 50 per cent ad valorem.
Canvas for sails, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Carpets, 22 to 60 cents per square yard and 40 per cent ad valorem.
Cattle (over 1 year old), 27½ per cent ad valorem.
Cigars and cigarettes, $4.50 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.
Clocks, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Clothing, ready-made, 50 to 60 per cent ad valorem.
Coal, bituminous, 67 cents per ton.
Confectionery, all sugar (if more than 15 cents per pound), 50 per cent ad valorem.
Copper, manufactures of, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton gloves and handkerchiefs, 45 to 55 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton hosiery, 50 cents to $2 per dozen pairs and 15 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton shirts and drawers, 60 cents to $2.25 per dozen and 15 to 50 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton plushes, unbleached, 9 cents per square yard and 25 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton curtains and cotton webbing, 50 and 45 per cent ad valorem.
Cutlery, 16 to 20 cents each, plus 15 to 45 per cent.
Diamonds, 10 cents and 60 per cent ad valorem.
Drugs, not crude, ¼ cent per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.
Dyewoods, extract of, ⅞ cent per pound.
Earthenware, 25 to 60 per cent ad valorem.
Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.
Extracts, meat, 35 cents per pound.
Fish, smoked, dried, ¾ cent per pound.
Flannels, 22 to 23 cents per pound, 30 to 35 per cent ad valorem.
Flax, manufactures of, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Flowers, artificial, 50 per cent ad valorem.
Fruits, 1 cent per pound, 25 cents per bushel, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Fur, manufactures of, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Furniture, wood, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Glassware, plate, silvered, and bottles, 60 per cent ad valorem, 8 to 11 cents per square foot, 1 cent per pound.
Glucose, 1½ cents per pound.
Glue, value not over 7 cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound.
Gold, manufactures of, not jewelry, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Hair, 10 to 35 per cent ad valorem.
Hams and bacon, 5 cents per pound.
Hay, $4 per ton.
Hemp cordage, 2 cents per pound.
Hides, 15 per cent ad valorem.
Honey, 20 cents per gallon.
Hoops, iron or steel, baling, 5 to 10 cents per pound.
Hops, 12 cents per pound.
Horn, manufactures of, 30 per cent ad valorem.
Horses, mules, $30 per head.
India rubber, manufactures of, vulcanized, 30 and 35 per cent ad valorem.
Instruments, metal and musical, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Iron, manufactures of, screws, tinned plates, 45 per cent ad valorem, 12 cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound.
Jewelry, 60 per cent ad valorem.
Lard, 2 cents per pound.
Lead, pigs, bars, type metal, 2½ cents, 1½ cents per pound.
Leather manufactures, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Linen manufactures, wearing apparel, 45 to 60 per cent ad valorem.
Macaroni, 1½ cents per pound.
Malt, barley, 45 cents per bushel.
Matches, friction, boxed, 8 cents per gross.
Matting, cocoa and rattan, 6 cents per square yard.
Molasses, 3 to 6 cents per gallon.
Nails, cut, horseshoe, 6 to 10 cents, 2¾ cents per pound.
Oilcloth, value over 25 cents, 8 to 20 cents per square yard.
Oil, olive, whale, and seal, foreign, 40 to 50 cents, 8 cents per gallon.
Onions, 40 cents per bushel.
Opium, 40 per cent ad valorem and $1 per pound.
Paintings and marble statuary, engravings, 20 to 25 per cent ad valorem.
Paper manufactures, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Pepper, cayenne, unground, 2½ cents per pound.
Perfumery, alcoholic, 60 cents per pound and 45 per cent ad valorem.
Photograph albums, slides, 33 per cent, 25 per cent ad valorem.
Pickles, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Pins, metallic, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Pipes of clay, common, 15 cents per gross.
Poultry, dressed, 5 cents per pound.
Pulp wood for paper makers, 1 to 12 cents per pound.
Quicksilver, 72 cents per pound.
Railroad ties, cedar, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Rugs, oriental, 10 cents per square foot plus 40 per cent.
Salt, 8 to 12 cents per 100 pounds.
Sauces, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Sausages (except bologna), 25 per cent ad valorem.
Silk, in skeins, laces, wearing apparel, 35 per cent, 60 per cent ad valorem.
Skins, tanned and dressed, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Slates, manufactures of, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Smokers' articles, except clay and meerschaum pipes, 60 per cent ad valorem.
Soap, castile, toilet, perfumed, 1½ cents, 15 cents per pound.
Spirits, except bay rum, $2.25 per gallon.
Straw manufactures, 30 per cent ad valorem.
Sugar (raw, 96°), 1.68 cents per pound.
Sugars (refined), 1.95 cents per pound.
Tin plates, 1½ cents per pound.
Tobacco, 35 cents to $2.50 per pound.
Umbrellas, silk or alpaca, 50 per cent ad valorem.
Vegetables, natural, preserved, 25 per cent, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Velvets, silk, $1.50 per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.
Watches, and parts of, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Wheat, bushel of 60 pounds, 25 cents per bushel.
Willow, for basket makers, manufactures of, 20 per cent, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Wines, 50 cents per gallon.
Wines, champagne, $2 to $8 per dozen.
Wool, 7 to 11 cents per pound.
Worsted yarns, 27½ to 38½ cents plus 40 per cent.
Woolen or worsted clothing, 44 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.

APPENDIX B.

[From the Shoe and Leather Reporter of January 18, 1906.]

DUTIES ON HIDES, SOLE LEATHER, AND SHOES—EXPRESSION OF OPINION FROM SHOE MANUFACTURERS REGARDING THE REMOVAL IN WHOLE OR IN PART OF THE DUTIES AFFECTING THE RAW MATERIAL AND FINISHED PRODUCT.

Early in December the Shoe and Leather Reporter sent a copy of the following letter and questions to the leading shoe manufacturers of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: We would respectfully call your attention to the inclosed letter from Mr. Charles H. Jones, president of Commonwealth Shoe and Leather Company, Boston, which appeared in the Shoe and Leather Reporter of December 7, and believe that you will be interested in reading his views on a subject of vital importance to the shoe and leather trade. In order to ascertain the present views of the shoe manufacturers of the United States on the hide and sole leather duties we ask the following questions. An expression of opinion is desired from every manufacturer, and we request the favor of an early reply.

Are you in favor of the repeal of the 15 per cent duty on hides and the 20 per cent duty on sole leather?

If you answer yes, are you willing to offer in exchange for these benefits to the shoe manufacturer the whole or any part of the 25 per cent duty on shoes?

As a result of the canvass 231 replies were received, as follows:

In reply to the first question:

Yes	199
No	4
Yes on hides, but only partial reduction sole leather	9
Noncommittal, and those not using leather in shoe making	19

In reply to the second question:

Yes—remove the whole duty if necessary	140
No	20
A part of the duty, ranging from 10 to 15 per cent	38
Noncommittal	33

Of these replies 96 were from New England shoe manufacturers and the remainder from those in the other States.

Quite a number commented on the topic, and believing that their views will be of interest we publish some of the comments herewith:

Snedicor & Hathaway, Detroit, Mich.: "Our idea would be, first get hides free, after that sole leather, and then take duty off shoes."

The Haynes-Webb Shoe Manufacturing Company, Denver, Colo.: "We certainly believe that the duty on hides, especially, should be abandoned. We would like to see a new bill put in effect."

Fargo Shoe Manufacturing Company, Belding, Mich.: "Am satisfied with condition that is best for the majority, only so it is settled and not brought up every little while to keep everyone guessing."

Andrews & Co., Everett, Mass.: "We have made no answer to the second question. The 'benefits' are all for the public and not the manufacturer."

Wichert & Gardiner, Brooklyn, N. Y.: "We have your circular letter of the 8th instant, relative to the repeal of duties, but are disinclined to express a lengthy opinion on this matter, as we have not gone sufficiently deep into its details. Our position would naturally incline us to favor a repeal of the 15 per cent on hides and 20 per cent duty on sole leather, believing that these measures would not be of very great disadvantage to those concerned in this line of business.

"With regard to the offering in exchange a surrender of the whole or any part of the 25 per cent duty on shoes, we should hesitate to express an opinion on a matter of so grave an import until some of the figures connected with it, and also some of the facts, were before us, on which a competent opinion might be based.

"It seems to us from the very fact that the United Shoe Machinery Company is placing its newest types of shoe machines in large quantities in all parts of the civilized world, that this fact, taken into consideration with the low price of labor prevalent in foreign countries, might be a good reason why the duty on shoes should remain undisturbed."

John A. Frye Shoe Company, Marlboro, Mass.: "We do not believe a reduction or repeal of the duty would benefit us at all, and so long as all shoe manufacturers are running to their fullest capacity with good profits, as they evidently are at the present time, we are in favor of 'letting the tariff alone.'"

The Pingree Company, Detroit, Mich.: "We are bending our energies to getting hides on the free list, and feel that at this time it is unwise to take up the question of free sole leather or free shoes, both of which would entail considerable inquiry. We do not feel competent to answer

your questions concerning this without more information than we have at hand."

M. F. Hammond, Pleasantville, N. Y.: "With cheap material we can make a fair profit; with high material we stand a chance to get part of it back, but a very small proportion. The condition of the shoe trade to-day could hardly be worse, so far as the manufacturers are concerned."

The Comfort Slipper Company, New York: "A reduction of duty on slippers, especially on cloth and felt slippers, which are classified under shoes, will practically ruin our business, no matter how cheap sole leather may be. Therefore, if the reduction of duty can only be reached by a reduction of duty on shoes, we must be against it."

Jerolemon-Oliver Company, Rochester, N. Y.: "I should not be in favor of taking the duty off shoes coming to this country."

Hanan & Son, Brooklyn, N. Y.: "If the duty of 15 per cent on hides is removed, and the duty on sole leather reduced to 10 per cent, and duty for shoes reduced to 10 per cent, I believe it would meet with all the requirements and necessities of the situation."

The Rich Shoe Company, Milwaukee, Wis.: "We favor most emphatically the repeal of the 15 per cent duty on hides, which, in our opinion, is nothing more nor less than an arbitrary tax on the American boot and shoe manufacturer and is a protection only to the meat packer and incidentally to the foreign boot and shoe manufacturer, who receives a drawback on American-made leather of imported hides.

"We would further say that, while we favor the removal of the 20 per cent duty on sole leather, we would not object, as a fair compromise with the tanner, to return to the McKinley 10 per cent duty on sole leather instead of demanding the repeal of the entire present duty of 20 per cent.

"In consideration of the above we would be willing to take our chances to compete with the world in the sale of shoes without any protective duty whatever. We believe that with the exception of a small proportion of fancy slippers, etc., in which a good deal of hand work is utilized, the American manufacturer, in spite of higher labor, can produce goods of superior fit and style that would give the American goods such preference as to command the trade of the world; at least so it appears to us at the present time."

Pontiac Shoe Manufacturing Company, Pontiac, Ill.: "We believe it would be a good thing for the people to have free hides. We are a part of the people."

William Eastwood & Son Company, Rochester, N. Y.: "We are in favor of the repeal of the duty on hide and sole leather, and, in further response to your inquiry, would state that we are in favor of such a revision of the duty on shoes as can be consistently made without jeopardizing the interests of shoemakers in a general way—say to such an extent as the proposed repeal of the duty on hide and sole leather would enter into the cost of shoes."

Giesecke-D'Oench-Hays Shoe Company, Jefferson City, Mo.: "If our industries are to be encouraged, it seems to us that the Government would better not add additional burdens in the shape of revenue taxation on raw material. This is surely no encouragement to manufacturing enterprises. Our own Government handicaps us in our efforts to establish export trade by giving foreigners the opportunity to buy American leather cheaper than citizens of this country can purchase it. This, of course, is due to the rebate which the Government grants on export leather. This means the encouraging of one industry at the expense of another."

Neenah Shoe Company, Neenah, Wis.: "If the 25 per cent duty on shoes, or any portion of that duty, would prevent the removal of the duty on hides, we would say, Remove all of the duty from shoes, as we need not at present fear competition from foreign countries in the manufacture of shoes. The removal of the duty on hides we believe to be essential, and should not have been placed there in 1897."

Isaac Ferris, jr., Company, Camden, N. J.: "I fully concur in the opinion expressed by Charles H. Jones in Shoe and Leather Reporter."

Tappan Shoe Manufacturing Company, Lynn: "Shoes need no protection. Foreign shoes could not be given away in this country. They are ill shaped and not fitted for the trade in this country. Besides, shoes can not be produced in any country as cheaply as here."

The D. M. Jones Shoe Manufacturing Company, Columbus, Ohio: "Yes, we are in favor of the repeal of all duties pertaining to the leather industry, and are willing to do what we can to that end."

Florsheim & Co., Chicago: "We are unqualifiedly in favor of the immediate repeal of the 15 per cent duty on hides, and also the 20 per cent duty on sole leather.

"It is a fact patent to almost all people identified with the shoe or leather industries that the repeal of the duty on hides without the repeal of the duty on sole leather would be more or less ineffective. It is absolutely essential that both the duty on hides and the duty on sole leather should be repealed in order to conserve the future of the shoe, leather, and harness business of the United States.

"In exchange we would be more than pleased to see the entire 25 per cent duty on shoes taken off. We require no protection as far as shoes are concerned. There should be none. It is a mere makeshift and sop. It does no good.

"We should have lower tariffs and more reciprocity, particularly with Canadian and South American republics."

Noyes-Norman Shoe Company, St. Joseph, Mo.: "If hides and leather should go much higher, would favor free list for hides, leather, and shoes. If a steady leather market now continues on about present basis, would be opposed to revision; shoes, leather, and hides are high enough; not much too high."

Racine Shoe Manufacturing Company, Racine, Wis.: "We believe the repeal of duty on hides is almost unanimous with shoe manufacturers. As to the duty on shoes, our trade is growing, with every country under the sun in open competition, and it does not seem that a duty on shoes is necessary."

Roberts, Johnson & Rand Shoe Company, St. Louis, Mo.: "The repeal of the duty on hides will help. It is just as important that the duty on leather be also repealed."

Craddock-Terry Company, Lynchburg, Va.: "We heartily concur in Mr. Jones's forceful views on this subject."

Wertheimer-Swarts Company, St. Louis, Mo.: "We favor the repeal of the duty on hides and sole leather. Lowering the cost of making of shoes, competition will take care of prices."

Churchill & Alden Company, Campello: "Am anxious to have the duty taken off." (This firm replied "yes" to both questions.)

M. D. Wells Company, Chicago, Ill.: "If we can have free hides, would be willing to allow shoes to come free of duty."

A. B. Noyes & Co., Georgetown, Mass.: "If we have free raw material, we will risk all competition."

J. S. Zulick & Co., Orwigsburg, Pa.: "Haven't studied the question carefully, but Mr. Jones's views on the subject seem right and are plausible."

F. M. Hodgdon, Haverhill, Mass.: "It would seem that possibly in the far-distant future a duty of 10 per cent might be an advantage to equalize difference in cost of labor on shoes, but believe the probability is to the contrary."

Friedman Brothers Shoe Company, St. Louis, Mo.: "The duty off hides and sole leather will benefit everyone. The duty on shoes very few at present, and with the advantage of free hides the American manufacturer can meet any conditions that may arise through foreign competition."

H. R. Ford & Co., Lynn, Mass.: "We are heartily in favor of repealing the duty on hides and sole leather, and are willing to have the whole duty on shoes taken off, as we do not fear competition on cheap shoes. We know that the manufacturers of this country can hold their own in this line."

J. G. Hynds Shoe Manufacturing Company, Nashville, Tenn.: "The shoe duty does not help us any, and we do not believe it helps any other shoe manufacturer in the United States.

"The hide duty enables the beef trust, Big 4, to dictate prices on hides in the United States. Abolish the hide tariff and the beef and hide monopoly will not be enabled to 'hold up' tanners as they now do."

THE PROBLEM OF FUTURE PRICES.

As the old year draws to a close and will soon sink into history and as the new year looms on the horizon, thoughtful men in our trade are mingling with their holiday rejoicing serious conjectures as to what may be in store for the leather and leather-consuming industry. Every one, from the hide dealer to the consumer of shoes, harness, etc., realizes that 1905 was a year of advancing prices.

WILL PRICES DECLINE OR ADVANCE?

The past is an open book that all may read, but the future is a blank page. Will prices stick or will they decline? These are pertinent questions, but a more sensational interrogation presses for an answer—will the advance continue and will present prices look small and cheap a year hence?

It is difficult to set aside self-interest and consider trade movements dispassionately, but it would seem necessary at this time seriously to decide whether the higher prices already established resulted from natural causes that will continue operative or whether the advance movement has reached its apex. If the disruption in leather values logically resulted from world-wide conditions, why should it not continue?

NO AX TO GRIND.

Hide and Leather has no interest except to hold the mirror up to a great industry and faithfully to reflect things as they are. We do not venture to predict, but we do call attention to world-wide conditions that are likely to affect future prices. For two years Hide and Leather has been printing articles demonstrating that the per capita consumption of beef is not keeping pace with the per capita consumption of leather, with the result that hides and skins under the operation of the law of supply and demand are increasing in cost in all the markets of the world.

