

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 13, 1908.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

USELESS PAPERS IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of papers, documents, etc., on the files of the Department which are not needed in the transaction of the public business and have no permanent value or historical interest, which was read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication will be referred to the Joint Committee on the Destruction of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] as members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directs the Secretary to duly notify the House of Representatives thereof.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. C. R. McKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 1931. An act to grant certain land, part of the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, Nebr., to the village of Valentine for a site for a reservoir or tank to hold water to supply the public of said village;

S. 2048. An act to provide additional station grounds and terminal facilities for the Arizona and California Railway Company in the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz. T.;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of John P. Hunter;

H. R. 12803. An act allowing Chandler Bassett to perfect final proof in his homestead entry;

H. R. 14043. An act to provide for the extension of time within which homestead entrymen may establish their residence upon certain lands within the limits of the Huntley irrigation project, in the county of Yellowstone, in the State of Montana;

H. R. 16073. An act to authorize the town of Edgcomb, Lincoln County, Me., to maintain a bridge across tide waters;

H. R. 16746. An act to authorize T. H. Friel or assigns to construct a dam across Mulberry Fork of the Black Warrior River; and

H. R. 16749. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River in the State of Pennsylvania by the Liberty Bridge Company," approved March 2, 1907.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Emmet Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., and a memorial of the Emmet Associates, of Lynn, Mass., remonstrating against the ratification of the pending treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of O'Connell Club, of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the ratification of the pending treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PLATT presented a memorial of the Merchants' Exchange, of Olean, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Aldrich emergency currency bill," which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of William J. Carle, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Kittredge copyright bill," which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 478, National Bartenders' Union, of Plattsburg, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the Memorial and Executive Committee, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to abolish certain pension agencies throughout the country, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Albany,

N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the pending treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society, Pittsburg Presbytery, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of opium within the jurisdiction of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of East Rochester and South Acworth, in the State of New Hampshire, of Sparta, Mich., and Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Portland, Me., Richmond, Va., Jackson, Miss., Ohio City, Ohio, and of Orlando, Fla., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Northeast Washington Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation requiring all new school buildings in the District of Columbia to be fireproof, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRAZIER presented a petition of local union No. 24, International Typographical Union, of Jackson, Tenn., praying for the repeal of the duty on white, paper, wood pulp, and the materials used in the manufacture thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Scotts Hill, Tenn., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," and also for the establishment of postal savings banks, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 4765) for the relief of the trustees of Mount Olivet Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Nolensville, Tenn., which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 2319) for the relief of Mrs. Corrinne Lawrence, of Nashville, Tenn., which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented an affidavit to accompany the bill (S. 4460) for the relief of the deacons of the Missionary Baptist Church at Franklin, Tenn., which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 5785) granting a pension to Willis J. Freeman, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Dexter, West Henrietta, Camden, Westville, Minisink, Stony Ford, and Newark, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a rural parcels post, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the John K. Neal Republican Club, of Kings County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of at least one of the proposed new battle ships at the New York Navy-Yard, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Independent Tobacco Manufacturers' Association of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to permit the sale of leaf tobacco for consumption without the payment of the revenue tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 292, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "Rodenberg anti-injunction bill," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the American Directory Publishers' Association, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Kittredge copyright bill," which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 292, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Middletown, N. Y., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the present interstate-commerce law relating to free passes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a petition of Local Union No. 111, International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, of Joliet, Ill., praying for the repeal of the duty on white paper, wood pulp, and the materials used in the manufacture thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELKINS presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 3565) granting an increase of pension to George W. Parsons, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the State Institute of Technology, Society of Arts, of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the conservation of the national forests, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservation and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, No. 11, Patrons of Husbandry, of Westboro, Mass., and a petition of Ponkapog Grange, No. 231, Patrons of Husbandry, of Canton, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LONG presented memorials of sundry citizens of Leavenworth and Randolph, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 1009, United Mine Workers of America, of Osage, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Penrose bill" to exclude nonmailable periodicals from second-class mail privileges, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Reformed Church of Goshen, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., Nashville, Tenn., Indianapolis, Ind., Jackson, Miss., Orlando, Fla., and Kansas City and St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Franklin County, Kans., praying for the passage of the bill (S. 4221) for the relief of Franklin Cowan, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Pap Thomas Post, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Great Bend, Kans., praying for the passage of the bill (S. 5758) for the relief of John F. Lewis, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RAYNER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mount Airy, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on the Philippines, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16143) to provide for payment of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2999) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of New Hampshire avenue, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1907, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5665) for the purchase of land for the use of the military post at Fort Sheridan, Ill., reported it with amendments and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. NIXON, from the Committee on Coast Defenses, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. ANKENY on January 27, 1908, proposing to appropriate \$5,478,751 for increased fortifications for Puget Sound, State of Washington, intended to be proposed to the fortifications appropriation bill, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it, with the accompanying paper, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which was agreed to.

Mr. HEMENWAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1160) to correct the military record of Lora E. Reed, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1744) for the relief of the heirs of George A. Armstrong, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McLaurin introduced a bill (S. 6099) for the relief of the estate of R. H. Hoffman, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 6100) authorizing and directing the Adjutant-General of the United States Army to furnish to the adjutant-general of the State of Florida copies of the muster rolls of certain military organizations filed or deposited in the War Department or other Departments of the Government, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine:

A bill (S. 6101) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; and

A bill (S. 6102) to further protect the public health, and imposing additional duties upon the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6103) granting an increase of pension to Abram Bickford, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6104) to compensate the commissioners to revise the statutes relating to patents, trade and other marks, and trade and commercial names for services rendered, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 6105) for the relief of pensioners of the Metropolitan police fund, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6106) making appropriation for dredging a channel in the southern branch of the Elizabeth River from the drawbridge of the Belt Line Railway to the drawbridge of the Norfolk and Western Railway Company, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DIXON introduced a bill (S. 6107) granting an increase of pension to John W. Winslett, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 6108) granting an increase of pension to Theodore R. Stearns;

A bill (S. 6109) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Wells; and

A bill (S. 6110) granting an increase of pension to Timothy L. Boswell (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 6111) granting a pension to William H. Atkins, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced a bill (S. 6112) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, of Fayetteville, Tenn., formerly known as the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Fayetteville, Tenn., which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. OWEN introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 6113) providing for the erection of a public building at Muskogee, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6114) providing for the erection of a public building at Enid, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6115) providing for the erection of a public building at Ardmore, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6116) providing for the erection of a public building at McAlester, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6117) providing for the erection of a public building at Tulsa, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6118) providing for the erection of a public building at Bartlesville, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6119) providing for the erection of a public building at Lawton, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6120) providing for the erection of a public building at Chickasha, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6121) providing for the erection of a public building at Vinita, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6122) providing for the erection of a public building at El Reno, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6123) providing for the erection of a public building at Anadarko, Okla.;

A bill (S. 6124) providing for the erection of a public building at Woodward, Okla.; and

A bill (S. 6125) providing for the erection of a public building at Alva, Okla.

Mr. du PONT introduced a bill (S. 6126) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Newcastle, State of Delaware, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 6127) to correct the military record of Harding Weston, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 6128) granting a pension to Lucy E. Gregory, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 6129) granting a pension to William J. Dowell (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6130) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Hull (with accompanying papers).

He also introduced a bill (S. 6131) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Rock River, State of Illinois, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 6132) granting a pension to William Hoberg, which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6133) granting a pension to Charles Dillon, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6134) for the relief of Edward Tearney, administrator of Samuel Ridenour, deceased, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 6135) providing for the disposal of the interests of Indian minors in real estate in Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DIXON submitted an amendment providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a building for the Weather Bureau, at Missoula, Mont., intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15372, known as the "omnibus claims bill," which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRAZIER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15372, known as the "omnibus claims bill," which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELKINS submitted seven amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15372, known as the "omnibus claims bill," which were referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15372, known as the "omnibus claims bill," which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENTS TO FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. FULTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3023) to amend the national banking laws, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3023) to amend the national banking laws, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

INTERSTATE-COMMERCE REGULATIONS.

Mr. FULTON submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be, and it is hereby discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 423) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," and is hereby instructed to report said bill to the Senate.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I see that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce is not present in the Senate this morning. Hence I will not ask for the present consideration of the resolution. I will ask that it may lie on the table, and I may call it up later.

I will say, in presenting the resolution, that I do not wish to be understood as reflecting on the committee or any members of it, or charging them with any disposition to smother the bill. I realize that the committee is so busily engaged with hearings on matters pertaining to other bills that it is not going to be able to take up this bill and consider it any further, and therefore I shall ask later on for the consideration of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table. Mr. FULTON subsequently said: Before the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] commences his address, I ask him to yield to me for just a moment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. I see that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce is now in the Senate Chamber. I wish to call his attention to the resolution which I offered discharging the committee from the further consideration of Senate bill 423. I take it that the Senator will not object to the resolution, and therefore it might, perhaps, be adopted without any waste of time. I am quite sure the Senator does not care to detain the bill any longer, because the committee is not considering it. I have offered the resolution as much as anything else to relieve the Senator from the embarrassment of detaining the bill in his committee.

Mr. ELKINS. I ask that the resolution be read. I was not in the Chamber when it was offered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution, at the request of the Senator from West Virginia.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. ELKINS. I ask that the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is not at the Secretary's desk, it being before the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ELKINS. I thought perhaps it was at the desk.

Mr. President, I want to say in behalf of the committee that I do not think there has been any unnecessary delay, or any delay that the committee could help, in the consideration of this bill. It was promptly referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a report, which was in due season made to the committee, unfavorable to the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULTON. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. ELKINS. I say the bill was promptly referred, early after its introduction by the Senator, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission reported unfavorably on the bill.

Mr. FULTON. The Interstate Commerce Commission reported against certain features or provisions of the bill. The Senator recalls very well that I appeared before his committee and accepted the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission simply desired certain changes and then recommended the bill favorably.

But, Mr. President, I do not wish to infringe on the time of the Senator from North Carolina, who is prepared to address the Senate this morning. I will ask, if the Senator from West Virginia has no objection, that the matter may lie over until after the Senator from North Carolina has concluded his remarks.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I can not allow that disposition of it without objection, for the reason that this is the second time the Senator from Oregon has referred to delay on the part of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and I want to put the committee right before the Senate. I think it is but fair to the committee that I should do so.