MORE SHEEP, LESS BEEF.

With a view to further substantiating or disproving this postulate we have interviewed M. F. Horine, official statistician of the Union Stock Yards and Transit Company, Chicago. He tells us that his company does not expect any considerable increase in the cattle supply, for the reason that the demand for beeves on the hoof and the prices paid do not furnish any incentive to stock raisers to increase their herds. Mr. Horine gives a variety of reasons why the cattle and beef industries are not expanding proportionately with the population of the country. He deplores the widespread daily newspaper attacks upon the so-called "beef trust," and says that these, together with the stories abut embalmed beef printed during the Spanish-American war, prejudiced the American public against dressed beef. In this connection he adduces the fact that receipts and slaughter of sheep have increased in much greater degree than those of cattle. In 1888 receipts of cattle at the great stock yards of Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, and St. Louis were 4,477,470 head. In 1904 the entry at these centers amounted to 7,274,110. Receipts of sheep at the four points in 1888 were 2,307,050 head, and in 1904, 8,050,900 head. From these figures it will be seen that receipts of cattle have not quite doubled in sixteen years, while receipts of sheep have almost quadrupled.

NO BEEF FOR BREAKFAST.

The introduction of cereal breakfast foods has probably not been sufficiently considered as a factor in revolutionizing the food supply of the American people. There are said to be sixty-two manufacturers of cereal foods at Battle Creek, Mich., alone. It is only necessary to visit any one of the thousands of small grocery stores and glance at the shelves to form some idea of the tremendous consumption of prepared cereals.

EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND REFRIGERATION.

Irrigation has become an important factor in the food supply. Thousands of acres that formerly were used for cattle feeding are now yielding cereals and table vegetables. The refrigerator car has made possible the transportation of perishable articles from long distances, and the cold-storage plant enables dealers to hold such merchandise for sale, so that eggs, poultry, fish, fruit, and fresh vegetables are obtainable by the American people practically during every month of the year. All these circumstances tend to lessen the per capita consumption of beef, and this reduces the supply of hides and skins available for making leather.

MORE LEATHER, BUT LESS RAW MATERIAL.

Coincident with this limitation of raw material is the greatly expanding consumption of leather. In recent years leather has come into great favor for upholstering fine furniture, as well as for mural decorations. A tanner of leather for automobiles recently told us that the sales of his company were just fifteen times greater than one year ago. Foot gear has been made for so many years at such reasonable prices that the per capita consumption of leather has increased by reason of the fact that nearly everyone possesses a number of pairs of shoes. There are shoes for every vocation and sport, and fashionable ladies have foot gear to match every gown.

CHEAP BEEF—DEAR HIDES.

Hides and skins are in less supply and greater demand in all the markets of the world, a condition that is faithfully reflected in the markets. The increasing demand for hides and the decreasing demand

for beef are reflected in the selling prices of hides and cattle on the hoof. During 1893 native steer hides ranged from 5½ to 9 cents in price, while the steers themselves brought from $5.25 to $6.50 per hundred pounds. To-day we find beeves on the hoof bringing about the same prices as twelve years ago, while the hides are closely sold up at 16 cents. Years ago hides sold for little more and sometimes for even less than beef, but to-day steers that sell for 5¼ cents per pound on the hoof yield hides that easily bring 16 cents per pound.

It must be admitted that the increasing cost of leather has a substantial basis in conditions affecting the quantity of raw material available. As we said at the outset, the question for every thoughtful man in the trade to endeavor to answer for himself is, Will the upheaval in prices during 1905 continue in the same or greater degree during 1906?

APPENDIX C.

BRITISH POLITICIANS ON AMERICAN SHOE TRADE—EFFECTS OF OUR TARIFF AS SEEN THROUGH ENGLISH SPECTACLES.

[From the Shoe and Leather Reporter.]

As I have said, opinions on the tariff question are much divided, even among manufacturers; as far as the operatives are concerned, however, I fancy the vote will go solid for free trade at the election. British shoemakers have always been advocates of liberal principles, and it seems most unlikely they will be won over by any arguments in favor of protection. Speaking at a small army-shoemaking center called Raunds recently, F. A. Channing, the late member for the division, dealt extensively with the aspect of American shoe trade and its position under a protective tariff. The speech appears to me to be so directly interesting to your readers that I am tempted to give rather copious extracts from it. Mr. Channing prefaced his remarks by observing that he had only recently returned from a tour of the United States, which included an inspection of the shoe industry of Massachusetts—"the Northamptonshire of the United States." He said this district was exactly in the same position, and had been for the past ten years, in which Mr. Chamberlain wanted to place the whole of this country. He went on to say Massachusetts resembled England in the sense that the greater portion of its food and raw material came from outside. She had been placed under a complete scientific tariff protecting every industry in the country. They had had ten years of protection, and what was the result? The whole of the workmen and nine-tenths of the manufacturers of that State engaged in the shoe industry were eagerly demanding a complete and absolute withdrawal of the system. The feeling was of the strongest possible kind against protection, because it was felt its burdens were far greater than any advantage the duty gave them. Mr. Channing went on to say that whilst he was in the State an election was in progress, and that turned on the question which of the two parties—Republicans and Democrats—were the most in earnest in getting rid of protection from that highly protected State. Until the Dingley tariff was adopted the boot and shoe industry was going up by leaps and bounds. The increase was 80 or 90 per cent in the ten years before the tariff, but now the growth of the industry was almost suspended and the number of employees and the amount of wages had decreased. They got the advantage of 25 per cent duty, yet they had to pay an enormous duty on coal, although they could otherwise have coal for very little by sea from Canada. They were prevented from getting steel and timber at terms reasonable enough for the construction of factories and machinery, and the raw materials, hides, or finished leather, were subject to a heavy duty, which largely increased the cost of production.

TRUSTS FROM A BRITISH STANDPOINT.

This champion of the British shoemakers was particularly caustic in his observations on American trade combinations. Alluding to the beef trust he said it had bribed the legislators to impose a duty of 15 per cent on raw hides, and were thus enabled to impose a blackmail of £2,000,000 on every industry of which leather was the raw material. Passing to the leather trust, he said that no sooner did it become powerful than the beef trust bought them up. The leather trust had a duty of 20 per cent on all leather imported into the United States, and got a rebate of 90 per cent on the raw hide, which they converted into leather and exported to England. The result was that English manufacturers, with their happy system of free trade, got the American leather 15, 20, to 25 per cent cheaper than the American manufacturers could get their leather, which was manufactured in America. At the conclusion of his speech to these British army shoemakers, Mr. Channing said these precious tariffs handicapped the American manufacturers and gave the English command of the markets of the world. "They need not be afraid," he added, "that these poor American manufacturers were going to slip out of the toils and compete with them in the near future, for no toad under the harrow was half so badly off as the American shoe industry under the combined forces of the gigantic trusts which used protection as their weapons."

I give the above opinions for what they are worth; they are, however, from two representative men, and show that American shoes and leather are playing an important part in shaping the destiny of British economic policy. Mr. Channing may be "playing to the gallery," as we say in England, but his opinions are given with a frankness which leaves no doubt as to his opinions. Whether his probably superficial inspection of American industrial conditions was sufficient to make him an authority on the effects of protected leather it is difficult to say, and I leave American readers to form their own opinions.

APPENDIX D.

LEATHER TRUSTS.

The United States Leather Company, a corporation formed under the laws of New Jersey, February 25, 1893, acquired the properties of a large number of companies and firms engaged in the manufacture of leather. The property consists of real estate, tanneries, bark lands, hides, bark, etc.; stock, par $100; authorized, common, $64,000,000; preferred, $64,000,000; issued, common, $62,882,300; preferred, $62,282,300; total, $125,164,600.

The preferred stock is 8 per cent, cumulative. Stock is transferred at the office of the company, New York. Registrar, Central Trust Company, New York.

The amount of stock originally authorized was $60,000,000 each of preferred and common. In July, 1895, an increase of $4,000,000 in each class was authorized to provide for purchase of bark lands, etc.

During 1895 6 per cent was paid on preferred, and in 1896 1 per cent. In 1897 4 per cent was paid on preferred, and in 1898 4¾ per cent. In April, 1898, dividend was increased from 1 to 1¼ per cent. In 1895 5 per cent was paid on the preferred. In 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904 6 per cent was paid. The dividend paid January, 1905, was 1½ per cent, being also on the 6 per cent annual basis. The amount of dividends overdue on the preferred January 1, 1904, was about 41 per cent. Dividends on the preferred are paid quarterly, in January (1), April, July, and October. (See below regarding details of the reorganization plan dated December 17, 1904.)

On December 17, 1904, a committee—P. Anderson Valentine, chairman; Edward C. Hoyt, A. Augustus Healy, W. G. Garritt, Eugene Horton, Samuel P. Davidge, Lewis H. Lapham, Frederic P. Olcott, Alvin W. Krech, and George Foster Peabody—submitted a plan of reorganization. It provided for a new company to acquire the assets of the old one, or to control it through a majority of the stock, the new company to have $45,000,000 twenty-year 5 per cent bonds, $40,000,000 7 per cent, cumulative, preferred stock, and $40,000,000 common stock.

Under the plan, holders of the old preferred were to exchange it for 50 per cent in new preferred, 50 per cent in new bonds, and 23½ per cent in new common, and the old common stock was to be exchanged for the new in the proportion of one share of new for three of the old common stock. The old 6 per cent debentures were left undisturbed. The capitalization of the new company would be as follows, if all holders of the stock accepted the plan: Five per cent bonds, $31,141,150; new preferred, $31,141,150; new common, $14,636,340, the latter including $6,200,000 of stock to be given to new interests in the company for cooperation and for all services and expenses in carrying out the plan.

The depositary of the committee was the Central Trust Company, New York, and deposits of the old stock were to be made over before February 15, 1905, the plan having been declared operative.

FUNDED DEBT.

Debentures, 6 per cent, due May, 1913, May and November, $5,280,000.

The issue of debentures was to provide the company with working capital. The bonds are subject to redemption by a sinking fund of 4 per cent annually, and bonds can be drawn for it at 110. There were, on December 31, 1904, $600,000 of the bonds in the company's treasury.

Report for the year ending December 31, 1902, gave profits $4,702,384. In 1903, profits, $4,784,998.

Balance sheet December 3, 1904.

ASSETS.	
Cash	$2,420,667
Due by customers	5,757,802
Bills receivable	549,117
Doubtful debtors, valued at	10,735
Sundry other debtors and book accounts	141,906
Hides and leather on hand and in process of tanning	9,814,944
Drawbacks due	559,485
Bark at tanneries	2,262,860
Sundry personal property	595,987
Advances to other companies	343,696
Tannery plants and lands	6,696,069
Stocks of other companies	50,515,442
Bonds of Central Pennsylvania Lumber Company	9,035,000
Bonds of Susquehanna and New York Railroad Company	879,888
Railroad mortgage	100,000
Treasury stock	100,000
Unexpired insurance policies	56,570
Good will, account, etc	62,832,300
Total	152,672,468
LIABILITIES.	
Accrued interest	$26,254
Current accounts	285,261
Bills payable	2,100,000
Exchange not due	1,098,297
Bonds	5,880,000
Less in treasury	600,000
	5,280,000
Reserve for fire insurance	517,685
Preferred stock	62,282,300
Common stock	62,882,300
Surplus January 1, 1905	18,200,011

American Hide and Leather Company, a corporation formed under the laws of New Jersey in August, 1899. The company acquired the plants and business of twenty-two different establishments engaged in the manufacture and sale of upper leathers, particulars of which are given in the manual for 1901.

The establishments acquired represented 75 per cent of the business in upper leather in the United States. In each case the properties acquired were taken in fee clear of all incumbrances. The aggregate annual net earnings of the separate concerns before consolidation were $1,585,748. Stock, par, $100; authorized, common, $17,500,000; preferred, $17,500,000. Issued, common, $11,274,100; preferred, $12,548,300; total, $23,822,400.

The stock preferred is 7 per cent, cumulative, and has a preference as to assets. At the beginning of 1905 the accumulated unpaid dividends amounted to about 35 per cent.

Transfer agents, North American Trust Company, New York; Colonial Trust Company, New York.

The first dividend on the preferred stock was 1 per cent, paid February 15, 1905. It was understood that this was a quarterly dividend, and that the stock had been placed on a 4 per cent basis.

FUNDED DEBT.

First mortgage, 6 per cent, due September, 1919, March and September, $7,837,000.

The first mortgage is for $10,000,000. Of the bonds outstanding, $2,445,000 were accepted by vendors of the property acquired by the company in payment for same, $3,200,000 were disposed of privately, and $2,800,000 were sold in January, 1900, by public subscription. Of the bonds held in the treasury, $1,000,000 only can be issued for the acquisition of new properties, which shall become subject to the mortgage. The trustee of the mortgage is the Colonial Trust Company, New York, interest being paid at that institution. There is a sinking fund of $172,500 per annum. Bonds may be bought for the sinking fund at not over 115, but are not subject to compulsory retirement. On June 30, 1903, there were $494,000 bonds in the sinking fund.

In the year ending June 29, 1901, the surplus over charges was $377,139. In the year ending June 30, 1902, the total profits were

$1,411,511; interest and deductions for depreciation, etc., $1,004,634; balance, $406,877. In 1902–3 profits were $886,114; interest, deductions, etc, $965,748; balance, deficit, $79,634. In 1903–4, profits, $1,204,601; deductions, $913,329; balance, surplus, $291,272. Total surplus, June 30, 1904, $838,155.

APPENDIX E.

TABLES SHOWING AVERAGE ANNUAL PRICES OF STAPLE PRODUCTS IN ST. LOUIS, MILWAUKEE, AND CINCINNATI FOR ABOUT TWENTY YEARS.

TABLE A.—*Quotations of No. 2 corn, No. 2 oats, and native steers at St. Louis for twenty years.*

[Furnished by George H. Morgan, secretary of the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange.]

Year.	No. 2 corn, per bushel.	No. 2 oats, per bushel.	Native steers, per 100 pounds.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	
1905	41¼ to 58¾	25½ to 34½	$5.25 to $7.10
1904	42½ to 57	30½ to 44	4.90 to 6.65
1903	38¼ to 55	32½ to 54	5.00 to 6.00
1902	40¼ to 69½	26⅛ to 59	5.15 to 8.75
1901	37¼ to 70	26 to 50	4.75 to 8.25
1900	30½ to 42½	21 to 30	4.00 to 6.50
1899	29¼ to 36½	20 to 26½	4.00 to 6.10
1898	25¼ to 35½	22 to 33½	3.90 to 5.65
1897	19¼ to 29½	16¾ to 23½	3.25 to 5.25
1896	18 to 27¾	15 to 21	3.00 to 5.10
1895	23½ to 53	16½ to 31	2.90 to 6.25
1894	31¼ to 56	27½ to 45	3.00 to 5.80
1893	31¾ to 41½	23 to 33	3.75 to 6.00
1892	34¼ to 50½	28 to 34¾	3.70 to 6.10
1891	47 to 73	27 to 56	3.50 to 6.30
1890	24¾ to 54	19½ to 45	3.00 to 6.50
1889	25½ to 33¾	17⅞ to 25¾	2.00 to 4.85
1888	30½ to 56	21 to 37½	2.10 to 6.10
1887	33½ to 49¾	25½ to 32½	2.75 to 5.00
1886	30½ to 40¾	25 to 31	2.85 to 5.65

TABLE B.—*Yearly range of leading grades of cash prices of corn and oats in the Milwaukee market for the past twenty years.*

Year.	Corn, No. 3.	Oats, No. 3 white.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
1905	40 to 59½	26 to 43½
1904	40 to 58½	28½ to 45
1903	39 to 55	31½ to 42
1902	43 to 67	29 to 61
1901	34½ to 65½	25 to 48¾
1900	30½ to 45¼	22¾ to 28¾
1899	29½ to 36	21¾ to 31
1898	24 to 38	20¾ to 33¾
1897	18½ to 31½	16 to 25¼
1896	20 to 30	14 to 21½
1895	24½ to 55	17½ to 33
1894	32½ to 60½	27 to 52
1893	33½ to 44½	24 to 36½
1892	34¾ to 53½	27½ to 37
1891	36 to 75	27½ to 60
1890	26 to 55	[a] 21½ to 48½
1889	28 to 37½	[a] 20 to 30
1888	30 to 58½	27 to 39
1887	----------	27½ to 34
1886	34 to 46	[a] 25½ to 37
1885	33 to 53	[a] 24¾ to 39

[a] No. 2 white.

TABLE C.—*Average annual prices of staple products at Cincinnati, Ohio.*

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1904.]

Year.	Cattle, gross, per 100 pounds.	Sheep, gross, per 100 pounds.	Hogs, gross, per 100 pounds.	Pork, barrels, each.	Ohio River salt, per barrel.	Leaf tobacco, per 100 pounds.	Cotton middling, per 100 pounds.	Tallow, per 100 pounds.	Hides, per 100 pounds.	Leather, per 100 pounds.	Wool, per 100 pounds.
1884–85	$3.53	$3.99	$4.44	$0.82	$1.00	$9.50	$10.42	$6.18	$9.22	$29.87	$28.52
1885–86	3.24	4.13	3.82	.83	.97	8.00	9.17	4.82	9.70	29.46	30.07
1886–87	2.98	4.10	4.28	.81	.87	10.80	9.72	4.22	9.17	30.78	31.10
1887–88	3.04	4.58	5.18	.78	.94	15.00	9.83	4.56	7.98	29.25	27.37
1888–89	2.84	4.46	5.15	.85	.93	10.25	10.24	5.12	7.00	29.49	29.55
1889–90	2.90	4.84	3.74	.83	.90	9.25	11.04	4.52	6.77	27.82	30.15
1890–91	3.28	4.83	3.64	.79	.93	9.00	9.25	4.90	5.75	27.70	29.67
1891–92	3.17	4.79	3.90	.70	.92	9.75	7.60	4.67	4.66	26.87	25.87
1892	3.22	4.86	5.05	.71	.92	10.00	7.73	4.65	4.44	26.31	26.50
1893	3.61	4.20	6.90	.76	.89	11.85	8.38	5.56	4.00	23.84	25.70
1894	3.85	3.10	5.10	.79	.84	10.05	6.93	5.15	3.66	22.44	19.60
1895	3.85	3.30	4.35	.78	.84	9.40	7.04	4.67	6.02	26.60	18.53
1896	3.40	3.15	3.50	.81	.75	6.95	7.57	3.75	5.52	23.96	17.81
1897	3.54	3.78	3.30	.80	.75	8.05	6.96	3.59	7.73	25.92	24.45
1898	3.70	3.87	3.85	.80	.77	9.10	5.69	3.90	8.71	25.96	24.95
1899	3.85	3.77	4.65	.71	.82	7.95	6.30	4.71	8.57	27.27	21.85
1900	4.00	3.72	5.10	.70	1.04	8.52	9.38	5.13	7.99	29.11	25.64
1901	3.78	3.34	5.95	.78	1.03	7.90	8.38	5.56	7.63	30.14	23.35
1902	4.10	3.80	6.80	.92	.80	8.10	8.65	6.75	7.70	30.50	23.50
1903	3.50	3.80	6.05	.99	.83	8.35	10.95	5.05	7.00	28.10	25.50
1904	3.40	3.70	5.25	1.03	.90	10.05	11.60	4.80	8.25	30.10	30.00

TABLE D.—*Average annual prices of staple products at Cincinnati, Ohio.*

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1904.]

Year.	Butter, dairy, per pound.	Butter, creamery, per pound.	Butterine, per pound.	Cheese, factory, per pound.	Eggs, selected, per dozen.	Potatoes, standard, per bushel.	Apples, green, per barrel.	Apples, dried, per 100 pounds.	Peaches, dried, per 100 pounds.	Sugar, hards, per 100 pounds.	Molasses, New Orleans, per gallon.
	Cts.	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*					*Cts.*
1884–85	16.45	25.34	14.56	9.24	16.59	50	$2.15	$3.31	$7.29	$7.00	48.70
1885–86	14.12	20.07	11.93	9.41	13.58	48	1.35	2.40	3.20	7.16	43.03
1886–87	18.82	24.52	14.50	11.19	14.60	53	2.59	3.99	5.58	6.51	42.31
1887–88	17.49	23.99	15.19	10.39	15.84	88	2.20	6.03	6.97	7.40	41.50
1888–89	14.66	22.01	16.29	9.69	13.50	40	1.54	3.01	2.82	8.49	41.21
1889–90	13.50	20.81	15.50	9.00	13.54	52	2.82	3.72	3.11	7.59	40.59
1890–91	14.98	22.89	16.23	9.60	16.30	97	3.49	9.07	8.16	6.12	34.60
1891–92	16.53	23.92	17.25	10.17	15.77	45	2.14	3.40	2.74	4.89	34.31
1892	17.03	24.27	18.09	10.00	15.66	55	2.50	3.35	3.10	5.04	31.73
1893	19.00	25.00	16.90	10.18	16.30	74	2.90	5.04	4.88	5.64	33.27
1894	12.88	18.92	14.97	9.75	12.41	66	3.30	5.55	5.65	5.05	32.11
1895	10.54	17.13	14.25	9.00	13.79	49	2.02	4.52	7.40	5.03	28.97
1896	8.60	14.50	12.50	8.85	10.75	28	1.89	2.25	6.25	4.73	31.86
1897	9.65	15.45	12.80	9.05	10.79	48	1.97	2.64	7.13	5.29	26.13
1898	11.03	16.46	13.75	8.68	12.14	57	2.75	4.31	8.05	5.74	31.82
1899	12.56	18.60	14.08	10.66	13.55	49	2.59	4.81	10.22	5.57	32.00
1900	13.99	19.90	16.02	10.98	13.43	43	2.54	3.44	8.85	6.15	38.46
1901	11.97	19.36	13.25	10.28	14.98	62	2.73	3.31	8.18	5.82	34.25
1902	15.52	21.83	16.80	11.60	18.00	62	2.90	4.20	8.36	5.22	33.46
1903	13.65	20.95	13.80	11.40	17.80	59	2.40	4.50	7.00	5.53	32.62
1904	11.40	20.70	13.00	9.40	19.60	78	2.30	4.45	7.85	5.80	32.66

TABLE E.—*Yearly range and average prices of grain, in cents, at Cincinnati, Ohio.*

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1904.]

Year.	Wheat.		Corn.		Oats.		Rye.		Barley.
	Range.	Average.	Range.	Average.	Range.	Average.	Range.	Average.	Average.
1893	52 – 75	64	35½–51	44	20 –36	32	48 –68	55	64
1894	48 – 60	54	32½–59½	45	29¾–54	35	41½–56	52	60
1895	53 – 90	66	24¾–56	41	19 –34½	27	40 –75	53	56½
1896	55 – 97	72	18½–33	27	15½–23	20	26½–44	38	36
1897	70 –100	89	20 –33	26	16¾–25	21	33 –52	41	39
1898	64 –145	86	27½–41	34	21½–34½	27	40 –80	51	47
1899	68 – 77	72	29 –40	36	21½–31½	27	56 –68	62	52
1900	70 – 89	75	34 –47	41	21 –28	25	51½–67	59	53
1901	64 – 90	77	39 –74½	52	25 –50¾	34	45 –73	60	64
1902	68 – 92	30	44 –69	61	27 –57	41	51 –71½	58	64
1903	74½– 92	81	40 –54½	47	31½–43½	37	54 –63	58	62
1904	92½–125	108	45½–59	51	31 –44½	38	61 –87	77	62

TABLE F.—*Average price of live hogs, winter seasons, at Cincinnati, Ohio.*

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1905.]

1888–89	$5.15
1889–90	3.75
1890–91	3.65
1891–92	3.90
1892–93	6.60
1893–94	5.35
1894–95	4.35
1895–96	3.80
1896–97	3.35
1897–98	3.60
1898–99	$3.55
1899–1900	4.40
1900–1901	5.05
1901–2	6.00
1902–3	6.50
1903–4	4.90
1904–5	4.80

TABLE G.—*Average annual prices of staple products at Cincinnati, Ohio.*

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1905.]

Year.	Clover seed, per 100 pounds.	Timothy seed, per bushel.	Flax seed, per bushel.	Hay, timothy, per ton.	Bran, per ton.	Middlings, fine, per ton.	Middlings, coarse, per ton.	Coal, afloat, Pittsburg, per bushel.	Coal, afloat, Kanawha, per bushel.	Coal, delivered, Pittsburg, per ton.	Coal, delivered, Kanawha, per ton.	Coal, anthracite, per ton.
								Cts.	*Cts.*			
1884–85	$8.02	$1.41	$1.31	$12.81	$12.96	$16.18	$14.49	8.04	7.43	$3.03	$2.98	$7.05
1885–86	9.27	1.83	1.06	12.16	11.76	14.84	13.26	6.58	6.24	2.79	2.68	6.62
1886–87	7.05	1.87	.97	11.17	12.85	14.62	13.21	9.55	7.26	3.06	3.01	6.78
1887–88	6.77	2.44	1.14	14.79	15.66	17.71	16.56	10.01	9.75	3.68	3.68	7.63
1888–89	7.78	1.50	1.25	12.74	12.07	13.86	12.66	6.71	6.10	2.76	2.68	7.00
1889–90	5.64	1.30	1.26	10.56	11.16	12.76	11.49	6.78	6.37	2.69	2.69	6.46
1890–91	6.88	1.30	1.18	10.58	16.64	19.57	18.27	7.28	6.75	2.84	2.84	6.36
1891–92	8.43	1.27	.92	11.25	14.25	16.20	15.55	7.63	7.09	2.87	2.87	6.41
1892	9.70	1.47	.95	11.10	13.67	15.11	13.94	7.49	------	2.88	2.88	6.79
1893	10.67	1.68	1.05	12.55	13.35	14.76	13.18	7.58	7.20	3.07	2.94	7.23
1894	8.80	2.10	1.16	10.95	13.15	14.10	13.40	6.34	6.69	2.53	2.55	6.35
1895	7.64	2.07	1.08	12.70	13.25	14.60	13.30	6.00	5.42	2.51	2.49	6.16

TABLE G.—*Average annual prices of staple products, etc,*—Continued.

Year.	Clover seed, per 100 pounds.	Timothy seed, per bushel.	Flax seed, per bushel.	Hay, timothy, per ton.	Bran, per ton.	Middlings, fine, per ton.	Middlings, coarse, per ton.	Coal, afloat, Pittsburg, per bushel.	Coal, afloat, Kanawha, per bushel.	Coal, delivered, Pittsburg, per ton.	Coal, delivered, Kanawha, per ton.	Coal, anthracite, per ton.
								Cts.	Cts.			
1896	$6.74	$1.39	$0.80	$12.20	$8.90	$9.50	$9.00	5.73	5.28	$2.34	$2.34	$6.44
1897	5.82	1.20	.73	9.80	9.55	10.55	10.10	5.70	4.91	2.25	2.26	6.42
1898	5.08	1.11	.87	8.67	11.92	12.52	13.23	5.66	4.89	2.23	2.27	6.20
1899	5.48	1.05	.94	10.10	12.70	13.75	13.20	5.30	5.58	2.64	2.63	6.50
1900	7.75	1.37	1.19	13.95	14.60	15.90	15.35	7.50	7.48	2.03	3.05	6.90
1901	9.27	2.21	1.31	13.60	16.75	18.15	17.45	7.50	7.15	2.82	2.78	6.70
1902	7.92	2.20	1.30	13.35	17.35	19.50	18.60	7.92	7.86	3.25	3.25	9.00
1903	9.66	1.45	1.08	15.40	17.00	19.00	18.00	9.25	9.25	3.66	3.66	8.00
1904	9.75	1.25	1.00	13.00	18.65	21.20	19.60	8.50	8.50	3.20	3.20	7.30

EXHIBIT H.

[The figures given below were taken from the Statistical Abstract for 1904.]

In 1891 the average farm value of hogs was $4.15. January 1, 1893, under Democratic rule, was $6.41, and January, 1894, was $5.98, two Democratic years, against January 1, 1904, of $6.15, and January 1, 1905, $5.99, in these prosperous years. How much more are the farmers' hogs worth than they were before, and how much did the tariff add to their value, when the price of corn had increased wonderfully?

How much better off is the farmer selling a bushel of timothy seed that he was able to get for in 1893 an average price of $3.85 and in 1894 $4.80, in 1895 $4.84, in 1896 $3.04, against $2.88 last year, under these prosperous times?

How much better off are the farmers who owned, according to the agricultural report, January 1, 1893, 35,954,196 head of cattle other than milch cows, at a value of $547,882,204, an average of $15.25, than the farmers who owned January 1, 1905, 43,669,443 head of cattle other than milch cows, valued at $661,571,308, an average of $15.15?

How much better off are the farmers who in 1893 had 16,424,087 milch cows, at a value of $357,299,785, or an average of $22 per head, against 16,292,360 in 1900, at a value of $514,812,106, which averaged about $31.50, and against the farmers that had in 1905 17,572,464 head, at a value of $482,272,203, or an average of $27.50?

The price of sheep, of which there was 47,273,553 in 1893, valued at $125,909,000, an average of $2.70, against 41,883,065 in 1900, valued at $122,665,913, an average of about $2.90, and in 1905, the most prosperous year, 45,174,423, valued at $127,331,850, an average of about $2.80.

In 1893 we had 16,206,202 horses, worth $992,225,185, an average of $62 per head, and in 1900, a prosperous year, had 13,537,524, valued at $603,969,442, an average of $45, and in 1905 we had 17,057,702, at an average of about $70. Was it Republican prosperity that made the price $45 in 1900 and $62 in 1893, and $70 in 1905, or was it due to the wars all over the world that created an extra demand for them, that they sold for an average price of $80.72 in 1906, or was it because the horses are better, as most of them are sold for working on the farms, no doubt?

TABLE No. 1.—EXTREME PRICES OF BEEF STEERS.—*Monthly range of prices at Chicago for 1,200 to 1,800 pound native beef cattle during 1904, with yearly prices.*

[From Yearbook of Live Stock Figures, published by Chicago Daily Drovers' Journal, February, 1905.]

	Steers, 1,200 to 1,350 pounds, average.	Steers, 1,350 to 1,500 pounds, average.	Steers, 1,500 to 1,800 pounds, average.
Month.			
January	$3.65 to $5.85	$4.10 to $5.75	$4.55 to $5.90
February	3.50 to 5.90	3.80 to 6.00	4.35 to 6.00
March	3.65 to 5.80	4.10 to 6.00	4.50 to 5.80
April	3.80 to 5.60	4.25 to 5.70	4.45 to 5.80
May	3.90 to 5.90	4.25 to 5.90	4.60 to 5.90
June	4.50 to 6.65	5.20 to 6.65	5.60 to 6.70
July	4.40 to 6.65	5.00 to 6.55	5.40 to 6.50
August	3.80 to 6.40	4.25 to 6.40	4.75 to 6.40
September	3.65 to 6.35	4.25 to 6.55	4.90 to 6.50
October	3.50 to 7.00	4.10 to 6.90	5.10 to 7.00
November	3.50 to 7.10	4.00 to 7.25	4.70 to 7.30
December	3.35 to 12.25[a]	4.00 to 9.00[a]	4.40 to 10.50[a]
Year.			
1904	3.35 to 12.25	3.80 to 9.00	4.35 to 10.50
1903	3.35 to 6.80	3.75 to 7.50	4.10 to 7.55
1902	3.60 to 9.00	4.00 to 9.00	4.25 to 14.50
1901	3.60 to 8.75	4.30 to 12.00	4.80 to 9.30
1900	3.90 to 8.50	4.30 to 11.00	4.70 to 15.50
1899	4.00 to 7.30	4.30 to 8.25	4.60 to 8.25
1898	3.80 to 5.90	3.90 to 6.15	4.10 to 6.25
1897	3.35 to 5.60	3.65 to 6.00	4.00 to 6.00
1896	2.90 to 5.85	3.20 to 6.50	3.40 to 6.25
1895	2.90 to 6.25	3.20 to 6.40	3.60 to 6.60
1894	2.90 to 6.40	3.10 to 6.40	3.50 to 6.00
1893	2.90 to 5.80	3.10 to 6.05	4.00 to 6.75
1892	2.85 to 5.85	3.25 to 6.35	3.75 to 7.00
1891	2.70 to 6.20	3.00 to 6.50	4.00 to 7.15
1890	2.75 to 5.10	3.25 to 5.00	3.75 to 6.40
1889	2.60 to 4.70	2.85 to 5.40	3.40 to 6.10
1888	2.75 to 6.40	3.30 to 6.75	4.00 to 7.00
1887	2.60 to 6.25	3.20 to 6.25	3.60 to 6.50
1886	3.00 to 5.80	3.50 to 6.10	4.25 to 6.50
1885	3.50 to 6.10	3.90 to 6.00	4.75 to 6.80
1884	4.10 to 7.00	4.50 to 7.25	5.35 to 8.00
1883	4.10 to 7.00	4.80 to 7.12½	5.35 to 7.25
1882	4.25 to 9.00	4.70 to 9.00	5.40 to 9.30
1881	3.80 to 7.00	4.10 to 7.20	5.30 to 8.00
1880	4.50 to 5.50	4.30 to 6.00	5.00 to 7.00
1879	3.20 to 5.00	3.90 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.00
1878	3.00 to 4.70	3.50 to 5.00	4.00 to 5.50

[a] International show cattle. Highest on open market, $7.65.