After the Interstate Commerce Commission reported against the bill (and I will ask that their report be read), the Senator indicated a willingness to accept the amendment proposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and made an argument in favor of his bill. I think some others appeared in favor of the bill. After that the opponents of the bill, the railroad companies, asked that they might be heard.

The bill was referred to a subcommittee and it is now in the hands of a subcommittee to consider the amendment recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission. In order to facilitate the hearing and to expedite action on the bill, the subcommittee was empowered to have hearings separate and apart from the full committee. I do not see the chairman of that subcommittee in the Senate. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] is the chairman of the subcommittee, and he tells me that he is doing all he can to have the hearings, that the subcommittee may be informed and report intelligently when the hearings are concluded.

Mr. President, I think it is unfair to the committee to introduce this resolution. It reflects upon the committee and it is entirely unjust. I have tried, and I think the committee have

tried, and have been disposed to facilitate the hearing. The Senator said he wanted to depart for his State about the 15th, and we have tried more than in the case of any other bill before the committee to get action on it. I submit it is not fair, when the railroad companies want to be heard on the bill and bring their attorneys and experts thousands of miles to be heard, to deny them a hearing.

I will ask that the letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission, reporting against the bill, be read.

Mr. CULBERSON. I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia, in view of the notice given by the Senator from North Carolina, that he might have the communication printed in the RECORD without taking up the time by having it read.

Mr. FULTON. I was going to ask—

Mr. ELKINS. I should like to have the letter read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the letter?

Mr. CULBERSON. I object, and ask for the regular order.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. FORAKER. Is there objection to the reading of the letter?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is interposed to the reading of the letter.

Mr. CULBERSON. I have no objection to its being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FORAKER. Can not the letter be read as a part of the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ELKINS. It is very short.

Mr. FORAKER. It is a letter I have been trying to read or have read ever since it was received in the committee, and I thought I was about to be gratified in that respect.

Mr. ELKINS. I will read it as a part of my remarks.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator from North Carolina suggests that the reading of it will not interfere with him, and I therefore withdraw the objection.

Mr. FORAKER. It will take only a few minutes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The objection is withdrawn, and the Secretary will read the letter, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 29, 1908.

HON. STEPHEN B. ELKINS,
Chairman Committee on Interstate Commerce,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Interstate Commerce Commission has the honor to submit the following in response to your communication of 24th instant, transmitting a bill (S. 423) to amend section 6 of the act to regulate commerce, introduced by Senator FULTON December 4, 1907, and requesting the Commission to "advise the committee before its next meeting, January 31, their opinion of said bill and what action they would suggest thereon."

Whilst the views of the entire Commission can not be definitely ascertained within the time named, because of absences on official business, a majority of the Commissioners, and probably all of them, would not be disposed to favor the enactment of this measure.

To give to the protest of a single shipper the effect of preventing the advance of any rate until the reasonableness of that advance was affirmatively determined by the Commission would establish a hard and fast rule of doubtful fairness to the railroads and questionable advantage to the public. Under existing conditions, we are of the opinion that it would be unwise to adopt the arbitrary limitation which this bill proposes, whatever may be found desirable or necessary in this regard in the future.

It is further to be observed that the passage of such a bill at this time would impose a burden upon the Commission which it ought not to be asked to undertake. If every proposed advance had to be investigated by the Commission and officially sanctioned before it could take effect, the number of cases to be considered would presumably be so great as to render their prompt disposition almost impossible. In instances of justifiable increase the necessary delay resulting from the probable volume of cases would work injustice to the carriers. Until conditions become more stable and the substantive provisions of the act are more completely observed in railway tariffs and practices we entertain the belief that a wider latitude of discretion on the part of carriers than this measure allows should be permitted.

It is also suggested that the practical effect of the proposed amendment might be to prevent voluntary reductions of rates by the carriers. If no rate could be increased without the approval of the Commission after affirmative showing by the carrier, it might happen that many reductions now voluntarily accorded would not be made.

This subject of rate advances was discussed in our recent annual report to the Congress, and that portion of the report is transmitted herewith for the information of your committee. It concludes with a recommendation relating to the matter in question, in which the entire Commission concurred, and that recommendation is now respectfully renewed.

Very respectfully,

MARTIN A. KNAPP, Chairman.

Mr. SIMMONS rose.

Mr. FULTON. Will the Senator from North Carolina allow me a word, and then I will let the matter go over until a subsequent time?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FULTON. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senator from North Carolina, and therefore I will refrain from discussing the matter at this time, but later in the day, if

possible, or at least at the earliest available opportunity, I shall call it up again and I shall show to the Senate that with the amendment recommended by the Commission, which I appeared before the committee and accepted, and which the subcommittee unanimously agreed to, the bill is recommended and indorsed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and has the approval of every member of that Commission.

I shall not further discuss the matter at this moment. I shall call it up later.

CERTAIN LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I desire to make, briefly, some remarks; but as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] gave notice of his intention to speak this morning, I will withhold my observations until the conclusion of his remarks.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. M. C. LATTA, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 10, 1908, the President approved a bill of the following number and title:

S. 3941. An act to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to prevent unlawful occupancy of the public lands," approved February 25, 1885.

On March 11, 1908:

S. 4351. An act for the relief of the Alaska Pacific Railway and Terminal Company; and

S. 3409. An act to extend the time of payments on certain homestead entries in Oklahoma.

On March 13:

S. 5155. An act authorizing the exchange of lands for the enlargement of maneuvering grounds.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CLAPP. I desire to submit the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill. In view of the proposed speech of the Senator from North Carolina, I will defer action upon it until after he concludes.

The report was submitted, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 21, 22, 23, 24, 49, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 73, 75, 85, 94, 99, 100.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 67, 77, 78, 80, 82, 83, 86, 87, 89, 91, 93, 102, 104, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert:

"The Secretary of the Interior shall take possession of all buildings on lands belonging to the Five Civilized Tribes, now or heretofore used for governmental, school, or 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 appraisal and sale, in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribes respectively owning the said land and improvements, and immediately after any such sale patents for the realty thus sold shall be made and delivered in the same manner as now provided by law for other tribal property: *Provided*, That when practicable preference right shall be given to the State, counties, and municipalities of Oklahoma to purchase said lands and improvements at the appraised value: *And provided*, That pending such appraisal and sale the Secretary of the Interior may temporarily lease said buildings and lands for the benefit of the tribes respectively to which they belong."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2, after the word "and," strike out the words "purchase of;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and correct the total so as to read: "In all, two million one hundred and fifteen thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert: "That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is hereby authorized to send a special Indian agent, or other representative of his Office, to visit any Indian tribe for the purpose of negotiating and entering into a written agreement with such tribe for the commutation of the perpetual annuities due under treaty stipulations, to be subject to the approval of Congress; and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall transmit to Congress said agreements, with such recommendations as he may deem proper;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "ninety" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eighty-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall;" in the same line strike out the words "from this" and in line 5 the word "appropriation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment add the following: "Provided, That this appropriation shall be so expended as to make further appropriation for this purpose unnecessary;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "reservation," in line 10, add: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available until the proper officer of the Indian Bureau shall investigate and report that the work contemplated can be completed for the amount herein appropriated;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert:

"That the land in the following subdivisions now embraced in the Coeur d'Alene Reservation, in Idaho, to wit: Sections one, two, and twelve, township forty-six north, range four west, Boise meridian; sections thirty-five and thirty-six, township forty-seven north, range four west, Boise meridian; all of those portions of sections two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, and eleven, township forty-six north, range three west, Boise meridian, lying south and west of the St. Joe River, in said township; all of those portions of sections thirty-one and thirty-two, township forty-seven north, range three west, Boise meridian, lying south and west of the St. Joe River, in said township, is reserved and withdrawn from allotment and settlement, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey any part thereof to the State of Idaho to be maintained by said State as a public park, said conveyance to be made for such consideration and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe. The proceeds of such sale shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States for the use and benefit of the Coeur d'Alene Indians in such manner as Congress shall hereafter prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2, after the word "authorized," insert the words "in his discretion;" and in line 6, after the word "purchase," strike out the words "in his discretion;" in line 9, after the word "Iowa," strike out the balance of said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2, after the word "to," strike out the words "use and;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2, strike out the words "and directed" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in his discretion;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: After the word "conclusive," in line 10, insert: "Provided, That the expense thereof shall be paid out of the moneys found due said Indians in said cause;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1, after the word "implements," insert the words "other equipment." In line 9, after the word "Interior," insert the words "provided that said expenditures shall be made;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to examine and report on the advisability and expense of settling Chief Rocky Boy's band of Chipewewa Indians, now residing in Montana, upon some suitable existing Indian reservation or public lands, and to report to Congress the cost thereof, including the cost of making such preparation for the use of the lands upon which they are to be settled, as in his judgment seems necessary."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment after the word "make," in line 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Such arrangement and agreement in reference thereto as said Secretary deems for the best interest of the Indians: *Provided*, That no lien or charge for construction, operation, or maintenance shall thereby be created against any such reserved lands: *And provided further*, That to meet the necessary cost of carrying out this legislation the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to expend, out of the sum appropriated in this act for irrigation, an amount not exceeding \$13,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert the following:

"For construction of concrete walk, driveways, and grading, \$2,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 strike out the word "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and correct the total so as to read: "In all, thirty-six thousand seven hundred dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2, after the word "Jack," insert the words "Choctaw allottees;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 strike out the words "and directed" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in his discretion." At the end of said amendment add:

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to pay, upon the surrender of the note hereinafter described, out of the above sum appropriated for the Sac and Fox Indians, to Helen Pennock, the widow and surviving heir of William Pennock, the sum of six hundred dollars, in full settlement of a promissory note given by Mo-ko-ho-ko and Ke-wa-quah, chiefs of the Sac and Fox Indians, and Ketch-e-Cush, a councilman."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of proposed amendment,

and on page 36, in line 21, after the word "patent," strike out "and conveying;" and in line 22 strike out the word "same;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof:

"That contracts heretofore or hereafter made by and between persons stricken by the Secretary of the Interior from the final rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes, or whose right to be upon said rolls is or shall be a matter of litigation, and attorneys employed by them to secure their restoration to or their right to be upon said rolls are hereby declared valid and enforceable in the event of the restoration of said persons to the rolls or success in such litigation against allotted lands or tribal funds of the persons so restored to or given rights upon the said rolls, if such contracts are approved by the Secretary of the Interior in their original or such modified form as he may deem equitable, and not otherwise."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the Chickasaw fund, to D. H. Johnson, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, compensation for his services as such governor at the rate of fifteen hundred dollars per annum from March fourth, nineteen hundred and six, so long as he shall legally serve as such governor."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof:

"and the Secretary of the Interior is directed to so disburse this appropriation as to complete said work by July first, nineteen hundred and nine."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert in lieu of the amount proposed, "\$12,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert:

"That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is authorized and directed to invite proposals for the construction of a gravity water system for the Rapid City School, to be supplied from the springs located on the school farms, said bids to cover construction of suitable reservoir and laying of a 6-inch main thereon to said school buildings and grounds, and such minor and collateral piping as may seem necessary, and to report thereon to Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment and insert the following:

"The Commissioner of Indian Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to expend so much of the trust funds of the Ute Indians, not exceeding \$75,000, now in the United States Treasury, as, in his judgment, may be necessary to prevent want and suffering among the Absentee Utes, and the amount so expended for each individual Absentee shall be made a matter of record to be charged against and deducted from the share said absentee may be entitled to receive when the trust funds of the Utes are allotted and distributed to the members of the tribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On line 3 of said amendment strike

out "Uinta" and insert "Uintah." Transpose entire amendment to page 48 and place after amendment one hundred and one; and the Senate agree to the same.

MOSES E. CLAPP,
P. J. McCUMBER,
ROBERT L. OWEN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. S. SHERMAN,
THOMAS F. MARSHALL,
JOHN H. STEPHENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the shipping bill, so called.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 28) to amend the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have given much thought and study to the proposition contained in the bill now before the Senate. It deals with an exceedingly important question, and I have earnestly sought to bring to its consideration an unbiased and untrammelled judgment.

I shall not attempt an elaborate discussion of the subject, but I shall content myself with a plain, direct statement of the purposes and effect of the bill and the practical conditions which, I think, make its enactment at this time wise and expedient.

The bill is simply a proposition to amend the ocean mail service law of 1891. It does not change the principles of that act in the slightest. The bill is very short, embracing only a few lines, and in order that I may present my argument with greater clearness, I will read it.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized to pay for ocean mail service under the act of March 3, 1891, in vessels of the second class on routes to South America, to the Philippines, to Japan, to China, and to Australasia, 4,000 miles or more in length, outward voyage, at a rate per mile not exceeding the rate applicable to vessels of the first class as provided in said act.

The act of 1891 authorized the Postmaster-General to enter into contracts for terms of years, not less than five nor more than ten, with American citizens for carrying the mails between this country and the ports of foreign countries. For the purposes of that law American steamships are divided into four classes: First, steamers of 20 knots speed per hour, with a gross tonnage of not less than 8,000 tons; second, steamers of 16 knots per hour speed, with a gross tonnage of not less than 5,000 tons; third, steamers of 14 knots, with a gross tonnage of not less than 2,500 tons; and fourth, of 12 knots, with a gross tonnage of not less than 1,500 tons.

The act provides that the rate of compensation for such ocean mail service for steamers of the first class shall not exceed \$4 per mile outward voyage; of the second class, \$2 per mile; of the third class, \$1 per mile; and of the fourth class, 66 cents per mile, by the shortest practicable route.

In order to come within the provisions of the act steamers of the first, second, and third classes are required to be constructed upon plans and specifications agreed upon by the Navy Department, with a view to prompt and economical conversion into auxiliary naval cruisers. These steamships are required also to carry a mail messenger and to provide suitable room and accommodation both for him and the mail; also one cadet or apprentice, who is to be an American boy, for each thousand gross tons capacity and for each majority fraction of a thousand gross tons.

By the terms of the law all steamers so employed may at any time be condemned by the Government and purchased for use as auxiliary cruisers or transports upon a price to be agreed upon, or in case of disagreement to be fixed by appraisement.

Finally, under the act the contract is let by advertisement, as required in the Revised Statutes, section 2941, for letting contracts for carrying inland mail.

These are the essential provisions of the act of 1891 as they are affected by the bill under consideration.

At present, Mr. President, and for many years past our foreign mail service has not only been self-sustaining but it has yielded a considerable profit. While the adoption of this bill will probably add twenty-five or twenty-seven high-class merchant ships to our almost at present insignificant merchant marine and give us prompt and reliable business communication with the Orient and the important countries to the south of us, it is practically certain that Congress will never be called upon, if this amendment is adopted, to appropriate one dollar for this

new and additional service. Certainly that will be the case if the amendment I shall offer and of which I shall speak later is adopted.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, the receipts from this service, exclusive of Canada and Mexico, amounted to \$6,579,043.48, while the disbursements amounted to only \$2,941,816.67, leaving a profit from this service in favor of the Government in that year of \$3,627,000. For the year 1906 the excess in receipts over cost in this service in round figures amounted to \$3,000,000; in 1905, to \$2,000,000; in 1904, to \$2,500,000; in 1903, to \$2,600,000; in 1902, to \$1,491,000, and in 1900, to \$1,452,000.

On the average for the past seven years the volume of the ocean mails has increased annually a trifle over 12 per cent, the postage for ocean mails nearly 13 per cent, the cost of ocean transportation only 6½ per cent, and the profits, subject to slight qualifications, 21 per cent.

These figures show not only a gradual, and I might add a rapid, increase in the profits of this service, but they show that the excess in receipts over cost in this branch of the postal service is not occasional but is a fixed factor in the finances of that Department, and may therefore be safely relied upon as a fund for the improvement of that service.

Early in the month of February, shortly after this bill was introduced, and I wish to ask the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire at this point, I introduced a proposed amendment to the bill in these words:

Provided, That the compensation from foreign mail service in any one year shall not exceed the estimated revenue therefrom in that year.

I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will see his way clear to accept this amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER rose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that I think his amendment is a very fair and proper one, and so far as I am personally concerned I will take great pleasure in accepting it and letting it become a part of the proposed bill without any controversy.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. If it does not interrupt the Senator, I would be glad to have him restate his amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. The amendment is to be inserted at the end of the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Has the Senator the text of the amendment there?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have. It reads as follows:

Provided, That the compensation for foreign mail service in any one year shall not exceed the estimated revenues therefrom in that year.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, if it does not interrupt the Senator from North Carolina, I desire to ask a further question, and that is, if he is able to state the expenditures and revenues of the postal service with reference to South America, the Philippines, Japan, China, and Australasia; in other words, I should like to know how the amount of expenditures for that particular service compares with the receipts?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not been able to get the Department to segregate the expenditures and the receipts of the service so as to enable me to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. CULBERSON. The figures now presented by the Senator from North Carolina refer to the whole foreign mail service?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; they relate to the whole foreign mail service. I will state that I have asked for such a segregation, but I have not up to this date received it.

The Department estimates that it will require twenty-seven 16-knot steamers to give us adequate mail with South America and the Orient under this bill, and that the cost of that service will be about \$3,630,000 per annum, or about \$30,000 less than the profits on our foreign mail service for 1907. If the present rate of profit on our foreign mail service continues and the Department's estimate of the cost of this new service is correct, the receipts will be sufficient for the establishment of the routes now contemplated, and my amendment would be unnecessary.

But, Mr. President, the bill does not limit the number of lines the Department may establish, nor the number of ships it may employ, and my purpose in offering this amendment is to limit expenditures to receipts and to prevent expansion of the service faster than the receipts from it may justify. This amendment is in line with the general policy of our postal administration, by which receipts from postage are appropriated to the expenses

of the postal administration. It fixes automatically a limit on expenditures by requiring that the expenses on ocean mail service can not exceed receipts, but as the business increases and the receipts increase this service may be extended and improved.

Mr. President, the bill simply amends the act of 1891 by authorizing and empowering the Postmaster-General to pay American steamships of the second class engaged in carrying our mail to South America, to the Philippines, to Japan, China, and Australia the same rate that that act allows to American vessels of the first class, and the only difference between vessels of the first and second class as defined in the act is the difference between 20 knots and 16 knots speed per hour and the difference between a tonnage capacity of 8,000 tons and 5,000 tons.

Would this amendment be to the interest of the postal service? Would it promote our foreign commerce and would it be a proper expenditure of the public money? I think, Mr. President, an analysis of the facts will show that the differentiation made by the act of 1891 between the compensation allowed steamers of first and second class is unwarranted and that in the conditions and requirements of our ocean transportation it is unjust and discriminatory against our oriental and South American postal service and trade.

There are to-day in the whole world, Mr. President—and this I regard as a very important fact in connection with the subject which I am discussing—there are to-day in the whole world but twenty-one steamships of the first class, as ships of this class are defined in the act of 1891, and every one of these steamships, except two owned by the Canadian Pacific Railroad and running between Canada and Europe, sail from New York to ports of northern Europe. Not one of them enters or clears any other port in this country except New York. The great volume of business and travel between New York and Europe, the character of that traffic, especially its high-class passenger and express business, has made these swift, luxuriously appointed steamships necessary in that trade, but they are not needed to meet the condition and requirements of trade anywhere else in the world.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SIMMONS. With pleasure.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President, under the act of 1891 the Postmaster-General is authorized to pay to ships sailing 20 knots an hour or more \$4 per statute mile for the outward trip. That law also requires that such ships shall be built under certain requirements of the Navy Department.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have stated that.

Mr. FOSTER. And that they must be manned by American seamen and must be available as cruisers in time of war.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. If this amendment prevails or this bill passes, giving to the 16-knot ships the same pay that the original law gave to the 20-knot ships, will it likewise require the ships to be built according to the regulations of the Navy Department, and will it likewise require them to be available for cruisers in time of war, and must they be manned by American seamen?

Mr. SIMMONS. Such ships will have to be built upon the same terms and conditions that the act of 1891 prescribes for the construction of ships of the first class to be employed in carrying the mails by the Government. This is a mere amendment of that act. The Senator was probably absent from the Chamber when I stated the general provisions of the act of 1891. I stated them to be substantially as he has stated them.

Mr. BACON. I understand the details which the Senator has recited apply to all the different classes.

Mr. SIMMONS. To all classes; yes, sir. The proposed amendment raises the compensation of steamers of the second to that fixed by the original act for steamers of the first class—that is the only change it makes as respects compensation.

The vessels of the first class, Mr. President—and it was the first class I was discussing—get \$4 per mile, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] has just stated, and every one of these twenty-one ships which flies the American flag is now under the employment of the Post-Office Department under the act of 1891.