TABLE No. 2.—AVERAGE PRICES OF NATIVE BEEF CATTLE.—*Monthly average prices for 1,200 to 1,500 pound native beef cattle at Chicago for seven years.*

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
January	$4.90	$4.90	$6.20	$5.10	$5.40	$5.35	$4.70
February	4.75	4.75	6.05	5.10	4.95	5.20	4.80
March	4.85	4.80	6.20	5.15	5.00	5.10	4.70
April	4.80	5.00	6.80	5.35	5.10	5.05	4.60
May	5.00	4.85	7.00	5.40	5.20	5.20	4.55
June	5.95	5.00	7.45	5.70	5.30	5.25	4.60
July	5.60	5.00	7.90	5.35	5.35	5.50	4.95
August	5.20	5.10	7.85	5.30	5.55	5.80	5.10
September	5.35	5.15	7.45	5.75	5.50	5.90	5.10
October	5.60	4.90	7.10	5.70	5.40	5.85	5.10
November	5.05	4.70	5.80	5.70	5.35	5.80	5.00
December	4.75	4.80	5.30	5.90	5.20	5.95	5.05
Yearly average	5.10	4.90	6.75	5.45	5.30	5.50	4.85

TABLE No. 3.—EXTREME PRICES OF BEEF STEERS.—*Monthly range of prices at Chicago for 900 to 1,200 pound native beef cattle and distillery-fed steers during 1904, with yearly comparisons for ten years.*

	Steers, 1,050 to 1,200 pounds average.	Steers, 900 to 1,050 pounds average.	Distillery-fed steers.
Months.			
January	$3.15 to $5.75	$3.00 to $5.75	----------
February	3.20 to 5.50	3.00 to 5.35	----------
March	3.25 to 5.60	3.00 to 5.40	$3.65 to $4.50
April	3.35 to 5.65	3.10 to 5.15	----------
May	3.60 to 5.70	3.35 to 5.50	4.25 to 5.65
June	4.00 to 6.40	3.80 to 6.25	4.75 to 6.30
July	3.95 to 6.40	3.80 to 6.10	5.00 to 6.25
August	3.35 to 6.30	3.00 to 6.25	5.15 to 5.90
September	3.00 to 6.15	2.85 to 6.05	4.65 to 5.85
October	2.75 to 6.60	2.40 to 6.35	4.50 to 5.30
November	2.60 to 6.75	2.40 to 6.25	4.75 to 5.10
December	[a]2.80 to 8.00	[a]2.50 to 8.00	4.80 to 4.90
Yearly range.			
1904	2.60 to 8.00	2.40 to 8.00	3.65 to 6.30
1903	3.00 to 8.35	2.90 to 6.05	3.50 to 5.70
1902	3.15 to 8.60	2.90 to 8.15	3.80 to 8.20
1901	3.30 to 9.50	3.30 to 8.70	3.90 to 6.25
1900	3.50 to 7.30	3.25 to 6.50	3.50 to 5.65
1899	3.85 to 6.75	3.75 to 6.50	3.80 to 6.25
1898	3.70 to 5.85	3.60 to 5.60	3.75 to 5.50
1897	3.35 to 5.60	3.25 to 5.25	3.70 to 4.90
1896	2.90 to 5.75	2.90 to 4.90	3.50 to 4.40
1895	2.75 to 6.20	2.70 to 5.85	4.25 to 5.75
1894	2.70 to 6.00	2.70 to 5.50	3.45 to 4.75

[a] International show cattle.

TABLE No. 4.—AVERAGE PRICES OF NATIVE BEEF CATTLE.—*Monthly average prices of native beef cattle at Chicago during 1904, with the yearly average for ten years.*

	1,500 to 1,900 pounds.	1,350 to 1,500 pounds.	1,200 to 1,350 pounds.	1,050 to 1,200 pounds.	900 to 1,050 pounds.	900 to 1,900 pounds.
Month.						
January	$5.30	$5.10	$4.65	$4.40	$4.15	$4.65
February	5.25	4.95	4.50	4.10	3.85	4.50
March	5.30	5.05	4.60	4.25	3.90	4.60
April	5.15	4.95	4.60	4.30	4.05	4.65
May	5.35	5.15	4.85	4.65	4.30	4.85
June	6.25	6.10	5.80	5.35	4.95	5.60
July	6.10	5.85	5.40	5.05	4.60	5.40
August	5.85	5.35	5.05	4.55	4.15	5.10
September	5.95	5.50	5.20	4.50	4.25	5.10
October	6.25	5.90	5.30	4.50	4.05	5.20
November	6.10	5.40	4.70	4.10	3.75	4.95
December	5.60	5.00	4.50	3.70	3.40	4.40
Year.						
1904	5.70	5.45	4.95	4.45	4.10	4.95
1903	5.20	5.05	4.80	4.45	4.15	4.80
1902	7.25	6.80	6.25	5.65	5.05	6.20
1901	5.95	5.65	5.25	4.85	4.50	5.25
1900	5.55	5.40	5.15	4.90	4.70	5.15
1899	5.75	5.55	5.25	4.95	4.70	5.30
1898	5.05	4.85	4.65	4.45	4.30	4.65
1897	4.95	4.70	4.45	4.25	4.10	4.50
1896	4.40	4.30	4.05	3.90	3.70	4.05
1895	5.20	4.85	4.40	4.10	3.95	4.50
1894	4.75	4.55	4.20	3.95	3.75	4.25
1893	5.35	4.75	4.40	4.10	3.85	4.45

TABLE No. 5.—TEXAS CATTLE RECEIPTS.—*Monthly receipts of Texas cattle at Chicago for 1904, with comparisons.*

Month.	1904	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.
January	500	413	8,600	14,175	19,150
February	1,673	6,684	8,919	9,208	14,200
March	1,902	2,809	4,031	8,517	18,400
April	492	2,702	3,473	5,423	7,100
May	1,870	4,478	7,640	2,316	6,000
June	25,135	22,299	26,076	12,510	11,300
July	16,705	35,398	37,695	26,075	20,859
August	14,375	22,130	23,714	17,600	32,127
September	9,983	29,411	25,900	25,105	23,324
October	3,210	17,428	22,575	26,510	25,410
November	900	4,622	13,246	6,780	9,178
December	200	2,000	8,400	7,000	7,500
Total	76,945	150,374	190,269	161,219	194,726

TABLE NO. 6.—TEXAS CATTLE PRICES.—*Monthly prices at Chicago for Texas steers, cows, heifers, and bulls for 1904, with yearly comparisons for twelve years.*

	Steers.	Bulk of sales.	Cows and bulls.
Month.			
February	$3.10 to $4.65	$3.40 to $4.00	$2.60 to $3.55
March	3.20 to 5.00	4.20 to 4.90	3.00 to 3.60
April	4.25 to 4.80	4.40 to 4.75	3.20 to 4.20
May	3.65 to 5.10	4.10 to 4.75	2.75 to 3.50
June	3.00 to 5.95	4.00 to 5.50	2.25 to 4.00
July	2.90 to 5.35	4.00 to 5.00	1.75 to 4.00
August	2.75 to 4.85	3.25 to 4.25	2.00 to 3.40
September	3.00 to 3.50	3.40 to 3.50	
October	3.75 to 3.45	3.10 to 3.45	
December	4.30 to 4.65	4.30 to 4.65	
Yearly range.			
1904	2.75 to 5.95	3.25 to 5.50	1.75 to 4.20
1903	2.40 to 5.10	3.25 to 4.60	1.50 to 4.15
1902	2.55 to 7.65	3.25 to 6.50	1.85 to 6.35
1901	2.85 to 5.60	3.25 to 5.30	1.50 to 4.85
1900	3.10 to 5.90	3.40 to 5.00	2.35 to 4.45
1899	3.00 to 3.75	3.50 to 5.00	2.10 to 4.65
1898	3.15 to 5.40	3.40 to 4.75	2.00 to 4.55
1897	2.75 to 4.80	3.00 to 4.50	1.75 to 4.25
1896	2.10 to 5.50	2.75 to 4.25	1.25 to 3.65
1895	1.90 to 5.75	2.75 to 4.20	1.40 to 5.15
1894	1.50 to 4.50	2.60 to 4.00	1.00 to 3.80
1893	1.60 to 6.00	3.00 to 4.25	1.25 to 4.30

TABLE NO. 7.—AVERAGE PRICES OF TEXAS CATTLE.—*Monthly average prices for straight Texas steers at Chicago for seven years.*

[From the same source.]

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
January		$4.30	$4.85	$4.35	$4.50	$4.45	$4.20
February	$3.65	3.95	5.10	4.15	4.30	4.20	4.15
March	4.50	4.10	5.40	4.45	4.30	4.50	4.25
April	4.55	4.55	5.70	4.75	4.65	4.50	4.20
May	4.50	4.10	5.65	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.15
June	4.80	3.95	5.65	4.65	4.40	4.70	4.20
July	4.50	4.10	5.00	4.10	4.25	4.60	4.45
August	3.75	4.00	4.30	4.15	3.95	4.20	4.00
September	3.45	3.65	3.85	3.80	3.85	4.00	3.60
October	3.20	3.30	3.75	3.45	3.65	3.75	3.65
November		3.25	3.50	3.55	3.95	3.85	3.75
December	4.40	3.85	4.50	4.55	3.90	4.30	3.80
Average	4.10	3.95	4.80	4.20	4.20	4.35	4.05

TABLE NO. 8.—TOP PRICES OF TEXAS CATTLE.—*Monthly top prices for straight Texas cattle (steers) at Chicago for seven years.*

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
January		$4.75	$6.25	$4.85	$5.90	$5.25	$4.65
February	$3.65	4.35	6.00	5.05	5.15	5.05	4.65
March	5.00	4.65	6.65	4.95	5.40	6.00	5.40
April	4.80	5.10	6.50	5.40	5.40	5.35	4.55
May	5.10	4.80	6.85	4.90	5.05	5.00	4.65
June	5.95	4.75	7.65	5.60	5.35	5.15	4.75
July	5.25	5.10	6.60	5.20	5.40	5.65	5.00
August	4.85	5.00	5.62	5.25	4.90	5.35	4.50
September	3.50	4.70	4.25	4.70	4.85	5.15	4.00
October	3.45	4.25	5.45	4.10	4.50	4.65	4.25
November		3.65	4.00	4.75	5.00	6.75	4.30
December	4.65	4.00	5.00	5.20	5.90	5.50	5.00
Top	5.95	5.10	7.65	5.60	5.90	6.75	5.40

A load of show Texas fed in Ohio sold in December, 1901, at $12, the highest Texas-bred cattle on record.

TABLE NO. 9.—TEXAS CATTLE AND FED WESTERNS.—*Monthly average prices for straight Texas, native-fed Texas steers, and native corn-fed western steers for 1904, with yearly averages.*

	Straight Texas steers.	Texas bulls, cows, and heifers.	Native corn-fed Texas steers.	Native corn-fed westerns.
Month.				
January			$4.40	$4.90
February	$3.65	$2.95	4.30	4.75
March	4.50	3.30	4.65	4.90
April	4.55	3.65	4.70	4.90
May	4.50	3.25	4.90	5.10
June	4.80	2.70	5.45	6.05
July	4.50	2.95	5.30	5.85
August	3.75	2.80	4.95	5.35
September	3.45		4.80	5.35
October	3.20		4.50	5.50
November			4.45	5.10
December	4.40		4.50	4.85
Yearly average.				
1904	$4.10	$3.10	$4.75	$5.20
1903	3.95	2.95	4.70	4.95
1902	4.80	3.35	6.20	6.60
1901	4.20	3.10	5.05	5.55
1900	4.20	3.30	4.75	5.30
1899	4.35	3.25	4.90	5.35

TABLE NO. 10.—TOP PRICES FOR WESTERN CATTLE.—*Top prices for grass western range cattle at Chicago for seven years.*

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
July	$5.00	$4.60	$6.90		$5.00		
August	4.75	4.75	7.15	$5.05	5.35	$5.40	$4.90
September	5.10	5.00	7.25	5.55	5.35	5.40	4.75
October	5.65	5.05	7.40	5.75	5.05	5.30	5.00
November	5.40	4.50	6.50	5.45	5.00	5.70	4.55
December	5.00	3.85	5.20	5.00		4.75	4.25
Top	5.65	5.05	7.40	5.75	5.35	5.70	5.00

TABLE NO. 11.—AVERAGE PRICES FOR WESTERN CATTLE.—*Monthly average prices for grass western steers at Chicago for seven years.*

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1893.
July		$3.90	$5.80		$4.45		
August	$3.80	3.85	5.55	$4.60	4.40	$4.65	$4.30
September	3.85	3.70	4.85	4.55	4.40	4.60	4.30
October	3.50	3.55	4.80	4.55	4.25	4.55	4.25
November	3.50	3.40	4.55	4.45	4.25	4.60	4.00
December	3.80	3.50	4.25			4.50	4 00
Average	3.65	3.65	4.95	4.55	4.35	4.60	4.20

TABLE NO. 12.—CATTLE RECEIPTS CLASSIFIED.

During 1904 Chicago received 2,882,185 head of so-called "native" cattle, being the second largest run of natives on record. Receipts of straight Texas during 1904 were the smallest in over twenty-five years, while western range receipts were over 90,000 larger than in 1903.

Classified receipts of cattle at Chicago for the last eighteen years were as follows:

Year.	Natives.	Texas.	Westerns.	All kinds.
1904	2,882,185	77,000	300,000	3,259,185
1903	3,072,386	150,300	209,800	3,432,486
1902	2,441,990	190,269	309,300	2,941,559
1901	2,729,499	161,419	140,478	3,031,396
1900	2,387,320	194,726	147,000	2,729,046
1899	2,159,524	171,222	173,700	2,514,446
1898	2,154,943	130,408	195,546	2,480,897
1897	2,118,696	202,697	233,531	2,554,924
1896	2,005,279	323,422	271,775	2,600,476
1895	1,798,389	359,643	430,526	2,588,558
1894	2,215,465	384,469	374,429	2,974,363
1893	2,148,887	670,029	314,420	3,133,406
1892	2,583,516	717,153	271,127	3,571,796
1891	2,190,829	689,187	370,343	3,250,359
1890	2,597,733	657,053	229,494	3,484,280
1889	2,246,128	616,757	160,396	3,023,281
1888	1,796,864	547,185	267,494	2,611,543
1887	1,635,205	485,528	261,275	2,382,008
1886	1,404,550	320,830	238,520	1,963,900

TABLE NO. 13.—AVERAGE PRICES FOR HOGS.—*Monthly and average prices for all grades of hogs and pigs at Chicago during 1904, with comparisons.*

	Mixed.	Heavy.	Light.	All grades.	Pigs.
Month.					
January	$4.85	$4.95	$4.80	$4.90	$4.30
February	5.15	5.25	4.95	5.15	4.45
March	5.40	5.50	5.25	5.35	4.75
April	5.10	5.15	5.05	5.10	4.55
May	4.65	4.75	4.60	4.65	4.25
June	5.05	5.05	5.05	5.05	4.65
July	5.40	5.35	5.45	5.40	5.20
August	5.30	5.25	5.45	5.30	5.30
September	5.75	5.70	5.85	5.75	5.40
October	5.45	5.35	5.40	5.40	5.00
November	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.80	4.40
December	4.50	4.55	4.45	4.50	4.10
Yearly average.					
1904	5.15	5.15	5.10	5.15	4.70
1903	6.00	6.00	5.95	6.00	5.70
1902	6.80	6.95	6.70	6.85	5.90
1901	5.85	5.90	5.80	5.85	4.95
1900	5.05	5.05	5.05	5.05	4.50
1899	4.05	4.05	4.05	4.05	3.75
1898	3.85	3.85	3.80	3.85	3.45
1897	3.70	3.65	3.75	3 70	3.40
1896	3.50	3.40	3.60	3 50	3.40
1895	4.30	4.35	4.30	4.30	3.90
1894	5.00	5.05	5.05	5.05	4.25
1893	6.00	6.55	6.60	6.60	6.05

TABLE NO. 14.—WESTERN SHEEP AND EXPORT STOCK.—*Monthly prices at Chicago for western sheep and export sheep and yearlings during 1904, with yearly comparisons.*

	Western sheep.	Bulk of westerns.	Export sheep and yearlings.
Month.			
January	$2.25 to $4.75	$3.75 to $4.50	$3.85 to $4.75
February	2.40 to 4.75	3.95 to 4.60	4.25 to 4.75
March	2.75 to 5.45	4.40 to 5.15	4.70 to 5.45
April	3.50 to 5.80	5.00 to 5.75	5.00 to 5.75
May	2.75 to 5.80	5.00 to 5.60	5.00 to 5.80
June	2.25 to 5.50	4.25 to 5.20	5.25 to 5.50

TABLE No. 14.—WESTERN SHEEP AND EXPORT STOCK.—*Monthly prices at Chicago for western sheep and export sheep, etc.*—Continued.