The conditions of the deep-sea commerce of the Pacific are entirely different from those between New York and the ports of northern Europe. The volume and character of our trade in those waters does not justify the use of vessels of the first class. In that trade a vessel of this class could not live at all. Of the eleven great steamships, whether floating our flag or that of a foreign country, running between the Pacific ports of the

United States and oriental countries not one is of the first class, and only eight are of the second class, and it will probably be many years before that trade will justify the employment of ships of a higher class than those now in use.

The same is true with respect to our ocean commerce with South America. At present there is not a single ship either of the first or second class, and only three of the third class, employed in that trade. That trade does not require ships of the first class; it could not support them. Ships of 16 knots speed, with a tonnage capacity of 5,000 tons, are as fast and as large a class of boats as either our South American or Pacific business at present requires, and they are just as well adapted to that trade as ships of 20 knots speed and 8,000 tons burden are to the trade between New York and Europe. I submit, Mr. President, that under these circumstances there is no reason why steamers of the second class should not be paid as much for carrying the mails in these waters as the larger and faster steamers which sail from New York. Under the circumstances, to allow \$4 per mile for carrying the mail between New York and Europe and only \$2 per mile for carrying it to South America and the Orient is an injustice and a discrimination which, in the interest of the public and the business involved, ought to be removed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that, while the law of 1891 requires that second-class steamers shall not be less than 5,000 tons, two ships, I think, that were built last year for the West India trade, although second-class steamships, were of 6,000 tons, and it is exceedingly probable, indeed almost a certainty, that on the longer routes ships will be built of at least 8,000 tons, and yet they will be denominated "second-class ships."

Mr. SIMMONS. That is, they will have less than the maximum speed required for first-class ships. No doubt as the business increases ships of larger tonnage will be required, and the Senator is right in saying the capacity of these vessels will be increased, but it will be a long time before that trade will require ships of 20 knots—that is, of the first class.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; they are simply 16-knot ships, but they are larger ships than would be required under the law of 1891.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the argument I was presenting when interrupted by the Senator from New Hampshire receives additional force from the fact that a \$4 per mile rate is not necessary to get our mail carried in American bottoms between New York and Europe, while it is necessary to pay a larger compensation than \$2 per mile in order to get our mail carried in American bottoms to South America and to the Orient.

I do not make this statement upon my own authority, but upon the authority of statements coming from officials of the Department having control of these matters. The report of the Postmaster-General shows that on account of the immense volume of our postal business between New York and Europe the four American contract steamers sailing from New York would have received for the year 1906 \$140,000 more than they did receive in that year if they had been paid under the weight-rates basis of the act of 1872 instead of the mileage basis of the act of 1891.

Bearing upon this phase of the question I have a letter from Mr. E. T. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation, addressed to me and dated March 6, 1907, which contains some exceedingly interesting statements and exhibits. With the indulgence of the Senate I will read a part of this letter.

I omitted giving you yesterday the statement you asked for showing that at the \$4 rate under the ocean-mail contract law of 1891 the 20-knot American mail-line steamers have really received less than they would have received had they been paid under the act of 1872, sea and inland postage. The annexed table shows the details since 1900, taken from the reports of the superintendent of foreign mails. I have no reports earlier than that date. The report for 1907 was not printed, but the company was actually paid under the act of 1891 the sum of \$691,224, while on sea and inland postage on mails carried it would have received \$931,309.12, showing that it would have received \$140,085.12 more under the act of 1872 than it did get under the contract act of 1891. For eight years the showing is as follows:

Excess of receipts.

Excess (act 1872):	
1907	\$140,085.12
1906	147,904.08
1905	119,748.48
1904	61,565.28
1903	38,589.36
	\$507,892.32
Excess (act 1891):	
1902	26,523.36
1901	162,073.44
1900	258,325.92
	446,922.72
Balance	60,969.60

This table shows, Mr. President, that in the beginning of its contract with the Government the company operating this line of steamers would have received under the mileage basis of the act of 1891 something over \$258,000 more than under the weight-rate act of 1872, and that that condition continued for several years, but that in recent years, especially during the last three, on account of the immense volume of mail these steamers now carry, it would have received largely more under the weight-rate basis of the act of 1872 than under the mileage basis of the act of 1891. For these reasons, Mr. President, I say that the postal rate prescribed in this act is no longer necessary to secure our mails carried in American ships from New York to Europe.

Now, Mr. President, let us see what has been the result of the efforts of the owners of second-class American steamships to carry our foreign mail on the Pacific for \$2 per mile. There are only seven American steamships engaged in foreign trade on the Pacific which are eligible for contract under the act of 1891; of these seven steamships only three, the *Sonoma*, the *Ventura*, and the *Sierra*, have seen fit to enter into contract under that act with the Government, and all of these have recently canceled their contracts with the Government upon the ground that they were losing money, and have gone out of business.

In other words, the compensation of \$2 per mile is so unattractive and unprofitable that none of the seven American steamships plying the Pacific are willing to carry our mails at this price. The situation with respect to South America, with the exception of Venezuela, is even worse. For seventeen years the Postmaster-General has been ready and willing and anxious to employ American steamships to take our mails to and from South American countries, but no American shipowner has been found who is willing to perform that service for the compensation provided, with the result that to-day not a letter nor a postal card, nor a pound of mail of any kind is carried from any South Atlantic or Gulf port to any country in South America, except Venezuela, upon a steamship of any kind floating the American flag.

Moreover, not a single American steamer of any kind or class is to-day running between this country and Brazil, or any South American country, except Venezuela. If we are willing that our work should be done by Asiatics, we can get it done at Asiatic prices. If we want it done by Americans, we must pay American prices. It has been demonstrated that we can not get our mails carried to South America in American bottoms at the price fixed by the act of 1891.

Mr. President, the condition of our postal communication with South America is a disgrace to our Government and people. The only steamship communication, either commercial or postal, we have with this country, with the exception of Venezuela, is by foreign ships, not one of which is of the first or second class and most of which are below the third class, all running upon slow and irregular schedules, when, indeed, they attempt or pretend to operate under any schedule at all. They are practically freight steamers and where they have any passenger accommodations at all they are of the crudest and most primitive character. Under these conditions we must either send our mail to South America by these slow and irregular channels, or we must send it across the Atlantic to Europe and then across the Atlantic again to its destination. As a matter of fact, to secure greater dispatch, a large part, perhaps the major part, of our foreign mail to South America goes by way of Europe. In his report for 1907 the superintendent of the foreign mail service says that in the last year the bulk of our mail to South America was sent by way of Europe, because business men of this country engaged in business with South America found that was the most expeditious method of communication with their customers in that country.

I have a letter written to me by the Acting Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Hollyday, dated March 5, which shows, even more clearly than the statement of the superintendent of foreign mails, the wretched conditions of our postal communication with South America. It is short and I will read it, because it discloses a most amazing condition in our postal relations with this country. I do not just at the moment find the latter in the mass of papers before me. I am afraid I have misplaced it or failed to bring it with me. I regret that this is so, but I can state the substance of it. In substance he says that during the month of February just passed there was only one dispatch of mail from this country to Brazil and other South American ports, and he adds that the irregular sailings slated for the present month will enable the Department to avoid dispatches by way of Europe.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suppose the Senator means direct to South America?

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course. I understood the Acting Second Assistant Postmaster-General to mean that we had only one direct dispatch of mail to South America during February. I regret I can not find the letter among the mass of matter I have before me.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course.

Mr. FOSTER. While the author of the bill, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], is on his feet I should like to ask him a question for information only. Why is it that the provisions of this bill are limited to South America, the Philippines, Japan, China, and Australasia, and not to Central America? Why is Central America excluded from the provisions of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, those of us who looked into that matter were of the opinion that the urgent necessity was to get communication with Brazil and Argentina; that the 4,000-mile route would apply to those countries, as well as to the oriental countries, and that we should make provision for such service at the present time. More than that, our trade will largely be with South America, rather than with Central America, and it is much more important, I think, that we should develop that trade.

Mr. SIMMONS. Besides that, if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I think our trade with Central America and our communication is in much better condition than with South America.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is in better condition at the present time. Of course we have no communication with South America.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from North Carolina will permit me to make an inquiry in that connection of the Senator from New Hampshire, who is the author of the bill, while he is on his feet, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if the 4,000-mile limit would not exclude Venezuelan ports? Is not Venezuela nearer than 4,000 miles?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and we have the Red D Line to Venezuela at the present time, sailing from New York. They are third-class vessels, but we have communication with Venezuela.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I have stated several times that Venezuela was an exception to the conditions that I have been relating. We now have not adequate, but fairly good communication with Venezuela. There is a line of steamers running there—though they are small steamers.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have a little line running there and they get a subvention under the act of 1891.

Mr. BACON. I suppose of course the 4,000-mile limit was fixed advisedly, and therefore I should like to know from the Senator from New Hampshire what is the first South American port, taking the starting point, say, at the South Atlantic ports, that would be available under that 4,000-mile limit?

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course the ports that we are much more interested in than any others are Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Ayres.

Mr. BACON. Well, how far is it to those places? I presume the Senator has taken his distances from New York.

Mr. GALLINGER. From New York.

Mr. BACON. And it would be less from South Atlantic ports?

Mr. GALLINGER. It would be less from Southern ports, of course. The distances, I will say—

Mr. SIMMONS. To Australasia via Hawaii it would be 7,300 miles. That is the longest distance. The shortest distance to any foreign port included in the provision of the amendment is 5,000 miles.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from North Carolina will permit me a moment, there is not much difference between the Atlantic and Gulf ports in this respect. To Rio Janeiro is 5,000 nautical miles; to Buenos Ayres, 6,000; to Hawaii, Japan, China, and the Philippines, 6,000; to Hawaii, Japan, China, and the Philippines, 6,500, and via Hawaii to Australasia, 7,300 miles.

Mr. BACON. The only point I felt interested in was to know whether the 4,000-mile limit would make available any of the South Atlantic ports.

Mr. GALLINGER. Absolutely.

Mr. BACON. All of them?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and the Gulf ports.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have stated in general terms that the shortest route would be 5,000 miles.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have succeeded, now, in finding the letter from the Acting Second Assistant Postmaster-General, to which I referred a moment ago, and I will read it. It is dated March 6, 1908, and is as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, March 5, 1908.

DEAR SENATOR: Referring to your personal call at this office yesterday, I beg to advise you that during the month of February one dispatch of mail was made from this country for Brazilian and other South American ports, namely, on the 6th. During this month there will be irregular sailings which will enable us to avoid dispatches of mail via Europe.

Respectfully, yours,
JOHN W. HOLLYDAY,
Acting Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Hon. F. M. SIMMONS,
United States Senate.

Think of that, Mr. President—only one dispatch of mail from this country to Brazil and other South American ports during the month of February. South America is a great country, larger by far in area than our own, with a rich and productive soil, inhabited by an intelligent, energetic, and progressive people, whose foreign trade, already valuable, is rapidly expanding. It is not only a part of our own hemisphere and bound to us by strong political ties, but there are many reasons connected with its climate, with the habits and pursuits of its people, why it should be a great consumer of our products, especially of our manufactured products. To this great country, with which we are trying to strengthen our social, political, and business relations, we had during the month of February only one dispatch of mail.

When at the Post-Office Department a few days ago I inquired how they kept up with the irregular sailings referred to in the letter of the Acting Second Assistant Postmaster-General. In response to this inquiry I was advised that just before these sailings the company notifies the Post-Office Department of the day and hour of these sailings and the Department orders the mail sent forward.

I think in the face of these facts further comment upon this phase of the subject is unnecessary.

Mr. President, the proposition before us is not a proposition to repeal the act of 1891. That act is the law of the land and has been for the last seventeen years. Nobody has offered a bill to repeal it. The bill before us simply proposes to amend that act, without extending its principles, for the purpose of correcting certain demonstrated irregularities and making it workable in the dispatch of our mails to South America and the Orient as well as to Europe; to amend it so as to allow the Postmaster-General to pay to the highest class steamers which the exigencies of our commerce and postal communication with South America and the Orient require and justify the same compensation for carrying our mails to those countries as the original act allows him to pay to the luxuriously appointed and swifter steamers plying between New York and Europe for the same service; to amend it so that a ship speeding 20 miles an hour may not be paid twice as much for carrying our mails from New York to Europe as one steaming 16 miles an hour is paid for carrying it to China, Japan, Rio, and Buenos Ayres.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. SIMMONS. With pleasure.

Mr. FRYE. I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that the bill which became a law in 1891 when it passed the Senate contained the same provision that is now applied in this bill to 16-knot steamers.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. A consideration of the relation and requirements of our trade with South America and the Orient, as compared with that of North Atlantic ports with Europe, leads me to conclude that a mistake was made in striking it out.

Mr. President, I repeat, this is not a proposition to repeal the act of 1891; it is a mere proposition to amend it so that a 20-knot steamship like those of the Cunard Line and the White Star Line, fitted up to accommodate the taste and fancy of the rich and aristocratic travel between New York and London, or Paris, or Hamburg, shall not be paid twice as much for carrying the mails as is paid to the less pretentious, but to the business involved, equally satisfactory steamships running to Sydney, Hongkong, Rio, and Buenos Ayres.

Whatever may be said of the act of 1891, the proposed amendment to that act is not in any sense a subsidy. It simply puts our mail carriers upon the Pacific Ocean and upon South Atlantic waters upon an equal footing in the matter of compen-

sation with those upon the Northern Atlantic and allows the receipts from our ocean mail service to be used for its improvement and betterment.

I have no sympathy with bonuses and subsidies, but where a great public object is to be accomplished, where the benefits to accrue to the public is incalculable, I would not oppose legislation to secure these benefits because the individual agencies through which these results must be worked out derive some incidental benefit, trifling in amount compared with that derived by the public. That is not legislation for private profit, but for public benefit. I am opposed to a protective tariff. I am now and I always have been in favor of a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection. That was the platform upon which Democracy won its first great national victory after the war. That is the principle upon which every Democratic tariff bill promulgated since the war has been framed. In levying a tariff to raise revenue to support the Government I believe in placing a duty upon foreign products sold in this country in competition with like home products sufficient to equal the difference between the labor cost of that product here and abroad. The American laborer is entitled to this equalization, whether his competitor is a European or an Asiatic laborer, and the whole country participates in the prosperity which comes to him as a result. The object accomplished is a public object. To levy a higher duty for this purpose than is necessary to equalize these labor conditions would be a private bounty and wrong.

Mr. President, international as well as domestic trade depends upon transportation, not only of merchandise but of the mails, through which business engagements are induced, initiated, and consummated. Commercial and postal communication are in a sense interdependent—there will be little commerce without postal communication and little postal communication without commerce. If the commerce between foreign ports is large the amount of mail matter will be large. Where the business is large, as between New York and London and Hamburg, there is no trouble about getting ample and quick transportation for both merchandise and mail, but where it is small, as between this country and South America and the Orient, the situation is different. In such a case the question is, Will we leave these great independent interests to their own resources to find such transportation as they can and to develop under the slow and tedious process of inadequate facilities controlled by hostile and unfriendly interests, or will we stimulate and quicken their development by helping to secure quick and adequate facilities of transportation and communication?

That is our problem to-day with South America and, to a lesser degree, with the Orient. It is the same problem which confronted us fifty years ago in the development of our internal domestic commerce. We had a great country, stretching from ocean to ocean, covering over three and a half billion square miles, but it was poorly linked together; its widely separated parts needed to be brought into communication by rail and water. I need not stop here to recount in detail the many ways in which the Government, the States and their subdivisions, and the people lent their cooperation to encourage and aid in securing our present vast and comprehensive system of inland rail and water transportation and postal communication, nor what we are still doing in that direction.

During the past forty years the National Government has spent millions upon millions of dollars in the improvement of our rivers and harbors, and the Government, the States, the counties, and towns, by way of subscription and donation, have invested many more millions to aid private capital in the construction of railroads and to provide inland transportation to accommodate the needs of intercourse and postal communication and for marketing and distributing the products of our fields, forests, mines, and factories.

Wherever the pioneer has gone we have soon sent to him the railroad, with its postal and express facilities. If we could not send the railroad to him we have sent the mail carrier. Likewise with our rural population, without counting the cost—over the plains and across the mountains—wherever he has builded his habitation we have sent the mail carrier to take to him his letters and papers. First by the star route and stage-coach we dispatched once a week the mails to the rural post-offices along their lines, and on Saturday the farmer went for his letters and his weekly paper. It was an inexpensive service, but it was not what the public interest required; it was not what the farmer was entitled to receive at the hands of the Government. In response to this demand we decided to give the farmer a daily mail delivered at his gate, and to-day we are paying approximately 38,000 rural carriers a salary of \$75 per month to ride over 38,000 rural routes every day, without reference to the amount of mail matter each distributes

and without reference to whether the receipts of the route he serves are sufficient to pay his salary or only a small part of it.

Starting with a small beginning a little over fifty years ago we have in that short space of time built up the best and most comprehensive domestic system of rail transportation and postal communication in the world. With these unrivaled facilities of transportation and communication as a chief factor in our development, we have in an incredibly short time become the greatest producing nation, with the greatest domestic market, in the world. We are not only producing nearly everything we consume, but much more of many things than we can consume. The question with the American manufacturer is no longer one of supplying home consumption, but to find other markets for what we can not consume, and the problem which confronts him is no longer one of inland, but one of ocean transportation. Pressed to find a market for their products to relieve the congestion at home and to make possible further industrial expansion, they are anxiously looking abroad, and everywhere we are beginning to hear the cry, "To the sea; to the sea!" It comes to us from the factory, the mine, the forest, and the field.

We have not by any means reached the limit of our industrial growth. We have only fairly begun. With equal and adequate sea transportation, we may hopefully look for our growth in world trade during the next quarter of a century to become as striking as has been the growth of our home trade during the last quarter.

In the industrial and commercial condition which confronts us to-day equal and adequate deep-water transportation and communication to and with the countries upon whom we must rely for the sale of the surplus products of our mines, mills, and factories has become, or soon will become, almost as pressing a question as that of domestic transportation in the last three or four decades. Unfortunately, upon the deep seas we have at present practically no transportation except such as our competitors in trade have graciously furnished us. Because it is to their interest to do it, the great commercial nations of Europe now furnish us ample transportation for our trade with them.

Great Britain, Germany, and France need our foodstuffs to feed their millions of operatives and they need our raw cotton to operate their mills and spindles to make the fabrics with which they clothe the world. They stand ready at all times to furnish us ships not only to transport these products to their own ports, but to furnish us with such of their own products as we may stand in need of. Europe already takes all of our surplus in agricultural products—our manufactured products they do not to any considerable extent need. But we can not rely upon the maritime nations of Europe to furnish us equal and adequate transportation to Africa, to Australia, to Asia, and South America, upon whom we must chiefly rely as purchasers of our manufactures. Neither of these countries are maritime nations; like ourselves, they have no deep-sea merchant marine, and in present conditions we are not able to help them and they are not able to help us in the matter of transportation. If we want to get our reasonable share of the trade of these countries we must have transportation and postal facilities with them equal to those of our competitors in that trade. This our European competitors will certainly not furnish to us, and if we get it we will have to supply it ourselves.

I recognize the difficulties in the way of building up our deep-sea merchant marine in the face of present conditions. I know that men do not invest their money in enterprises from motives of patriotism; they must see a reasonable prospect of profit. Upon the ocean competition is free—our tariff laws and our exclusion laws do not protect there.

In several respects our competitors on the sea have us at a disadvantage. First, the greater cost of building a ship in America; second, the greater cost of operating a ship manned by American seamen; third, the fact that our competitors upon the ocean are paid more for carrying the ocean mail of their own country than we pay. The difference in the cost of ships has been in part overcome by removing the Dingley tariff duties on materials entering into the construction of American-built ships. It may be altogether overcome by admitting to American registry ships built abroad and owned by American citizens. This can be done without serious injury to anyone, because but few ships in our foreign trade are now built in our own shipyards. Of course the higher rate of pay for carrying the mails is a difference which can only be met by our paying a higher rate. If other things were made equal, I think our postal rate will not be so far below that of other nations that our shipowners could not overcome this difference and maintain themselves in competition with them.

The most serious difficulty is the greater cost of operating our ships on account of the higher wages paid American seamen and sailors. If it were competition between white labor, the problem would not be so difficult. The greater efficiency of the American sailor, like that of the operative in our cotton factories and our factories for making machinery and agricultural implements, would in a measure compensate for the higher wages received and enable the shipowner, as the cotton manufacturer and the maker of machinery and agricultural implements, to meet European competition. But it is not Caucasian competition, it is Asiatic competition, especially on the Pacific and largely in our South American trade, because, whether the ship in those waters is a Japanese, English, or German ship, as a rule it is largely manned by Chinese or Japanese sailors, willing to work for a price at which a white man would starve. By our immigration laws we have protected American labor on the mainland against Asiatic competition, but these beneficent laws do not extend to the high seas. The ocean is free, and upon it everybody is equal.