	Western sheep.	Bulk of westerns.	Export sheep and yearlings.
Month.			
July	$2.00 to 4.65	$3.50 to 4.40	$3.75 to 5.25
August	2.00 to 4.25	3.35 to 4.00	3.80 to 4.50
September	2.00 to 4.35	3.00 to 4.10	4.00 to 4.50
October	2.00 to 4.75	3.15 to 4.35	3.90 to 4.75
November	2.00 to 4.85	3.60 to 4.60	4.10 to 5.00
December	3.00 to 5.60	4.20 to 5.00	4.35 to 5.60
Yearly range.			
1904	2.00 to 5.80	3.50 to 5.20	3.75 to 5.80
1903	1.25 to 7.00	3.00 to 5.50	3.15 to 6.50
1902	1.25 to 6.30	3.00 to 6.25	3.40 to 6.25
1901	1.25 to 5.25	3.00 to 5.00	3.25 to 5.25
1900	2.50 to 6.50	3.40 to 6.30	3.75 to 6.00
1899	2.40 to 5.55	3.35 to 5.50	3.85 to 5.25
1898	2.75 to 5.25	3.50 to 5.00	
1897	2.15 to 5.35	3.00 to 5.00	
1896	1.15 to 4.30	2.40 to 3.85	
1895	1.35 to 5.55	2.00 to 4.75	
1894	1.10 to 5.40	1.75 to 4.50	
1893	1.25 to 6.40	2.50 to 5.25	

APPENDIX F.

TABLE A.—*Range of prices of No. 1 buffs and calfskins since 1892 in Milwaukee.*

Year.	No. 1 buffs.				No. 1 calfskins.			
	High.		Low.		High.		Low.	
	Price.	Month.	Price.	Month.	Price.	Month.	Price.	Month.
	Cents.		*Cents.*		*Cents.*		*Cents.*	
1892	5½	Jan	4½	Sept	9½	Dec	7½	June.
1893	5	Mar	3¾	Nov	10½	Mar	6½	Aug.
1894	6	Dec	3½	June	9¾	Dec	7	Apr.
1895	9¾	July	5¾	Feb	14¾	July	8	Dec.
1896	9½	Oct	5½	Aug	11½	Nov	7¾	Apr.
1897	10	Sept	7¾	May	14	Nov	9¾	May.
1898	10½	June	9	Apr	13½	Feb	11¼	Apr.
1899	11½	Dec	9½	Apr	13½	Dec	12	June.
1900	11	Jan	8½	Aug	13½	Jan	9½	Aug.
1901	9¾	Oct	7¾	Apr	12¾	Oct	11½	Mar.
1902	9¾	Sept	7¾	Mar	12¾	Dec	11	July.
1903	9½	June	8	Nov	13	Dec	11½	June.
1904	10¾	Nov	8¾	Feb	14¾	Dec	13	Apr.
1905	13¾	Nov	10	Mar	16	Nov	14¼	June.

This table plainly shows that calfskins, which are upon the free list, advanced and declined at different times, depending solely upon the supply and demand and not the tariff.

TABLE B.—*Green hide prices since 1854 in St. Louis, Mo.*

Year.	Highest.	Lowest.	Year.	Highest.	Lowest.
	Cents.	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1854	6¼	4½	1880	10	6¼
1855	6½	4½	1881	9½	8¼
1856	8	6	1882	9½	8½
1857	11	4	1883	8½	7
1858	7½	4½	1884	9½	8½
1859	8½	6	1885	9¾	7¾
1860	7	6	1886	9½	8¼
1861	6	2½	1887	8	6¼
1862	7½	4½	1888	7¼	6¼
1863	9½	7	1889	6	4½
1864	11½	8	1890	8	4¼
1865	9	5	1891	6¼	4½
1866	10½	6½	1892	4¼	3¾
1867	12	8	1893	4½	2¾
1868	12	10	1894	5½	3¼
1869	12	9	1895	9	5
1870	10	7½	1896	8½	4¼
1871	10	9	1897	9½	7¾
1872	11	10	1898	9½	8
1873	11½	7	1899	10¾	8½
1874	9½	8½	1900	9	7½
1875	9¾	7	1901	8½	6¾
1876	9½	6	1902	8½	7½
1877	9½	7½	1903	8	7¾
1878	8¾	5½	1904	9½	7¾
1879	10½	6¼	1905	13¼	9½

TABLE C.—*Prices of hides at Chicago with comparisons of previous years.*

CHICAGO PACKER HIDES, 1905.

Date.	Heavy native steers.	Butt branded steers.	Heavy Texas steers.	Light Texas steers.	Heavy Colorado steers.	Heavy native cows.	Light native cows.	Branded cows.	Native bulls.	Branded bulls.	Average price.
Jan	$13.80	$12.50	$13.81	$12.87	$12.37	$12.03	$11.75	$11.05	$10.50	$9.25	$11.993
Feb	13.49	12.47	13.81	12.93	12.27	11.81	11.65	11.75	10.50	9.25	11.993
Mar	13.00	12.41	13.96	13.10	12.32	11.62	11.62	11.92	10.37	9.37	11.969

TABLE C.—*Prices of hides at Chicago with comparisons of previous years*—Continued.

Date.	Heavy native steers.	Butt branded steers.	Heavy Texas steers.	Light Texas steers.	Heavy Colorado steers.	Heavy native cows.	Light native cows.	Branded cows.	Native bulls.	Branded bulls.	Average price.
Apr	$13.11	$12.65	$14.75	$13.76	$12.62	$12.00	$12.06	$12.12	$10.25	$9.50	$12.282
May	13.45	13.25	15.11	14.25	13.16	12.37	12.50	12.50	10.37	9.62	12.658
June	13.42	13.08	14.63	14.15	13.12	12.55	12.55	12.65	10.25	9.46	12.586
July	14.13	13.11	14.50	13.12	13.10	13.20	13.17	12.96	10.27	9.56	12.712
Aug	15.25	13.65	14.73	14.37	13.59	14.15	14.00	13.50	10.82	9.95	13.401
Sept	15.19	13.75	14.30	14.47	13.54	14.24	14.09	13.50	11.25	10.00	13.433
Oct	15.34	13.75	14.41	14.50	13.50	14.50	14.41	13.50	11.25	10.04	13.520
Nov	15.66	13.91	14.57	14.60	13.65	14.69	14.62	13.65	11.65	10.50	13.750
Dec	15.77	14.00	14.75	14.75	13.75	14.75	14.75	13.75	11.70	10.67	13.864
Average:											
1905	14.30	13.21	14.44	13.91	13.08	13.16	13.10	12.74	10.77	9.76	12.847
1904	11.66	10.89	12.65	11.67	10.81	10.60	10.52	10.28	9.10	8.15	10.633
1903	11.69	10.57	12.64	11.19	10.54	10.07	9.64	9.19	9.61	7.69	10.233
1902	13.38	12.33	14.41	12.42	12.10	11.12	10.12	10.01	10.50	9.10	11.549
1901	12.37	11.46	12.88	11.53	11.21	10.66	10.07	9.87	10.19	8.54	10.878
1900	11.94	11.04	11.99	11.09	10.49	10.62	10.44	10.18	9.93	8.42	10.614
1899	12.34	11.44	12.07	11.55	10.70	11.27	10.40	10.90	10.04	8.50	11.021
1898	11.50	10.08	10.74	10.43	9.24	10.84	11.02	9.72	9.56	7.32	10.045
1897	9.96	9.14	9.33	8.94	8.28	9.35	9.74	8.74	8.27	6.36	8.810
1896	8.14	7.25	7.44	6.94	6.45	7.51	7.53	6.66	6.63	5.25	6.980
1895	10.20	8.97	9.48	8.60	8.39	8.76	8.52	8.00	7.41	6.42	8.475
1894	6.38	5.73	6.39	5.41	5.31	4.95	4.67	4.53	4.38	3.81	5.156
1893	7.31	6.28	6.45	5.49	5.59	5.21	4.74	4.71	5.20	4.07	5.505
1892	8.79	7.40	7.46	6.50	6.36	5.94	5.38	5.17	5.87	4.31	6.318

CHICAGO COUNTRY HIDES, 1905.

Date.	No. 1 heavy steers.	Branded steers, flat.	No. 1 heavy cows.	Branded cows, flat.	No. 1 buffs.	No. 1 extremes.	No. 2 buffs.	Bulls, flat.	No. 1 calfskins.	No. 1 kips.	Average price.
Jan	$11.50	$11.18	$10.37	$10.01	$10.22	$10.32	$9.31	$8.50	$14.33	$11.82	$10.756
Feb	11.17	11.50	10.37	10.14	10.15	10.35	9.20	8.50	14.43	11.36	10.717
Mar	11.35	11.03	10.36	9.71	10.35	10.50	9.44	8.50	14.55	11.39	10.718
Apr	11.37	11.25	10.50	9.92	10.52	10.60	9.64	8.53	14.70	10.89	10.792
May	11.42	11.42	10.94	10.25	11.00	10.94	9.95	8.78	14.66	10.96	11.032
June	11.60	11.58	11.35	10.56	11.31	11.44	10.34	9.06	14.17	11.22	11.263
July	12.25	11.58	12.33	10.62	12.33	12.53	11.39	9.25	14.44	12.00	11.872
Aug	13.07	12.10	12.96	11.26	12.96	13.25	12.07	9.57	14.86	13.22	12.532
Sept	13.50	12.42	13.25	11.87	13.25	13.75	12.38	9.84	15.19	14.40	12.985
Oct	13.94	12.45	13.42	11.95	13.38	13.98	12.58	10.31	15.19	14.67	13.187
Nov	14.25	12.78	13.65	12.28	13.65	14.25	12.78	10.67	15.85	14.88	13.504
Dec	14.21	13.05	13.55	12.56	13.40	13.75	12.52	11.12	15.71	14.20	13.407
Average:											
1905	12.47	11.86	11.92	10.93	11.88	12.14	10.96	9.39	14.84	12.58	11.897
1904	10.03	9.42	9.47	8.42	9.45	9.75	8.49	7.87	13.37	11.08	9.734
1903	9.71	8.82	8.66	7.85	8.59	8.87	7.63	7.75	12.05	10.16	9.009
1902	10.99	9.45	9.41	8.55	8.74	8.83	7.78	8.73	11.89	9.67	9.404
1901	10.50	8.84	9.25	8.56	8.73	8.77	7.73	8.43	11.93	9.36	9.210
Average:											
1900	10.29	8.75	9.30	8.73	9.11	9.52	8.26	8.05	11.91	10.16	9.409
1899	10.79	9.69	10.13	9.56	10.08	10.43	9.58	8.71	12.84	10.95	10.276
1898	10.25	8.85	9.90	8.85	9.94	10.49	9.43	8.46	12.49	11.20	9.986
1897	9.00	7.77	8.65	7.88	8.86	9.55	8.35	7.45	12.08	10.50	9.009
1896	7.20	6.16	6.86	6.21	6.85	7.43	6.36	5.83	9.10	7.96	6.996
1895	8.79	8.07	7.97	7.26	7.86	8.07	7.36	6.51	11.23	8.93	8.205
1894	5.30	4.89	4.41	4.02	4.21	4.76	3.73	3.89	7.84	6.12	4.917
1893	6.09	4.82	4.57	3.91	4.26	4.49	3.65	4.37	8.35	6.21	5.072
1892	7.61	5.64	5.30	4.49	4.86	6.28	4.28	5.05	8.15	6.00	5.764

TABLE D.—*Antwerp prices of South American salted ox hides.*

Year.	Price.	Year.	Price.
	Cents.		*Cents.*
1905	14½	1895	13¾
1904	14½	1894	10½
1903	14	1893	10
1902	13½	1892	9¾
1901	12½	1891	10½
1900	13	1890	11½
1899	12¾	1889	11
1898	12¾	1888	10½
1897	11½	1887	13½
1896	11	1886	12½

The price of hides is, after all, the best index of supply and demand. It will be observed that South American hides were dearer in 1905 and 1904 than at any time in twenty years. It should be interesting and instructive to readers of Hide and Leather to discover that conditions affecting the supply and cost of hides are substantially the same in South America as in our own country.

THE SUPPLY OF PACKER HIDES.

The actual slaughter of cattle at five leading western packing points for 1905 shows an increase of 295,090 head from 1904, but a decrease of 127,772 head from 1903. This table gives the detailed figures:

Slaughter of cattle at five points for three years.

	1905.	1904.	1903.
Chicago	2,002,273	1,939,152	2,163,031
Kansas City	1,244,775	1,012,665	1,033,384
Omaha	681,757	642,277	766,870
St. Joseph	367,916	406,467	404,937
St. Louis	765,162	766,232	821,433
Total	5,061,883	4,766,793	5,189,655

It is evident from this showing that the supply of packer hides is not keeping pace with the increased consumption of leather caused by the increased population and prosperity of the country.

APPENDIX G.

EXHIBIT A.

[Letters from harness manufacturers showing quantity and value of leather used in heavy harness.]

ST. LOUIS, *January 18, 1906.*

Mr. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your kind favor of 15th to hand. In response to same we give you herewith weight of the leather used on the heavy farm-team harnesses. Weight of same would be from 35 to 45 pounds, according to the grade. The value of the leather would be 45 cents per pound for cut stock, based on to-day's prices of harness leather. In order to make one dozen heavy full-leather horse collars it would take from 85 to 90 feet of collar leather, which is worth to-day 19 cents per foot.

Trust information is satisfactory. If anything further is required, we shall be pleased to furnish same, and remain,

Yours, very truly, ——— ———.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 19, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your communication of the 15th would state the amount of leather used in a heavy team harness ranges, according to the style and dimensions, from 35 to 60 pounds. Think the average for this section is about 45 pounds per set, for two horses, and costs (cut stock), not counting labor for cutting, if average good stock is used, $22.50 at the present price of leather. The labor on an average-priced team harness, by hand, about $6.50 per set. A good ordinary team horse collar has 85 feet of leather, which is worth $17. Labor, from $5.50 to $6.50 per dozen.

It seems to the writer, when we consider according to the best statistics at hand, there is a world shortage on hides, and especially when the price of cattle is not at all based on the value of the hide, which is considered a by-product only and really benefits only the large packers, who control both the hide and leather market to-day, the tariff ought to come off. There is no considerable number of people benefited by high-priced hides, as the percentage of country hides taken off is very small indeed compared to a few years ago before the time when large packers inaugurated their present system of furnishing dressed beef to all the small markets throughout the country, thereby cutting off the local killing by the small butchers. The heavy increased demands for different kinds of leathers has during the past two years made it very difficult for manufacturers to secure sufficient quantity of certain kinds of leather to supply their needs. Tanners outside of what is ordinarily called the trust claim that they are unable to secure hides at a price sufficient to run their tanneries at a full capacity.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

CHICAGO, *January 17, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours 15th instant, the cost of leather in producing heavy farm team harness is from $10 to $20 per set, the labor from $3 to $6 per set. For heavy full-leather horse collars, cost of leather is from $15 to $20 per dozen, and labor from $4 to $10 per dozen.

This information is not definite, but there is considerable difference as to both cost of materials and labor depending upon the grade and heft of the harnesses and collars.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 19, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 15th, will say that in a single set of heavy farm team harness there is about 40 pounds of leather, at about a valuation of 45 cents per pound. In a dozen full-leather horse collars there is about 100 feet of collar leather, at 21 cents per foot.

Trusting this will be satisfactory, we remain,

Yours, very truly, ——— ———.

EXHIBIT B.

[Letters from manufacturers of plow shoes and plow boots, showing quantity of leather used and its value per pair.]

MILWAUKEE, WIS., U. S. A., *January 20, 1906.*

Mr. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Sheboygan Falls, Wis.

DEAR SIR: We have your favor of the 15th instant, inquiring as to the amount of leather used in producing heavy grain-leather plow shoe and boot.

It takes fully 2½ feet to cut a regular height (6 inches) plow shoe, and for the lowest plow boot we make, which is 14 inches, it takes fully 4½ feet of leather. The leather we are using now costs 19 cents a foot.

Yours, truly, ——— ———.

CHICAGO, *January 18, 1906.*

Mr. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 15th, figures such as you ask for necessarily will vary in different institutions, according to the size of the last, height of shoe, and quality. Those we give below are the ones in use in our establishment, and apply to standard height, last, and quality made for workingmen.

Six and one-half to 7 ounce western oil grain is used, for which we are asked 18½ cents per foot, with the usual discount. It requires about 2½ feet per pair; about quarter of a foot for the gusset, or tongue, which is cut out of 7-cent leather. The strap on leather is usually got out of scrap which falls from the cutting of the sides. On shoes made plain, without any trimmings, the above constitute all the leather in the upper.

In sole leather it is hard to give any idea of the amount, for different stocks are used for outsoles, slip soles, counter, and heels, and the total weight in the shoe can only be arrived at by footing up the estimates for these different parts and dividing by the average cost of the leather. In this way we arrive at about 2¼ pounds. As to cost, there is considerable variation, according to the quality of the leather used. An outsole cut from leather tanned from South American dry hides, at 24½ cents per pound, to-day's market, would cost about 24 cents per pair on our dies; inner soles, about 7½ cents; slip sole, 6½ cents; the counter, at 7½ cents; the heel and top lift, 10 cents; total of 56 cents. If domestic-slaughter sole leather is used, about 2½ cents shoud be added to the allowance for the outsole.

The amount of stock used in boots varies according to the height. We have made boots which take only 5¼ feet per pair, and from that up to 6. These would be cut from 7½-ounce oil grain sides, which are to-day quoted at 20 cents per foot, with the usual discount. This brings the cost of the upper from $1.05 to $1.20. To the sole-leather estimates about 12 to 15 per cent should be added on account of the heavier weight required for boots.