It is a great and difficult problem, which will grow more pressing as the years go by. It can not be ignored or pushed aside; it must be met and solved. For myself, I have an abiding confidence that the wisdom of American statesmanship and the pluck, energy, and enterprise of our people will, in the end, solve it wisely and justly, and that our flag will regain its prestige upon the seas.

Undoubtedly both Germany and England will gladly continue to furnish us transportation for any business we may have with these countries; but in the future, as in the past, they will furnish such transportation for this purpose as will make our competition with them for the trade of these countries hopeless.

No better evidence of this statement, Mr. President, is needed than a comparison between the small lines of slow-going, poorly equipped steamers which the English and Germans are to-day running between this country and the important countries of South America and the five first-class mail and passenger lines of swift and commodious steamers which they and our other European competitors are now operating on regular schedules from their own countries to Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Ayres, and other important South American points.

Having surrendered to our European competitors the control of our means of transportation and communication with South America, they have arranged it most admirably to promote their own advantage—they carry our mails for us, but they take twice as long as they do to carry their own; they carry our commercial products, but they charge a higher price than they charge for carrying their own. Sometimes they provide passenger accommodations, but they are so poor and the journey so tedious and slow the American business man whose business takes him to this country generally finds it preferable to go first to Europe and then by one of the swift and luxurious steamers that they have provided for the accommodation and dispatch of their own business with these countries.

Mr. President, no country outside of Europe would seem to offer better opportunity for the sale of our manufactures than China and South America. They are an agricultural people and buy in considerable quantities lines of manufactures that we produce in excess of home consumption and that we have demonstrated our ability to make and sell at a satisfactory profit in these markets in competition with our European competitors.

Our manufacturers recognize these facts, and in recent years they have been making special effort to get a foothold in these markets for their products. This is especially true of our manufacturers of machinery and agricultural implements and cotton goods, who have in recent years shown their ability to meet the prices of their English and German competitors in these markets. Mr. President, not only South America, but most of the countries of the Orient, by reason of the character of their pursuits, the habits of their people, and on account of their climate, have great need for cotton goods and for machinery and agricultural implements. If I had time I would like to discuss more fully the possibilities of enlarging our trade with these countries in the sale of machinery and agricultural implements. It is a very interesting subject, but I have not the time, without trespassing too greatly upon the time of the Senate, but I do wish to briefly call attention to the present condition, with respect to markets for their surplus, of our cotton mills in the South and to the efforts our cotton manufacturers have made in recent years to secure a part of this trade and what has been the result.

Our cotton mills are making, as everybody knows, more cloths than we need at home. Our domestic demand, great as it is, is no longer sufficient to consume their present output. We have got to find a market for this surplus, or this great industry of

the South and New England has reached the limit of its expansion, and we have got to stop, for a while at least, building new mills and enlarging old ones, although we do not now manufacture over one-third of the raw cotton we produce. Our European competitors manufacture the other two-thirds, and with their ships sailing every sea and going to every quarter of the globe they find a market for all they make. We have the raw cotton and we have the factories, or we have the money with which to build the factories. We can convert this cotton into cloths and sell it in the competitive markets of the world as cheaply as our competitors, but we have not the ships to carry them to these foreign customers, and as a result of all our efforts to find a market for this surplus the maximum of our exports of cotton goods for any one year has never reached as much as \$50,000,000, and that has fallen off materially in the last two years. Last year our exports of cotton goods did not reach half that amount.

Mr. President, if we had the same transportation and postal facilities which our competitors have for reaching the markets of the world, we could, and in the next ten or fifteen years we would, manufacture half of our raw cotton instead of one-third, and find a market for the converted product. That would mean not only employment to many thousand more operatives, but it would mean the greatest development in the cotton-growing and cotton-manufacturing States in the next two decades which has ever taken place in the same length of time in any other country in the world.

I have in my hand a book—I call it a book because it is in the form of a book, though it is not in a literal sense such—published by a distinguished citizen of North Carolina in 1900, for the purpose of showing the difference between the value of the raw cotton grown in North Carolina and what would be its value converted into cotton fabrics. It is a very interesting book. One one side of each page is a sample of a cotton fabric manufactured in North Carolina, and on the other is a comparison between the value of the cotton crop of that State, estimated in the year in which this book was published at 500,000 bales, and what would be the value of that amount of cotton converted into that particular fabric.

On the first page is a sample of what is known as "3-yard drill." It is, I believe, the cheapest goods made by our North Carolina mills. At the time this book was printed cotton was selling at 6 cents per pound and the estimated value of the crop for that year is \$15,000,000, and in that year 3-yard drill, like the sample, sold for 16 cents per pound, and the estimated value of the North Carolina cotton crop converted into these drills is \$40,000,000. On the next page is a sample of North Carolina "sheeting," and the difference between the North Carolina cotton crop in the raw state and manufactured into this product is estimated at \$30,000,000. On the next is bleaching. The difference between the North Carolina cotton crop in its raw state and its value converted into this cloth in that year is estimated at \$35,000,000. Then we have "cheviot," with a difference of \$50,000,000 between the raw cotton and the finished product. The next is "6-ounce denim," with a difference in value between raw cotton and the manufactured product of \$60,000,000, and then gingham, with a difference in value of \$75,000,000, and so on until we reach the highest grade of cotton goods then made in North Carolina, known as "fancy gingham," and here the difference in value is estimated at \$535,000,000.

Mr. President, North Carolina—and I say it with pardonable pride—is the only cotton-producing State in the Union which manufactures as much cotton as it produces. The story of that State's exceptional material development in the two decades through which we have just passed; of how, starting almost at the foot, it has within that short space of time advanced to the front of the column in the march of industrial progress; of how in the last decade it has surpassed all of its sister States in the average percentage of material development has become a familiar story and one which has excited universal astonishment as well as admiration. If we should look for the causes of this wonderful growth and development we would find many, but next to the energy and intelligence of its people we would find the chiefest of all of them in the fact that we are manufacturing all the cotton we make, or rather as much cotton as we make, and that instead of realizing from fifteen to twenty-five million dollars from our annual crop we are realizing from two to three hundred millions for the fabric which we weave out of it. If every cotton State of the South would do what North Carolina is to-day doing and could enter the markets of the world and find purchasers for their products, in twenty-five years, yea, in less time, the South would be the most marvelously rich country upon which God's sun has ever rose and set.

I know of no reason why we can not manufacture the most of this cotton and find markets for it, as our European competitors now manufacture two-thirds of it and find markets for it, except that we have practically no transportation beyond the water's edge save such as is furnished to us by countries which have an interest in keeping us out of markets which are now almost entirely supplied from their own factories.

Mr. President, some of our Southern cotton mills are largely dependent on foreign markets for the sale of their products. In recent years they have been making strenuous efforts to sell their surplus products both in China and South America. With the aid of our consuls in those countries and that of the special investigators sent out by the Government they have learned what kind of goods those markets require, and they have been making their goods in accordance with those requirements. What, Mr. President, has been the result of these efforts? With China we started off well. In 1903 we sold her cotton goods to the value of about \$10,000,000; in 1904, about \$9,000,000; in 1905, \$30,000,000; but as soon as we began to be troublesome to our competitors in this market, through their control of our means of transportation they put the screws upon us, and our trade with China began to fall off. In 1906 it fell to \$20,000,000, while in 1907 it fell to less than \$3,000,000, while in the latter year Great Britain's sales to her advanced to about \$43,000,000, and Japan's, which in 1905 was only about one-sixteenth as great as ours, advanced to nearly the same figures as ours. In South America they have not let us get much of a foothold at any time. In 1906 Argentina bought about \$29,000,000 worth of cotton goods. We sold her in that year only \$271,500 worth. In that year Brazil bought about \$15,000,000 worth of cotton goods, of which we sold her only \$479,300. In that year the countries of South America bought \$74,712,400 worth of cotton goods. Of this amount Great Britain sold in round numbers \$47,000,000; Germany, \$11,000,000; France, \$5,400,000; Italy, over \$7,000,000, and the United States only \$3,630,100.

There may be, as has been frequently suggested, several minor obstacles such as establishing agencies upon the ground, lack of adequate exchange facilities, etc., in the way of our getting our reasonable share of the trade of these countries, but the real reason is our slow, inefficient, inadequate, and expensive means of transportation and postal communication as compared with the cheaper and up-to-date service in these regards of our competitors. And that condition will not change for the better just so long as we allow, as we do now, our competitors for this trade to own, regulate, and control the instrumentalities of our commercial and postal communications with these countries.

Mr. President, we are told on the one hand that we can secure reasonably adequate transportation in our own ships to accommodate our trade, present and prospective, with the countries upon whom we must rely to sell the finished products of our cotton mills by paying out of the profits we now realize from our foreign mail service to the slightly slower ships required to accommodate this trade the same price for carrying the mail that we are now paying to the faster ships that have been constructed to accommodate the rich and aristocratic travel between this country and Europe. On the other hand, we are told we must not do this, we must suffer conditions to remain as they are, that our competitors must not be disturbed in their possession of these rich markets, that their doors must remain closed to the products of American labor and capital, because, forsooth, it is claimed that in providing this transportation under the ægis of the American flag we will have to pay the American shipowner for carrying the mail on quick and regular schedules something more than we are now paying to the foreign shipowner to carry it on slow and irregular schedules; because some private interest may be incidentally advanced and promoted; because the American shipowner may receive a trifle more than they think is fair and just for the service performed, although after seventeen years it has been shown he can not perform it for less, we should forego these vast public benefits, continue the embargo upon our trade with these countries and place a disheartening limitation upon the expansion of the greatest industry, not only in my own State, but in the South and in New England.

Calmly, dispassionately, and laboriously, with no thought except to discharge my duty to the public and to the country, I have studied and investigated and probed, that I might find out and understand all the facts, and in the light of these facts discharge the duty which my commission as a member of this body imposes upon me. Mr. President, I am not infallible—no man is; I can not see—no man can see—farther than the light which has been given me will let me see. I may err in my position in this matter as I have erred in many things before; but employing such powers of mind and heart as have been given

me, my duty in this matter seems as clear to me as the sun on a cloudless day. If I should fail to discharge this duty as my mind and conscience have shown it to me because of a fear that some, through a misunderstanding of the facts, and others through prejudice based on a misunderstanding of the facts or otherwise, may disapprove and censure, I should be unworthy of the seat I now occupy in this Chamber and of the great and enlightened people whom I, in part, have the honor to represent on this floor. During all my public life I have taken counsel from that "still, small voice" which never fails to speak its counsel to the willing mind and heart, and I will not now turn a deaf ear to its whisperings.