Trusting that this information will be satisfactory, and ready to serve you further,

Yours, truly, ——— ———.

APPENDIX H.

EXHIBIT A.

[Telegrams showing weights of western hides.]

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 17, 1906.*

CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Three thousand October hides shipped by one dealer average 50 pounds, including all selections 25 pounds and up.

——— ———.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 15, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Shipments of hides received from small packer in Montana to-day. After sorted 25 pounds and up, the hides, 1,055 green salted, averaged 56½ pounds.

Yours, truly, ——— ———.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 16, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The hides sold in Kansas City during the month of October and September, this year, 25 pounds and up, averaged 48 to 50 pounds.

Yours, truly, ——— ———.

DAYTON, OHIO, *January 16, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE.

DEAR SIR: Our hide collections in September, 1905, averaged 52 pounds for 25 and upward. Indianapolis collections averaged about the same.

——— ———.

EXHIBIT B.

[Letters quoting freight rates of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway on green and dry hides.]

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE AND ST. PAUL RAILWAY,
Chicago, January 20, 1906.

Confirming my telephone message of this date, following are present rates from Denver, Colo., to Chicago, Ill.:

Hides, green:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	$1.25
C. L., per 100 pounds	.70
Hides, dry:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	2.05
C. L., per 100 pounds	.95

——— ———.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE AND ST. PAUL RAILWAY,
Chicago, January 20, 1906.

Confirming my telephone message of this date, following are present rates from Butte, Mont., to Chicago, Ill.:

Hides, green:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	$2.10
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.15 7/10
Hides, dry:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	3.10
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.80

——— ———.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE AND ST. PAUL RAILWAY,
Chicago, January 20, 1906.

Confirming my telephone message of this date, following are present rates from Salt Lake City, Utah, to Chicago, Ill.:

Hides, green:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	$2.20
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.38
Hides, dry:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	3.30
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.57

——— ———.

EXHIBIT C.

[Letters showing ocean freight rates on green and dry hides, loose and baled.]

NEW YORK, *January 22, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your esteemed favor of the 20th instant we beg to quote you the following freights:

Dry hides from Mexico, loose, 20 cents each and 5 per cent primage.

Dry hides from Mexico, when baled up, three-fourths cent per pound plus 5 per cent.

W. S. hides from Mexico, three-eighths cent per pound plus 5 per cent.

Dry hides from Central America, in bales, 1½ cents per pound net.

Dry hides from South American ports, 12½ cents each plus 5 per cent, and light-house dues 86 cents per ton, wharfage 12 cents per ton. These are export entry charges.

If we can get you any further information, please command us.

Yours, truly, ——— ———.

NEW YORK, *January 23, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your previous inquiry about freight rates, we give you below the following quotations, which we received this morning, and which we hope will be of service to you:

From Calcutta: Buffalo hides, 60s. per 14 hundredweight; goatskins, 70s. per 14 hundredweight.

——— ———.

NOTE.—Sixty shillings equal $14.75; 70s. equal $17.20.

NEW YORK, *January 17, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to our communication regarding the freight rates, our freight agent gets us the following:

London to New York, goatskin hides, 15s. plus 10 per cent for 2,240 pounds (on deck).

New York to Milwaukee, goatskin hides, 30 cents per 100 pounds, mimimum 30,000 pounds; less than carload, 35 cents per 100 pounds.

London to New York, dry hides, loose, 27.6s. plus 10 per cent; in bales, 22.6s. plus 10 per cent.

New York to Milwaukee, dry hides, loose, 50 cents per 100 pounds; in bales, 35 cents per 100 pounds; minimum, 20,000 pounds.

If we can be of any service to you here, please command us.

We are importing dry Batavia cowhides, very spready, about 8 pounds average, which we have sold very extensively in your neighborhood, and we expect some in next month, and can offer you about 1,000 of them, subject to previous sale, at 36 cents per pound.

If you are interested in them, kindly advise us.

Hongkong-New York rates are not obtainable here, but we estimate 25 per cent for green salted.

Yours, truly, ——— ———.

[According to the above letter of January 17, the rate on green salted hides from London to New York is 15s. plus 10 per cent for 2,240 pounds (on deck), which is about 33 cents per hundred, or 68 cents per hundred to Milwaukee in less than carload lots, against a rate of $2.10 for less than carload lots from Butte, on green salted hides to Chicago, and a rate of $2.20 on less than carload lots on green salted hides from Salt Lake City, making a difference in the stock about the same as the difference in the tariff, or, according to the average country hide prices since the duty has been on, making a difference in the value of hides from there about the same as the duty, and the man from Butte, Mont., doesn't receive any more for his hides if he ships them to Chicago than the man from London, England, who ships to Chicago, which is the greatest hide market in the world. How does the 15 per cent duty protect the man in Butte, and isn't it the railroads that fix the price?]

APPENDIX I.

A comparison of the world's cattle statistics—Tabulation of official returns.

[Alfred Seymour Jones in the London (England) Leather Trades Review. Reprinted in Hide and Leather, issue of January 27, 1906.]

WHY HIDES ARE DEARER.

"I am inclined to say that the increase in cattle has not kept pace with the constantly increasing demand for leather brought about by increase in population, new industries, factories, and wealth." (Alfred Seymour Jones, English leather trade authority.)

Much has been said and written to explain the cause of, or causes for, the advance in the values of hides during recent times. Among the causes advanced the following have been especially urged: That the birth rate of cattle has not kept pace with the birth rate of human beings. That when a country becomes a manufacturing area it does so at the expense of the depletion of the head of cattle. That rinderpest and drought have caused serious losses. That more people to-day buy leather than formerly. That war, during recent years, has, at least in two countries, accounted for large declines in local herds.

In order to ascertain whether these causes are good we must take the official returns for all those countries which at present furnish them, and at the same time compare in a relative sense the demands of the population for leather.

In all cases I give the maximum head first, then the minimum, and when necessary the latest returns. The figures are extracted from official returns during the past twenty-five years. The comments following each are my own.

THE UNITED KINGDOM.

1905	11,674,026
1882	9,832,417

The progress of increase has been steady for over twenty-five years, and the total head has never been so large as it is to-day.

It is interesting to note, and to remember, when comparing the figures for the United States, that the British board of agriculture say, "The live imports of cattle for 1904 numbered nearly 550,000 head, or 27,000 more than for 1903. The increase came from the United States, whence 100,000 more cattle were received than in 1903, equal to 72 per cent."

We will now turn our attention to the four leading continental countries.

Russia in Europe, including Poland and Caucasia.

RUSSIA.

1900	32,913,228
1883	23,628,031
1903	32,791,700
1904 (estimated)	30,858,410

POLAND.

1888	3,013,392
1903	2,887,400
1904 (estimated)	2,349,524

CAUCASIA.

1903	3,625,600
1900	3,515,590
1904 (estimated)	2,892,841

The official Russian returns for 1904 show a decline, and from my knowledge of that country I should put the reduction down to the unsatisfactory political situation which has existed there for some years past, but with the establishment of good government the total head of cattle should be largely augmented. The country is especially suited to the rearing of cattle.

GERMANY.

1900 (latest)	18,939,692
1873	15,776,702

I have gone back thirty years in the case of Germany to ascertain if there is any justification for the plea that "when a country has become a manufacturing area it does so to the depletion of the head of cattle."

I think no one will deny that the Fatherland, since the war of 1870, which brought her unity, has become a large manufacturing country. Yet from 1873 up to date, each year shows a steady and progressive increase in her cattle.

FRANCE.

1902	14,928,550
1885	13,104,970
1903	14,103,090

The increase has been continuous up to 1902.

AUSTRIA.

1900 (last)	9,506,626
1869	7,425,212

HUNGARY.

1895 (last)	6,783,365
1870	5,279,193

In the instance of Austria I had to go as far back as 1869 to find the minimum. It is regrettable that both countries afford no later dates than those given, but each country shows a remarkable and steady increase.

In referring to the above countries, the British board of agriculture says: "So far as the head of the five leading European countries are concerned, viz, Russia in Europe, Germany, United Kingdom, France, and Austria, there would appear to have been a general advance in numbers. The combined heads are greater by nearly 22 per cent than they were some thirty years ago. If the older figures may be trusted, the percentage of rise in Austria was the greatest, or something like 28 per cent, as against 20 per cent in France and Germany and 13 per cent in our own country."

UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA.

1900	67,822,336
1870	23,820,608
1905	61,241,907

"The heads of the United States have, according to the official data, shown no growth whatever since this country began," say the British board of agriculture.

It will perhaps be of interest if I give the statistics since 1870:

1870	23,820,608
1880	29,675,533
1890	57,648,792
1900	67,822,336

The above are census figures. The census of 1900 included spring calves, a procedure, it is explained, adopted in only a few instances in the enumerations of 1890, 1880, and 1870.

1902	61,424,599
1903	61,764,433
1904	61,049,315
1905	61,241,907

It appears to me that had the annual census been taken on 1900 basis there would have been no falling off, but a fairly steady total during the past five years.

CANADIAN DOMINION.

1901 (last)	5,576,451
1891	4,120,586

The data collected at the census for the following provinces do not agree with those published by the provincial governments, consequently are not comparable with above:

ONTARIO.

1904	2,776,104
1881	1,702,167

The increase has been constant annually.

MANITOBA.

1903	310,577
1902	282,343
1904	306,943

NORTHWEST TERRITORY.

1901 (last)	591,739
1891	231,827

NEW BRUNSWICK.

1901 (last)	227,196
1891	204,692

NEWFOUNDLAND.

1901 (last)	32,767
1891	23,828

NOVA SCOTIA.

1891	324,772
1901 (last)	316,174

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

1901 (last)	112,779
1881	90,722

QUEBEC.

1901 (last)	1,365,829
1891	969,312

With the exception of two provinces, Canada as a whole has steadily, year by year, increased her store of cattle.

AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH.

NEW SOUTH WALES.

1895	2,150,057
1902	1,741,226
1903	1,880,578

This State every three years reaches 2,000,000 head, and in subsequent two years loses ground. Drought possibly has something to do with it.

VICTORIA.

1891	1,782,881
1881	1,286,267
1901	1,602,384

Census taken every ten years.

QUEENSLAND.

1895	6,822,401
1903 (last)	2,481,717

This State has reduced her head of cattle steadily since 1895, and appears to be going out as a live-stock producer.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA, EXCLUDING NORTHERN TERRITORY.

1891	359,938
1903	213,343
1904	244,610

This State has been declining in head of cattle for some years, falling below 300,000 in 1897.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

1903 (last)	497,617
1887	93,544

This State shows an annual increase since 1887.

TASMANIA.

1904 (last)	185,938
1890	150,004

This State shows a steady annual increase.

NEW ZEALAND.

1904	1,736,850
1898	1,203,024

Here, too, the increase has been year by year.

It can scarcely be maintained that the vast area of Australia, 1,902,447,000 acres; New Zealand, 67,041,000 acres, are cattle-raising countries; yet, excepting Queensland, the total head of cattle has been fairly maintained in spite of the drought, etc.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

1896	2,303,582
1899 (last)	1,077,044

The returns of 1899 do not include Vryburg division of Bechuanaland. Since 1899 war has undoubtedly diminished the head of cattle, but it is anticipated that when enumeration is resumed the figures of 1896 will be approached.

NATAL.

1903 (last)	626,727
1898	278,558

This colony shows a continuous increase since 1898.

RHODESIA.

1905	114,592
1903	94,544

A new colony with great promise.

TRANSVAAL.

1903	200,000
1902	50,000

These are official estimates.

URUGUAY.

1900	6,827,428
1894	5,205,272
1901	6,326,601

Returns show a fairly continuous advance up to 1900.

ARGENTINA.

1888	21,961,657
1895 (last)	21,701,526

Unfortunately this important cattle-raising state provides no regular or recent statistics, but we may reasonably expect a further decline, because as agriculture increases it is the invariable rule for live stock to make way for the plow.

ALGERIA.

1891	1,233,051
1898	1,004,175
1901	1,035,104

MEXICO.

1902	5,142,457

JAPAN.

1901 (last)	1,282,341
1890	1,044,976

It is doubtful whether Japan, in spite of her 94,499,000 acres, will ever be a serious cattle-raising country. The area of the pasture land is limited, and the prevalence of bamboo grass a constant source of danger to live stock; nor is she likely, in my opinion, for many years yet, to become, outside of her army and navy requirements, a large user of leather.

SIBERIA AND STEPPES.

1903	4,946,800
1900	4,154,450
1904	4,483,585

Latter is an official estimate.

SERVIA.

1900 (last)	942,087
1890	819,251

Increase continuous.

SPAIN.

1891	2,217,659

ROUMANIA.

1900 (last)	2,588,526
1897	2,138,315

Increase erratic.

BULGARIA.

1893	1,767,974

Including 342,193 buffalo.

ITALY.

1890	5,000,000
1875	3,489,125
1882	4,783,232

1890 estimated by authorities.

SWITZERLAND.

1901 (last)	1,340,375
1876	1,035,856

Steady annual increase.

SWEDEN.

1901	2,594,359
1880	2,227,757
1903	2,586,204

Increase fairly steady.

NORWAY.

1875	1,016,617
1900 (last)	950,201

Steady decrease.

HOLLAND.

1903 (last)	1,667,100
1894	1,504,300

Increase annually.

BELGIUM.

1903 (last)	1,720,150
1866	1,242,445

Increase slow, but steady throughout.

INDIAN EMPIRE.

India plays no small part in influencing hide values. The number of bovine animals is so large that I give the totals for the past five years of enumeration returns:

1899	87,069,789
1900	87,737,930
1901	87,288,933
1902	85,295,210
1903	85,135,600

In comparing these figures we must bear in mind that in 1899 Sind was not included, and in 1902 and 1903 the largest province of Bengal was not included. Had it been enumerated I think it would have been found that India shows little or no decline in numbers.

CEYLON.

1901	1,476,747
1902	1,347,827
1904	1,421,533

CONCLUDING SUMMARY.

The foregoing official returns, though not up to date, will furnish us with some indication of the position of the cattle herds of the major portion of the world. It omits such important countries as China, Korea, Manchuria, Malay States, Africa (general), and many South American states. A careful study of the figures will show that the herds have been fairly maintained, if not increased, in many important instances, and that when a country becomes a manufacturing area the tendency is to increase the herds. If that is true, what are the causes for the apparent scarcity? I am inclined to say that the increase in herds has not kept pace with the constantly increasing demand for leather brought about by increase in population, new industries, factories, and wealth.

This increased demand has been met somewhat in the past by the splitting machine, which made a hide or skin go from two to four times as far as formerly, but even that limit has been passed. The introduction of electricity was heralded as the abolitionist of leather belting, yet more belting is being made to-day in leather, textile, and rubber than ever, and electric works have become large users of leather. In boots and shoes we have become extravagant. Our forefathers were not content if a boot did not last a few years; it had to be soled and heeled until the upper was done. Where are the boot repairing shops, the cobbler, to-day? Clogs in Lancashire and Yorkshire are giving place to boots. On the Continent sabots no longer find favor. Increased facilities of locomotion—electric cars, motor cars, palatial steamers, etc., all make for increased consumption of leather, even to alteration in style of footwear.

We have, in my opinion, to recognize that the social and mechanical revolution during the past two decades accounts for a very large share of the increased demand.

The wars in South Africa and Manchuria must have depleted the world's accumulation of leather, and while raging brought grist to the suppliers, but war always leaves evil effects on commerce which time alone can repair.

In conclusion, the foregoing statistics do not in all cases bring us up to date, but looking at the various countries in the light of their history and over the events of the past few years, especially where we have no returns, I think that we may reasonably sum up the situation: "The herds of the world have increased in proportion to demand in a declining ratio."

APPENDIX K.

TABLE A.—*Imports of cattle.*

Year.	Free, for breeding.		Dutiable.	
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.
1895	14,956	$99,114	134,825	$666,749
1896	734	15,091	217,092	1,494,765
1897	204	24,360	328,773	2,565,497
1898	577	76,631	291,012	2,836,592
1899	624	95,353	199,128	2,225,009
1900	1,045	202,615	179,961	2,055,079
1901	1,249	273,728	144,773	1,657,705
1902	1,928	375,096	94,099	1,233,626
1903	1,481	225,875	64,694	935,673
1904	684	79,986	15,372	230,751

TABLE B.—*Exports of cattle.*
[From Agricultural Year Book, 1904.]

Year.	Number.	Value.	Average price.
1892	394,607	$35,099,095.00	$88.95
1893	237,094	26,032,428.00	90.68
1894	359,278	33,461,922.00	93.14
1895	331,722	30,603,796.00	92.26
1896	372,461	34,560,672.00	92.79
1897	392,190	36,357,451.00	92.70
1898	439,255	37,827,500.00	86.12
1899	389,490	30,516,833.00	78.35
1900	397,286	30,635,153.00	77.11
1901	459,218	37,566,980.00	81.81
1902	392,884	29,902,212.00	76.11
1903	402,178	29,848,936.00	74.22
1904	593,409	42,256,291.00	71.21

The tariff of 27½ per cent added to the price of these cattle, no doubt, according to the man from Iowa's idea, in the home market, and the duty of 15 per cent on hides added to the price of these cattle when the hides are sold in the foreign market and must pay 15 per cent duty to get back in the United States. Won't the hide be worth less the duty and freight in the foreign market; and then don't the cattle sell for less here than they would if hides came back here free, we being the largest tanning country in the world, and use them? Or was it because we imported 328,773 head in 1897 and only 15,372 in 1904 that caused these large exports and the difference in price of $21.50 lower in 1904?

TABLE C.—*Imports of hides and skins.*

Year.	Pounds.	Value.	Dutiable.
1905	240,071,391	$64,763,146	$14,949,518
1904	274,733,467	52,006,070	10,989,035
1903	319,094,698	58,031,613	16,159,902
1902	326,169,103	58,006,618	17,474,039
1901	280,809,837	48,220,013	14,647,413
1900	345,934,778	57,935,698	19,408,217
1899	267,090,750	41,988,043	13,621,946
1898	245,774,616	36,068,932	13,624,989
1897	206,100,844	27,863,026	Free.
1896	210,398,011	30,520,177	Free.
1895	226,575,745	26,122,942	Free.
1894	.....	16,784,152	Free.
1893	.....	28,947,896	Free.
1892	.....	26,850,218	.....
1891	.....	27,930,759	.....

In 1898 we tanned 126,243,595 pounds of imported hides, with the duty on. In 1904 we tanned 85,370,168, or a decrease of over 50 per cent of hides that we pay a duty on, which shows that in the tanning business this class of stock has been decreasing because we can't get the raw material free. In 1898 we tanned hides that come in free, or so-called "skins," to the extent of 54,607,534 pounds, and in 1904 103,024,752 pounds, an increase of almost 100 per cent, showing plainly that when we have the raw material free we can compete with the world in producing leather, and if we have free hides will tan sufficient leather to supply the needs of the whole world, employing American capital and American labor.

TABLE D.—*Export of hides.*

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1904	32,727,643	$3,246,887
1903	12,859,949	1,224,409
1902	9,372,947	906,504
1901	11,161,749	1,064,952
1900	7,486,256	804,674
1899	10,140,840	929,117
1898	11,536,073	1,015,032
1897	31,119,166	2,338,530
1896	39,545,324	3,858,946
1895	36,002,859	2,310,323

Export of hides is caused by the use of different grades of hides for different purposes, as, in order to make the different grades of shoes, they must have leather made out of different kinds of hides to produce the shoe at the lowest possible price.

TABLE E.—*Imports of all kinds of leather and kid gloves and all other manufactures of leather.*

Year.	Leather.	Kid gloves, etc.
1905	$12,952,519	$6,571,344
1904	4,909,231	6,190,984
1903	5,173,566	6,120,601
1902	5,021,846	6,295,939
1901	5,701,193	6,185,819
1900	6,519,172	6,073,024
1899	5,237,707	5,878,940
1898	5,625,145	5,788,980
1897	6,337,664	6,945,507
1896	6,098,005	7,362,137
1895	6,863,343	6,959,695

Imports of leather consist mostly of fine kid, manufactured kid shoes, and fancy gloves, and fine English rein and saddle leather, which is mostly used for the fine trade in the large cities, and costs a great deal more than the American goods, and could not be produced in America on account of the difference in tanning and currying. Enameled leather, which we have never been able to make successfully on account of our tanning, Germany and France having the quality of bark that is necessary to make these goods which we can not secure except by going over there and buying it from them.

TABLE F.—*Exports of leather and manufactures of leather.*

1905	$37,936,745
1904	33,980,615
1903	31,617,389
1902	29,798,323
1901	27,923,653
1900	27,293,010
1899	23,466,985
1898	21,113,640
1897	19,161,446
1896	20,242,756
1895	15,615,407
1894	14,283,492
1893	11,912,154
1892	12,084,781
1891	13,278,847

Exports of leather increased about 90 per cent in the four years from 1893 to 1896, so-called "dull and panic years," and from 1897 to 1905, such prosperous years, only increased about 95 per cent, showing plainly that when hides were on the free list the exports of manufactures of leather increased more rapidly.

TABLE G.—*Statistics of boot and shoe manufacture in the United States.*
[From the Census Report of 1900.]

	Year.	Establishments.	Capital.	Wage-earners.
United States	1900	1,600	$101,795,233	142,922
	1890	2,082	95,282,311	133,690
California	1900	30	1,257,746	994
	1890	56	1,740,175	2,280
Connecticut	1900	15	789,618	719
	1890	20	683,100	995
Illinois	1900	55	5,351,482	5,553
	1890	56	3,781,476	3,932
Kentucky	1900	7	254,382	207
	1890	11	280,166	296
Louisiana	1900	12	289,345	397
	1890	17	293,244	786
Maine	1900	48	5,148,278	6,432
	1890	53	4,804,946	6,382
Maryland	1900	19	499,609	896
	1890	28	863,965	1,182
Massachusetts	1900	640	37,577,630	58,645
	1890	1,057	44,567,702	67,374
Michigan	1900	13	1,135,961	1,117
	1890	12	972,534	1,309
New Hampshire	1900	67	8,123,481	12,007
	1890	64	3,956,774	7,912
New Jersey	1900	84	3,153,255	4,421
	1890	109	2,811,098	5,162
New York	1900	223	11,983,239	15,796
	1890	257	11,950,891	15,361
Ohio	1900	81	7,549,142	12,718
	1890	63	3,176,318	5,743
Pennsylvania	1900	146	6,860,480	9,144
	1890	158	5,394,799	7,616
Wisconsin	1900	40	2,473,626	2,507
	1890	32	2,621,606	2,036

TABLE H.—*Exports of boots and shoes.*

Year.	Pairs.	Value.
1905	5,315,699	$8,057,697
1904	4,642,531	7,238,940
1903	4,197,566	6,665,017
1902	3,966,766	6,182,038
1901	3,494,041	5,525,290
1900	3,016,720	4,726,656
1899	1,934,277	2,711,385
1898	1,307,031	1,816,538
1897	1,224,484	1,708,224
1896	1,036,235	1,436,686
1895	822,412	1,010,228
1894	647,318	777,354
1893	493,027	590,754
1892	745,112	914,974
1891	551,735	651,343

Boots and shoes, from 1893 to 1896, increased about 100 per cent, and from 1901 to 1904 increased only about 30 per cent, showing that the percentage of gain was much larger when we had free hides than when we had the duty on.

THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINE DOLLARS A YEAR IS WHAT ILLINOIS MINERS GET—BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS REPORT SHOWS THIS WAS AVERAGE PAY FOR 1905—199 WERE KILLED AND 535 INJURED AT WORK—WHILE THE OPERATORS CRY "OVERPRODUCTION," THEY ARE OPENING NEW MINES.

[By W. C. Roberts.]

SPRINGFIELD, *April 8, 1906.*

The bureau of labor statistics demonstrates in glaring figures why the Illinois miners are seeking an advance in wages. The 53,336 employees who work underground in the mines earned an average of only $379 last year. They received an average of only one hundred and seventy-five days' work. They earned an aggregate of $20,214,344.

The value at the mouths of the pits of the coal they mined was $38,689,514. What the operator received for his coal in the different markets to which it was shipped is not given. The figures are taken from reports made by the operators and the amount for which the coal was sold omitted by them.

Another feature of the report that establishes the danger of the miners' employment is that 199 were killed, or 1 to every 186,851 tons of coal mined, and 535 were injured. Children left fatherless number 231. This was before the shot-firers law was enacted. Since the law went into effect there have been fewer violent deaths. The operators do not like the law, because the miners in their new agreement demand that the operators pay the shot firers. The miners claim that it is the duty of the operators to make employment in mines as safe as possible, and therefore they should pay the shot firers, who, the legislature believed, were necessary for that purpose.

WHAT THE REPORT SHOWS.

Advance sheets of the coal report of 1905 have been furnished by Secretary David Ross. The following table gives many interesting facts regarding the miners:

Table showing mining statistics for 1905 and 1904.

	1905.	1904.
Number of counties producing coal	56	54
Number of mines and openings of all kinds	990	932
New mines or old mines reopened during the year	168	106
Mines closed or abandoned since last report	110	109
Total output of all mines in tons of 2,000 pounds	37,183,374	37,077,891
Number of shipping or commercial mines	397	380
Total output of shipping mines ....tons	35,956,543	35,779,517
Number of mines in local trade only	536	352
Output of local mines ....tons	1,226,831	1,298,580
Total tons of mine-run coal	9,248,558	10,627,904
Total tons of lump coal	16,819,321	16,888,010
Total tons of egg coal	1,716,219	1,014,700
Total tons of nut coal	2,036,152	1,602,380
Total tons of pea coal	6,247,511	5,751,570
Total tons of slack coal	1,115,613	1 193,334
Total tons shipped	31,667,073	31,778,260
Tons supplied to locomotives at the mines	1,178,237	1,223,099
Tons sold to local trade	2,600,808	2,521,612
Tons consumed or wasted at the plant	1,737,256	1,554,926
Average days of active operation for shipping mines	198	213
Average days of active operation for all mines	175	197
Average value per ton, all grades, at the mines	$1.041	$1.10
Average value per ton of mine-run coal at mines	$1.062	$1.03
Average value per ton of lump coal at the mines	$1.291	$1.37
Average value per ton of egg coal at the mines	$1.237	$1.39
Average value per ton of nut coal at the mines	$0.865	$1.0494
Average value per ton of pea or screenings coal at the mines	$0.48	$0.5613
Average value per ton of slack coal at the mines	$0.301	$0.5336
Aggregate home value of total product	$38,689,858	$40,774,223
Number of mines in which mining machines are used	78	66
Number of mining machines in use	784	609
Number of tons undercut by machines	8,202,066	7,400,345
Number of tons mined by hand	28,981,308	26,677,554
Average number of miners employed during the year	41,202	37,987
Average number of other employees underground	10,694	9,812
Average number of boys employed underground	1,540	1,562
Average number of employees above-ground	5,794	5,413
Total employees	59,230	54,774
Number of men at work underground	53,436	49,361
Number of men on surface	5,794	5,413
Average price paid per gross ton for hand mining, shipping mines	$0.5782	$0.5933
Average price paid per gross ton for machine mining	$0.4432	$0.4659
Number of kegs of powder used for blasting coal	938,500	923,418
Number of kegs of powder used for other purposes	4,158	3,717
Number of men accidentally killed	199	157
Number killed inside of the mines	197	148
Number killed outside of the mines	2	9
Number of wives made widows	102	87
Number of children left fatherless	231	239
Number of men injured so as to lose a month or more of time	535	507
Number of gross tons mined to each life lost	86,851	236,165
Number of employees to each life lost	298	349
Number of deaths per 1,000 employed	3.4	2.87
Number of gross tons mined to each man injured	69,502	73,132
Number of employees to each man injured	111	108

NEW MINES BEING OPENED.

Many new mines are being opened in Illinois, notwithstanding the operators say that too much coal is being mined. At the Indianapolis convention the operators declared they could not pay an advance because of overproduction. Now they are discrediting their own claims by preparing to increase the production when they sign up with the miners after getting rid of the vast quantities of coal they stored in anticipation of a strike.

While the miners lived last year upon an average of $379, they increased this during the months of February and March. They were given all the work they could do. But they received no more per ton. They simply mined more coal. But for the next sixty days they are not likely to have any employment and the average for this year will be as low as that of the last.

Mining is different from almost every other occupation. The miners work out in the country, far from factories and large towns. When not employed in the mines they can not get work at any other calling. They must remain idle. They are therefore slaves to their trade. The operator knows this and he can take advantage of the miner by throwing him out of employment whenever the whim strikes him.

There are several thousand miners in Sangamon County. They are nearly all idle. A number of small mines are working. But the miners who are waiting the pleasure of the operators declare they intend to stand out for the advance in wages. They have no doubt they will get it. Even the operators admit this. But not now.

"Let us sell our coal first," they say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the half of the following sums named, respectively, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the purposes following, being for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, namely.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill and had come to no resolution thereon.

MARY E. DUGGER.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to return to the House the bill (S. 1975) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dugger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The order was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 14591. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River in or near the city of Clarksville, State of Tennessee;

H. R. 14592. An act to authorize the construction of two bridges across the Cumberland River at or near Nashville, Tenn.;

H. R. 8158. An act granting an increase of pension to Lemuel P. Storms;

H. R. 8892. An act granting an increase of pension to Malek A. Southworth;

H. R. 13572. An act granting an increase of pension to Saturnino Baca;

H. R. 15691. An act granting an increase of pension to Jerry W. Tallman;

H. R. 5931. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Narron;

H. R. 11046. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen G. Heiner; and

H. R. 10298. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Redic.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

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. 16014. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create the southern division of the southern district of Iowa for judicial purposes, and to fix the time and place for holding court therein," approved June 1, 1900, and all acts amendatory thereof;

H. R. 1895. An act granting a pension to H. Edward Goetz;

H. R. 2034. An act granting a pension to Cora F. Mitchell;

H. R. 3569. An act granting a pension to Ada N. Hubbard;

H. R. 5840. An act granting a pension to Catherine Spier;

H. R. 6094. An act granting a pension to Julia G. Aldrich;

H. R. 6969. An act granting a pension to Ellen C. Lewis;

H. R. 7588. An act granting a pension to Thomas F. Dowling;

H. R. 8191. An act granting a pension to John Hobart;

H. R. 8307. An act granting a pension to William C. Estill;

H. R. 9190. An act granting a pension to Ida Carty;

H. R. 9661. An act granting a pension to Charles R. Hill;

H. R. 9888. An act granting a pension to Abigail Townsend;

H. R. 11076. An act granting a pension to Marion W. Stark;

H. R. 11622. An act granting a pension to Martha A. Remington;

H. R. 11657. An act granting a pension to Madison M. Burnett;

H. R. 12182. An act granting a pension to Sallie W. Mason;

H. R. 12651. An act granting a pension to Louis Grossman;

H. R. 13526. An act granting a pension to Levi N. Lunsford;

H. R. 14472. An act granting a pension to Thomas Cheek;

H. R. 523. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin G. Hawkins;

H. R. 603. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Blyth;

H. R. 1069. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Britton;

H. R. 1218. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan Hinkle;
H. R. 1357. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Burton;
H. R. 1667. An act granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Hicks;
H. R. 1793. An act granting an increase of pension to Playford Gregg;
H. R. 1939. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Limpus;
H. R. 1969. An act granting an increase of pension to Christian Peterson;
H. R. 2120. An act granting an increase of pension to Parmer Stewart;
H. R. 2263. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Keating;
H. R. 2377. An act granting an increase of pension to John N. Moore;
H. R. 2468. An act granting an increase of pension to John Broad;
H. R. 2491. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Botsford;
H. R. 2757. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan E. Floyd;
H. R. 3223. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. McLaughlin;
H. R. 3273. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Levi;
H. R. 3423. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Watt;
H. R. 3434. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Darby;
H. R. 4364. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Neece;
H. R. 4633. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie E. Morrow;
H. R. 4671. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Brady;
H. R. 5210. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Moore;
H. R. 5373. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Smith;
H. R. 5403. An act granting an increase of pension to John Lines;
H. R. 5488. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Foster;
H. R. 5511. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher Bohn;
H. R. 5555. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Allen;
H. R. 5638. An act granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Jones;
H. R. 5639. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Craig;
H. R. 5712. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline Dehlendorf;
H. R. 5806. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Harding;
H. R. 5850. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucas Hagar;
H. R. 5936. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline Neilson;
H. R. 6055. An act granting an increase of pension to Angeline Watson;
H. R. 6118. An act granting an increase of pension to Bridget Reidy;
H. R. 6384. An act granting an increase of pension to William McBeth;
H. R. 6454. An act granting an increase of pension to Milo B. Morse;
H. R. 6461. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Sterling;
H. R. 6488. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Osterberg, alias William McKay;
H. R. 6500. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Bucey;
H. R. 6563. An act granting an increase of pension to George Stewart;
H. R. 6576. An act granting an increase of pension to Napoleon McDowell;
H. R. 6773. An act granting an increase of pension to Weston Ferris;
H. R. 6897. An act granting an increase of pension to Abbie B. Gould;
H. R. 6937. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Furey;
H. R. 7243. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses B. Page;
H. R. 7483. An act granting an increase of pension to Laurence V. Whitcraft;
H. R. 7518. An act granting an increase of pension to George Richter;
H. R. 7630. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Higley;
H. R. 7718. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Peterson;
H. R. 7759. An act granting an increase of pension to John Gemmill;
H. R. 7760. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown;
H. R. 7807. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Atwaters;
H. R. 7935. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Stannah;
H. R. 8137. An act granting an increase of pension to Marion L. Holvenstot;
H. R. 8319. An act granting an increase of pension to John Gardner Stocks;
H. R. 8869. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan Coward;
H. R. 8953. An act granting an increase of pension to Lutellus Cook;
H. R. 9033. An act granting an increase of pension to Burgoyne Knight;
H. R. 9039. An act granting an increase of pension to James R. Hales;
H. R. 9270. An act granting an increase of pension to Wiley B. Johnson;
H. R. 9271. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Henry Martin;
H. R. 9277. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Butler;
H. R. 9294. An act granting an increase of pension to S. Amanda Mansfield;
H. R. 9397. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. King;
H. R. 9451. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Wood;
H. R. 9587. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Thompson;
H. R. 9765. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Anderson;
H. R. 9832. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander D. Polston;
H. R. 9910. An act granting an increase of pension to John McCoy;
H. R. 10148. An act granting an increase of pension to John Sphar;
H. R. 10432. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Oyler;
H. R. 10449. An act granting an increase of pension to George B. D. Alexander;
H. R. 10451. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert M. White;
H. R. 10452. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Daly;
H. R. 10523. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Gorton;
H. R. 10747. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Lengle;
H. R. 10818. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Creasey;
H. R. 10819. An act granting an increase of pension to John Burns;
H. R. 10830. An act granting an increase of pension to Dudley Portwood;
H. R. 10831. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi C. Bishop;
H. R. 10864. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Kleckner;
H. R. 10884. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Libby;
H. R. 11168. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Matthews;
H. R. 11206. An act granting an increase of pension to John Wilhelm;
H. R. 11256. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Ewing;