Mr. President, there are other phases of this question of large and far-reaching importance which I would like to discuss, but they have been discussed by others, and I will not detain the Senate to give expression to my views with regard to them, because I feel that I have already trespassed too long upon its time, and because I know Senators are anxious to take up the regular business assigned to consideration after the expiration of the morning business.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire, before the matter passes from consideration of the Senate, a question in regard to it. We know the fact that the present law has failed to induce the organization of steamship lines which will give us direct trade communication with South American ports, I will say, without going into the question of oriental ports.

I desire to know from the Senator whether investigation has been made to such an extent as to give assurance that upon the passage of this bill the conditions will be different, and that there will be steamship lines organized, and to what extent they may be anticipated.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that careful inquiry has been made and assurances have been given that if the amount of compensation given to first-class steamships shall be given to second-class steamships, lines will undoubtedly be established to Brazil and Argentina and at least two lines across the Pacific.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator understand that the lines to Argentina and Brazil will be separate lines, or that the same lines will carry to the ports of both countries?

Mr. GALLINGER. The expectation is that if there is more than one line—and there may be three—they will not all go from the same port. The Postmaster-General has that in his discretion, and I have no idea that he would permit more than one line to be established at any given port. It would not be good business policy for him to do it.

Mr. BACON. It is certainly not desirable that there should be, because we all know, of course, if there is more than one from one port what that port will be; and it is very desirable, if this policy should be inaugurated, that there should be a general enjoyment of the benefits of it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Hampshire neglected to state that the bill would probably inaugurate a line from the Pacific coast to Australasia.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, certainly, that is in contemplation.

CERTAIN LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. FRYE. I call up Senate joint resolution No. 40.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 40) to provide for the transportation by sea of material and equipment for use in the construction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, having a subject somewhat germane to the canal question, I will briefly occupy the time of the Senate.

On the 3d of February a bill was introduced in this body by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, providing for a continuance for a period of two years of certain surface tracks on streets leading to the navy-yard. It appeared that by existing law the railroad company was required to remove the tracks in question on the 28th day of February. The Committee on the District of Columbia could not perceive any special advantage in extending the time for the removal of the tracks for two years without making some provision for another connection in the meantime to the navy-yard, because it was apparent that after the lapse of two years we would be compelled, in the absence of any other connection, to extend the time again.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the subject upon which the Senator from Montana is addressing the Senate is an important one and relates to a matter Senators ought to be advised about. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ankeny	Dick	Hale	Paynter
Bacon	Dillingham	Heyburn	Perkins
Bankhead	Dixon	Hopkins	Piles
Borah	Dolliver	Johnston	Rayner
Bourne	du Pont	Kean	Scott
Brown	Elkins	Knox	Simmons
Burkett	Flint	Lodge	Stephenson
Burrows	Foraker	Long	Taylor
Carter	Foster	McCreary	Teller
Clay	Frazier	McLaurin	Warren
Crane	Frye	Martin	Wetmore
Culberson	Fulton	Nelson	Whyte
Cullom	Gallinger	Newlands	
Curtis	Gamble	Nixon	
Depew	Guggenheim	Overman	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator from Montana allow me one word?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. I am hoping to get a vote on the joint resolution within an hour, and I trust that Senators will remain at least that length of time, in order that the lack of a quorum may not be developed when the joint resolution is on its final passage.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I think it is but just to say that it was not upon my insistence that Senators were called from their several tasks in their committee rooms, nor did the Senator from Maine prefer his request on my motion so as to keep an audience here during the few remarks I am about to make.

I was proceeding, Mr. President, to call attention to a subject which has challenged the notice of the Senate and has attracted attention elsewhere, and to the end that Senators who were not present in the Chamber at the moment may be advised, I will recapitulate briefly the few observations I made prior to the order of the roll call.

On the 3d of February the Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, presented, at the request of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, a bill extending for the period of two years the right of a railroad company to maintain tracks on certain streets leading to the navy-yard. It was urged that these tracks, in the absence of this legislation, must be taken up on the 28th of February, to the very great inconvenience of the navy-yard and its source of supplies.

The Committee on the District of Columbia referred that bill to a subcommittee, of which I was made chairman. The subcommittee concluded that the extension of time, without providing in the interval for the construction of some other rail connection with the navy-yard, would leave the Government after the lapse of two years in precisely the same predicament of to-day. So the bill was amended, and the amendment was subsequently adopted by the committee. The amendment required that the railroad company should proceed within the period of six months to construct a rail connection with the navy-yard along the banks of the Anacostia River.

To that amendment the railroad company took serious exceptions. The bill was passed by the Senate once, and on demand for a hearing the vote by which it was passed was reconsidered to the end that objections might be heard. That was a proper proceeding.

Upon hearing it was alleged by the railroad company that about 3,000 feet of track which we ordered constructed by the bill would cost about \$300,000, including the right of way, and it was insisted that the demand was unreasonable and unjust.

The bill was finally passed as amended, with a very slight concession upon the part of the Government, whereby we granted the right of way over public land and agreed to a contribution of \$25,000 for the purchase of a right of way over private holdings. It was insisted that this contribution was inadequate, but nevertheless it is the belief of all that the road will finally be constructed.

Then attached to the bill was a proviso that pending this new construction the present tracks might remain where they are, but not to exceed two years. In the course of the consideration of the proposed amendment attorneys of the railway company called attention to their desire for an amendment which would confirm their right of way, occupied since some time in the early seventies across the Anacostia flats. The committee declined to entertain such an amendment to the bill. But the reason urged for the amendment led to an inquiry into certain legislation that had theretofore passed through Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Montana kindly suspend while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the Secretary?

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3023) to amend the national banking laws.

Mr. HALE. Let the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Without objection it is so ordered. The Senator from Montana will proceed.

Mr. CARTER. There was presented to the subcommittee as explanatory matter a brief of the facts signed by the Hon. Wayne MacVeagh. That name attached to the brief carried to my mind a certain degree of assurance that the facts therein stated were correctly stated. Mr. MacVeagh, as is known throughout the country, is a lawyer of recognized ability, formerly Attorney-General of the United States, and a man of high probity of character.

It appeared from this statement that in 1904 a bill had passed Congress directing the Secretary of War to deed block 1131 in the District of Columbia to a Mr. Sidney Bieber. That bill, as set forth in this statement of facts, had been regularly introduced, regularly referred to the War Department, commented upon by the officers of the District of Columbia, finally reported from the committee, and passed. It passed both Houses of Congress.

It is noteworthy that in the comments of the chairman of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia the statement is made that "the District has nothing to do with the matter; it is recommended that the bill be referred to the Secretary of the Interior or the Attorney-General." That disposes of the action of the District Commissioners.

The bill was referred to the War Department. The War Department reported that there was no such block of ground in existence as the particular block to which the bill referred, and one indorsement—the final one, I think—is that no objection can be seen to the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am afraid I do not understand the Senator, and I therefore interrupt him to ask him a question.

Did I hear him say that the War Department reported that there was no such block in Washington, and then indorsed the idea of granting the permission, or recommending Congress to grant the permission, to deed something that did not exist.

Mr. CARTER. I do not wish to have it understood that the language of the War Department was other than what I stated, that the Department could see no objection to its passage.

Mr. TILLMAN. In other words, they could see no objection to passing a bill to deed a piece of property that did not exist?

Mr. CARTER. That appears to have been the indorsement.

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to get at the fact to see how the War Department does business, or how it did business then.

Mr. CARTER. The War Department in that behalf was probably following routine procedure. Congress has supreme authority over the public domain and the public property of the United States; and the War Department, in response to an inquiry from Congress relative to the propriety of passing a certain bill, responded that the Department did not know of any objection to its passage and had no knowledge of the existence of the block. That is the sum and substance of the combined recommendations and observations of the Department on the subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. But subsequently the War Department conveyed that lot and took \$1,000 as compensation for it.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Now, Mr. President, this block was subsequently conveyed by the War Department, having been surveyed as required by the bill, and the conveyance was made by the Department for the sum of \$1,000. The block is 285 feet by 206 feet. The bill was passed to remove what was denominated a "cloud on the title" of the block, the title being claimed by Mr. Bieber. The cloud on the title was created by the deeding of the block before it was surveyed, by a man who had no more claim to it than the man in the moon, to a woman whose name appears on the District records as the grantee. This woman listed the lot for taxes. It was sold for taxes by the District Commissioners, and repeated sales occurred until finally the various tax titles became merged in the grantee from the Government, under the act of Congress, Mr. Bieber.

There is some semblance of shadow or claim of righteousness to that legislation, notwithstanding it may be justly alleged that the tax title had its inception in fraud, and that the fraud was consummated when the transaction was accomplished by alienating the title of the United States to perfect the mere shadow which Mr. Bieber's title constituted.

As to that there can be no complaint, however, because, as alleged, there was a certain openness about it all. Congress was not generally advised of the provisions of the bill. No one in this Chamber, I assume, knew when that bill passed that Congress was deeding or authorizing the conveyance of a tract of land 285 feet by 206 feet in this District to a person who held a mere shadow of claim based upon a tax title that had no virtue whatever. If the transaction had stopped at that point it would have been bad enough, but still not as bad as now.

The Senate at later dates had presented to it two other bills in furtherance of the same scheme. The public-building bill of 1906 embraced a section known as section 21, which authorized and directed the Secretary of War to convey three other blocks to Mr. Sidney Bieber in the same locality.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume I am right in saying that the bill came from another body containing that provision.

Mr. CARTER. I will touch that. Section 21 of the bill was framed in committee manifestly because it nowhere appears in the Record that it was offered as an amendment. This section 21 directed the surveyor of the District of Columbia to survey these three additional blocks. It directed the Secretary of War to convey to Sidney Bieber title to the three blocks—that is, all of the claim of the United States, which was the paramount and only outstanding title for such consideration as considering all the circumstances might seem just.