H. R. 11331. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Rowan;
H. R. 11332. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Kenner;
H. R. 11334. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Steel;
H. R. 11409. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah H. Seabold;
H. R. 11484. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wilson;
H. R. 11563. An act granting an increase of pension to John Henderson;
H. R. 11597. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Apgar;
H. R. 11702. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Pender;
H. R. 11716. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren B. Tompkins;
H. R. 11804. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick McDermott;
H. R. 11856. An act granting an increase of pension to Luke McLoney;
H. R. 11866. An act granting an increase of pension to David H. Allen;
H. R. 11868. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dougal;
H. R. 11926. An act granting an increase of pension to John Hornbeak;
H. R. 12049. An act granting an increase of pension to Rolland Havens;
H. R. 12122. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Shuey;
H. R. 12187. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Davenport;
H. R. 12192. An act granting an increase of pension to William Cummings;
H. R. 12205. An act granting an increase of pension to George Holden;
H. R. 12241. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Barber;
H. R. 12498. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Runnels;
H. R. 12509. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Botner;
H. R. 12532. An act granting an increase of pension to Zachariah George;
H. R. 12533. An act granting an increase of pension to Zadick Carter;
H. R. 12884. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Gain;
H. R. 12992. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Klink;
H. R. 13019. An act granting an increase of pension to George Whitman;
H. R. 13079. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Griffin;
H. R. 13110. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Moomaw;
H. R. 13153. An act granting an increase of pension to George Budden;
H. R. 13170. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Mabee;
H. R. 13255. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Hays;
H. R. 13336. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Horn;
H. R. 13537. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Busbee;
H. R. 13573. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Ballew;
H. R. 13723. An act granting an increase of pension to John Underwood;
H. R. 13803. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Forman;
H. R. 13822. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus D. King;
H. R. 13866. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Place;
H. R. 14131. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Simpson;
H. R. 14143. An act granting an increase of pension to Zacur P. Pott;
H. R. 14235. An act granting an increase of pension to John Williams;
H. R. 14241. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Edwards;
H. R. 14337. An act granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Y. Palmer;
H. R. 14375. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmond R. Haywood;
H. R. 14437. An act granting an increase of pension to Marquis M. De Burger;
H. R. 14454. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Blossom;
H. R. 14489. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Krieger;
H. R. 14532. An act granting an increase of pension to Augusta N. Manson;
H. R. 14547. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Chapman;
H. R. 14559. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry West;
H. R. 14560. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Weston;
H. R. 14718. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Jones;
H. R. 14823. An act granting an increase of pension to William Woods;
H. R. 14824. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Newman;
H. R. 14855. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Carr;
H. R. 14874. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Hearne;
H. R. 14875. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Witt;
H. R. 14909. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Creager;
H. R. 14918. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Simpson;
H. R. 14920. An act granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Bruce;
H. R. 14951. An act granting an increase of pension to James Nunan;
H. R. 15028. An act granting an increase of pension to Anthony Emes;
H. R. 15029. An act granting an increase of pension to Sabine Vancuren;
H. R. 15059. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred W. Morley;
H. R. 15110. An act granting an increase of pension to John Green;
H. R. 15192. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Merideth;
H. R. 15198. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Martin;
H. R. 15200. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Klein;
H. R. 15251. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Taylor;
H. R. 15252. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Allbright;
H. R. 15253. An act granting an increase of pension to Balos C. Dewees;
H. R. 15304. An act granting an increase of pension to Irwin O'Bryan;
H. R. 15306. An act granting an increase of pension to Asa Wall;
H. R. 15347. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Love;
H. R. 15382. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Moore;
H. R. 15385. An act granting an increase of pension to William Lucas;
H. R. 15392. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Wise;
H. R. 15393. An act granting an increase of pension to Nancy N. Allen;
H. R. 15414. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Blinn;
H. R. 15491. An act granting an increase of pension to James Buckley;
H. R. 15536. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Tilson;
H. R. 15552. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Hayter;
H. R. 15553. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan H. Isom;

H. R. 15622. An act granting an increase of pension to Argyle Z. Buck;

H. R. 15893. An act granting an increase of pension to Volney P. Ludlow;

H. R. 15940. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Carley;

H. R. 15974. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin C. King;

H. R. 16519. An act granting an increase of pension to Erwin G. Dudley;

H. R. 6982. An act for the relief of James W. Jones;

H. R. 6401. An act granting an increase of pension to William V. Van Ostern;

H. R. 9924. An act granting an increase of pension to Carrie A. Conley;

H. R. 13010. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice B. Hartshorne;

H. R. 11748. An act granting an increase of pension to James Wilson;

H. R. 6158. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Rittenhouse;

H. R. 12028. An act granting relief to John W. Donovan;

H. R. 13247. An act for the relief of John H. Tharp, of Eversonville, Mo.;

H. R. 10605. An act for the relief of Edward F. Stahle;

H. R. 10584. An act for the relief of F. H. Driscoll;

H. R. 6675. An act for the relief of the Methodist Church at New Haven, Ky.;

H. R. 5927. An act for the relief of the board of trustees of West Tennessee College, Jackson, Tenn.;

H. R. 7709. An act for the relief of Joseph Crow;

H. R. 1863. An act for the relief of M. A. McCafferty;

H. R. 3649. An act for the relief of Zenas Parker;

H. R. 14541. An act for the relief of C. R. Williams;

H. R. 120. An act to amend section 9 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8278. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to Keystone Camp, No. 2879, of the Modern Woodmen of America, to certain lands for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 11275. An act increasing the penalty for certain offenses in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9324. An act to authorize the Fayette Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County;

H. R. 15259. An act to authorize the North Mississippi Traction Company to construct dams and power stations on the Bear River on the northeast quarter of section 31, township 5, range 11, in Tishomingo County, Miss.; and

H. R. 14578. An act to provide for the establishment of a public crematorium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

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

S. 5533. An act to appoint an additional judge for the southern district of New York—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 5489. An act to provide for sittings of the circuit and district courts of the southern district of Florida in the city of Miami in said district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 5297. An act providing for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

At the request of Mr. BURTON of Ohio, by unanimous consent, a reprint was ordered of the bill (H. R. 18024) for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes.

Mr. MADDEN, by unanimous consent, was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for mileage of officers and contract surgeons—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for bringing home bodies of officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who die abroad—to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. FOWLER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13566) to amend section 6 of the currency act, approved March 14, 1900, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3349); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18078) providing for an additional chaplain of the United States Army, to be assigned to the Corps of Engineers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3350); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOGG, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17884) to authorize the sale and disposition of surplus or unallotted lands of the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation, in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3352); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5203) granting to the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, of Montana, a right of way through the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, in Montana, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3353); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOULDEN, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17879) amending section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the carrying of dangerous articles on passenger steamers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3354); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15248) for the relief of George E. O'Neal, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 3351); which said bill and report were ordered laid in the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 18373) to increase the efficiency of the United States Navy by building cruisers and torpedo boats after the design of Richard B. Painton—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 18374) relating to the department of lectures in connection with the public schools of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 18375) to regulate the manufacture, sale, and transportation from one State to another State of any article of food in cans, glass, boxes, or packages, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 18376) to authorize the Minnesota, Dakota and Pacific Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Missouri River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A resolution (H. Res. 409) authorizing

the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands to sit during sessions of the House and to have necessary printing done—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VREELAND: A resolution (H. Res. 410) for the payment of the expenses of the subcommittee on Naval Affairs while investigating hazing at Annapolis—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. ADAMS of Pennsylvania (by request): A bill (H. R. 18377) providing for the adjudication of the claim of the Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Company by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 18378) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Dunlap—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 18379) for the relief of Jose Salazary y Ortiz—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 18380) to complete the naval record of Charles W. Held—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 18381) granting a pension to Mary Jane Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 18382) granting an increase of pension to George M. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18383) granting an increase of pension to Fredrick Shinnaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCKS: A bill (H. R. 18384) granting an increase of pension to James F. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 18385) granting an increase of pension to William Markman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 18386) for the relief of Henry Marlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18387) for the relief of Bailey Owens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18388) for the relief of the New South Brewing and Ice Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18389) for the relief of P. H. Bridgewater—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18390) granting a pension to Wiley Garland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18391) granting an increase of pension to James Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18392) granting an increase of pension to Lauraney Helton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18393) granting an increase of pension to David F. Crouch—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18394) granting an increase of pension to Jonothan Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 18395) granting an increase of pension to John G. Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18396) granting an increase of pension to John Nix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 18397) granting a pension to Alice R. Cronkite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 18398) granting an increase of pension to Susan R. Freeman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18399) granting an increase of pension to Pauline Bietry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18400) granting an increase of pension to Elmira M. Gause—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18401) granting an increase of pension to Mahala A. Payne—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18402) granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18403) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Ragan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 18404) granting an increase of pension to James R. Buckner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18405) for the relief of Joseph M. Withrow, of Wolf Creek, Cherokee County, N. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18406) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 18407) granting an increase of pension to John A. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18408) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte J. Triplett Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 18409) granting an increase of pension to Joel Gay—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 18410) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Cushing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18411) granting a pension to John M. Turner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 18412) to pay accrued pension to Martha Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 18413) granting a pension to Martha L. Packard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 18414) for the relief of James M. Wright, of Crawford County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 18415) for the relief of J. de L. Lafitte—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18416) for the relief of Louise Powers McKee, administratrix—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 18417) for the relief of the Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 18418) for the relief of Priscilla J. Shipman, administratrix of the estate of John J. Shipman, deceased, for work done and materials furnished to the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 18419) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Emma R. Bailey, executrix of John J. Bailey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18420) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Abner D. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18421) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of A. A. Wade, administrator of estate of S. L. Carpenter, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18422) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of J. J. Todd, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18423) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Robert C. Jameson, administrator of estate of David Jameson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18424) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Elizabeth Burke, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18425) for the relief of the estate of John W. Hester, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 18426) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hathaway—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 18427) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Eva Benton Booth and Helen Leone Booth each the sum of $5,000—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 18428) granting an increase of pension to James L. Gamble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 18429) granting an increase of pension to David Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 18430) granting an increase of pension to James H. Baum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 18431) granting relief to Reuben B. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18432) granting an increase of pension to David Dirck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 18433) granting an increase of pension to William Wentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 18434) granting an increase of pension to Adam Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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. 18253) granting a pension to Mary Gerard—

Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 18254) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Crane—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on 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: Petition of Division No. 105, Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, of Beaver, Pa., against bill H. R. 12973—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., against the Little and Gilbert bills relative to immunity of labor organizations in disputes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of The T Square Club, of Philadelphia, for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Camp Walter E. Brown, No. 4, Society of the Army of the Philippines, for bestowal of medals on officers and men (and families of such as may be dead) who remained in service after the term of enlistment had expired, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of citizens of Arvada, Jefferson County, Colo., relative to religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of citizens of Lynn and Anderson counties, Kans., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of citizens of Wausau, Wis., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Henry B. Zeitler, of Kenosha, Wis., against bill H. R. 12973, to prohibit coming of Chinese laborers into the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of William C. Wyk, against bill H. R. 12973—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: Petition of citizens of Montana, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DRESSER: Petition of Camp Walter E. Brown, No. 4, and Camp Hawkins, No. 1, Society of the Army of the Philippines, for the Bonynge bill providing special medals to officers and men (and families of those dead) who served beyond legal enlistment in the Philippine war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the T Square Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph M. Withrow—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joel Gay—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Loyalty Council, No. 314, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Greensburg, Pa., for an amendment to bill H. R. 4403, to include the educational test and requiring each alien immigrant to possess $50 on arrival—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Edgar A. Wightman and Guy King, for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Women's Health Protective Association, for bills S. 50 and 2962 and H. R. 4462, relative to child labor and a children's bureau in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Trades League of Philadelphia, against the Little bill and the Gilbert bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LILLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ezra H. Wiggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. M. Applewhite, administrator of estate of Jesse Applewhite—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the National Consumers' League, for the immediate consideration of the Gardner bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Chattanooga Manufacturers' Association, favoring the waiving of the eight-hour law relative to alien employees on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Master House Painters and Decorators of Massachusetts, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Macon and Andrews College, Memphis, Tenn., for the Stone postage rate bill, relative to a special rate on publications issued at regular intervals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Consumers' League of Knoxville, Tenn., for the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Ward-Kent Company, of Greenville, Tenn., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Nashville, Tenn., and the Board of Trade of Knoxville, Tenn., for bill H. R. 7006 (the Mondell bill)—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the Memphis Commercial College, for bill S. 3886, relative to journals and annuals in the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the University of Tennessee, favoring bill H. R. 7006 (the Mondell bill)—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the Typothetæ of New York City, against the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, against bill H. R. 5281 (the pilotage bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the National Board of Trade, for forest reservations in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Board of Trade, for the reclamation bill, the stone and timber bill, and the forest reservation bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Japanese and Korean Exclusion League, of San Francisco, for retention of the present Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Protective Tariff League, against any change in the present schedules of the tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Oklahoma, favoring an amendment of the clause in the statehood bill relative to location of the capital at Guthrie until 1915—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Dames of 1846, for bill H. R. 6010, relative to increased pensions for Mexican war veterans—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Confederate Southern Memorial Association, of New Orleans, La., for bill H. R. 1234, relative to care of graves of Confederate dead—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the United States Brewers' Association, of New York City, for a Federal judicial court in the Orient—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Japanese and Korean Exclusion League of San Francisco, for the retention of the present Chinese law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of many business firms of St. Louis, for revocation of the fraud order by the Post-Office Department against the Woman's Magazine—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Nashville Hosiery Company, for the repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Nashville Hosiery Company, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chattanooga Manufacturers' Association, against the Gilbert anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chattanooga Manufacturers' Association, for the Southern mail appropriation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Barbara Frietchie Council, No. 84, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, for an appropriation to investigate the industrial condition of women in the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of many of the first business men of Milton, Pa.; the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Milton, Pa., against

bill S. 3413, to extend the time of cattle in cars in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Green B. Raum, for Senator NELSON's amendment to the Army appropriation bill, relative to a retired volunteer list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Intermunicipal Research Commission, for legislation for the protection of the unemployed—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for an appropriation to deepen the Coney Island channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Association of the Bar of New York City, for the bill providing for an increase of the salaries of Federal judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Council of Women of the United States, the Women's Health Protective Association, of New York, and the Sorosis Club, of New York, for bills S. 50 and H. R. 4462, relative to child labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the National Board of Trade, for forest reservations in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Green B. Raum, Samuel J. Crawford, and William Birney, for the Nelson amendment to the Army appropriation bill, creating a volunteer retired list of officers of the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Division No. 171, Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, against bill H. R. 12973—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of the Otis Company, of Ware, Mass., and the Ampere Silk Mill, of Bloomfield, N. J., against bill H. R. 8988 (the Littauer metric system bill)—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of the Woman's Health Protective Association, of New York City, for the child-labor bill for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Union No. 1015, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of Bernardville, N. J., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *April 20, 1906.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Postmaster-General, submitting an increase in the estimate of appropriation for wrapping twine and tying devices for postal service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, from $175,000 to $225,000; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Edward F. Mitchell *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Jonathan Pigman, executor of Benjamin Pigman, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Leonidas Thompson, administrator of Mathew Brown, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Thomas Dunn, administrator of Charles Hunter, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Mary J. Owen, widow of Elias K. Owen, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Florence Murray, widow of Alexander Murray, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Elliott C. Harrington *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Fannie S. B. Halm, widow (remarried) of John C. Beaumont, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Bella A. Leach, widow of Boynton Leach, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Ezra Z. Derr *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of George R. Gray *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of G. V. Mengies *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Nelson H. Drake *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Ebenezer S. Prime *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Edward K. Valentine *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Hobart L. Tremain *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Emma G. Jenness, widow of Thomas B. Gammon, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.