Within a short time after the approval of this act—it was approved June 30—some time in September, the Acting Secretary of War conveyed the three blocks to Mr. Bieber for \$3,000, or thereabouts. Thus this gentleman became possessed of blocks of ground extending over a stretch of 1,600 feet by 285 feet in the District of Columbia for the sum of \$3,000, or a small fraction above \$3,000, plus \$1,000 paid for the first block.

As to the bill of 1906, there is no pretense that any consideration was given to the subject anywhere. I find in the report which I have just received from the document room, dated June 25, 1906, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, Report No. 5011, a description of the purpose of each section of this bill of 1906—that is, the bill which contains section 21, and this is the reference made in the report to this particular section:

Section 21 authorizes the acquisition of certain triangles in the city of Washington.

Acquisition by whom? The only reasonable inference is an acquisition by the Government of the United States, because the bill was passed for the purpose of enabling the Government to purchase building sites. It carried about \$26,000,000 for that purpose and the construction of buildings, and this, in so far as the records that I have been able to trace show, is the only statement of record in Congress concerning the purpose of section 21, which authorized and directed the Secretary of War to convey this body of property to a stranger who had neither claim nor shadow of claim to any part or portion of it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Do I understand the Senator to state that section 21 had been put in the bill in conference?

Mr. CARTER. I did not so state. I will say to the Senator it was manifestly in the bill when reported from the committee. It was in the bill when it came to this body.

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to know on that particular point, because I have known things slipping in in conference or put there by the conferees that were very fishy.

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. President, there was, I believe, about thirty-six hours of time for the consideration of that bill when it came to the Senate. On that point the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is fairly well advised, and I should be glad to have him state, if he cares to do so, what the course of the bill was in this body.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] correctly states, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate had that bill for possibly thirty-six or forty hours. It was a bill carrying an appropriation of \$26,000,000. Inquiry was made of the chairman of the committee of the House in regard to the provisions of the bill, we stating that we did not have time to take up the bill and consider it minutely, it being desired to report it back to the

Senate so as to enable Congress to adjourn at the time that had been agreed upon between the two Houses. We were assured that the bill as it came from the other House had been carefully considered and scrutinized. Consequently the committee on this side only went over the matters which we had added to the bill after it came here, and the section which has been referred to was in the bill when it came to us.

Mr. CARTER. I endeavored to so state.

Mr. President, in due course of time the conveyance was made, as I have heretofore suggested, to this gentleman for these three blocks of land in addition to the first block.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Senator to again read that section, as importance has been given to it since he first read it.

Mr. CARTER. I will send it to the Secretary's desk and ask that it be read. It is section 21.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if he is shortly coming to a consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 40?

Mr. CARTER. I shall reach the canal portion of this subject very quickly. I will say to the Senator from Maine that I do not desire to consume time which I am aware he desires to have devoted to the consideration of his joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Sec. 21. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant and convey unto Sidney Bieber and his heirs and assigns all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all of certain land in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, lying south of square 1123, 1148, and 1149, conforming with the metes and bounds of square 1131, and that part of square 1117 situated between the north lines of Water and I streets, the east line of Eighteenth street, and the west line of Nineteenth street, when said streets are extended, upon the payment by the said Sidney Bieber into the Treasury of the United States of such sum of money as the said Secretary of War, upon consideration of all the circumstances, shall determine proper to be paid for the said squares; and the surveyor of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized and directed to mark out such areas, to record plats, and to designate the proper square numbers.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. The section which has just been read was in the bill when it came to the Senate. I wish to say, in order to put the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in a proper light before this body, that the report which the Senator from Montana has been reading is the report of the House committee and not of the Senate committee.

Mr. CARTER. It is a report on this section 21. That conveyance was made, as I suggested, Mr. President, for the sum of substantially \$3,000.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to have it made very clear from which body it was reported that section 21 referred merely to the conveyance of triangles.

Mr. CARTER. To the acquisition of titles to triangles.

Mr. KNOX. To the acquisition of triangles. Was that from the House or from the Senate committee?

Mr. CARTER. That was a House report. The report concerning the acquisition of the triangles described in section 21 was made to the House of Representatives.

The transaction, however, does not close at this point. Emboldened somewhat by unbroken success, this individual returns again in 1907, manifestly determined to pursue the lines of little resistance [laughter]; and we find in the public-buildings bill of 1907, as reported from the committee of the House of Representatives to that body, section 13, which directs the Secretary of War to convey an indefinite quantity of land to the purchaser from the United States of these several blocks previously acquired by Mr. Bieber. The bill does not name the grantee this time. Apprehensive that his name might become a danger sign and attract somebody's attention he preferred to pass under a general description which could be specifically applied only to one person—and that person himself. So the act of 1907 directed the Secretary of War to convey to this man all of the lands south of these blocks and between them and the channel of the Anacostia River.

In connection with that bill, I think it but fair to say that the report of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reads as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds unanimously recommends the passage of this bill without amendment.

This bill is in the nature of an "omnibus correction bill" and merely corrects a number of errors which occurred in the public-building act of the first session of the present Congress.

This bill carries no authorization for the expenditure of any additional money.

Section 13 of the bill, to which that report refers, reads as follows:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey to the purchaser from the United States of square No. 1131, and the south part of square No. 1117, and the squares south of squares Nos. 1123, 1148, and 1149, in the city of Washington, all the interest of the United States in the land lying south of the squares so purchased and between them and the channel of the Anacostia River, upon the payment by such purchaser into the Treasury of the United States of such sum of money as the said Secretary of War, upon consideration of all the circumstances, shall determine proper to be paid for the said land; and the surveyor of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized and directed to mark out such land and determine the areas, and to record a plat thereof.

Mr. TILLMAN. Who signed that report?

Mr. CARTER. That report was made by Mr. BARTHOLOTT, of Missouri. In the consideration of the matter I find, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1907, this line of observations recorded:

A motion was made in the House of Representatives to take up the bill. The bill was read. Then follows:

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second and ask that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to have an explanation of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands a second and asks unanimous consent that the second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to twenty minutes and the gentleman from New York to twenty minutes.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely corrects a number of errors which occurred in the legislation had at the last session. It makes no appropriation, and all the changes provided for in this bill are to be made within the limits of cost heretofore fixed.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the object of the bill?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. I will explain it to the gentleman.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to ask the gentleman if there are any new constructions authorized in this bill?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. There is not one dollar's worth of new construction, nor is there a foot of ground authorized, but in some cases it was necessary to transfer from the appropriation made for the building to the appropriation made for the site because an additional small amount was necessary to procure the site which the people wanted.

Mr. MANN. Is the total cost of building and site in any case increased?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Not in one single instance.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to ask the gentleman another question. The first section of the bill is entirely new legislation. Now, do you apply it—I did not catch it as it was read—to the act passed June 20, 1906? It does not extend the authority of the Secretary over buildings hereafter to be constructed?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. No, sir; it applies merely to the legislation of last session.

Mr. TAWNEY. What changes this bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make in buildings now authorized must be made within the limits of cost fixed by the act of June 30, 1906.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Exactly; the gentleman states it correctly.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman specifically mention the buildings which this affects?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. It will take about twenty minutes to read all the changes.

Mr. CANDLER. I think it is necessary.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. In further explanation, I want to say that the Attorney-General has recently rendered an opinion that where the Congress has appropriated for a specific building and it should become necessary to locate in that building a room, for instance, for the customs service or internal-revenue service or Weather Bureau, or whatever the service may be, such a change can not be made unless we pass this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, if the gentleman from Missouri will pardon me, I understand that as the law now is, if a certain amount of money is appropriated for a site, and a certain amount for building, and the site can be gotten cheaper or the site will cost more, thereby necessitating a difference in the proportion of the expenditure for the two things, that difference can not be met, and this bill will enable it to be met?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. That is it; exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand, furthermore, if the building is for a post-office, for example, and it is desired to hold court in the building, without some such legislation as this that could not be done?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. It does not apply to courts. If Congress should authorize the holding of a court in a certain place where it had not been heretofore authorized, the amount heretofore fixed would not be sufficient to enable the Treasury Department to make a court-house out of it. So it does not apply to those cases.

Mr. CANDLER. Does it apply to the general appropriations—for the post-office buildings throughout the country?

Mr. TAWNEY. Only those authorized by the act of June 30, 1906.

Mr. CANDLER. Is there anything in it with reference to Columbus, Miss.?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. No, sir. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill as amended.

The question was taken; and in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

That is the whole record with reference to this bill for 1907, and so far as I know there is no other record with reference to the bill for 1906. I have not been able to prosecute a thorough search in that behalf, but I have no knowledge whatever of anything else having been said about either bill, in so far as sections 21 and 13 are concerned.

Mr. President, after the Senate had passed a bill repealing this section of 1907 the gentleman who was the beneficiary of these various acts—a nimble citizen, who was to me unknown at the time the report was made and is to me unknown to-day—comes forward and admits his existence and likewise admits the fact that he has the plunder in his possession to the extent given him by the two bills passed—those of 1904 and 1905—but avers that the whole transaction was known to everybody; that there was no concealment about it, and, further still, that the grants do not include a part of the grounds of the Hospital for the Insane and that it can not take in any part of the navy-yard; third, that this whole business ought to be condoned and that no accountability to the Government or to anyone else should obtain, because, foresooth, the information leading to the detection of this scheme was given by Mr. Wayne MacVeagh, an attorney for a railroad company.

Mr. MacVeagh was protecting his company's property, and the individual who seeks to avoid responsibility in the fashion Bieber adopts is on exactly the same plane as the crook with the stolen property on his body pointed out in the crowd and arrested, claiming that he had not stolen as much property as he was charged with stealing, and, moreover, that the man who had pointed him out was an unpopular citizen. [Laughter.] That is the whole story without any sort of exaggeration.

I do not make these observations for the purpose of casting any reflection on any Member of Congress. I do not believe that any intentional wrong was done by any Member of Congress; but I do know this, that the people of many of the States have thought proper to incorporate in their constitutions clauses prohibiting this kind of legislation. I do not know of a State which would authorize a grant of this sort to an individual or which could do so under its constitution. We have not in the Federal Constitution any such prohibition.

These corridors have been—probably more in days gone by than now—infested with a lot of slick and slimy self-seeking individuals seeking to profit by the confidence that men here assembled exhibit in their constituents and in those who petition here in good faith for relief. A character such as this Bieber, who comes forward again and again behind committee doors, insidiously and continuously pressing his claim, not in any public interest, but for private gain, is just about as dangerous in the presence or seen in the company of a public man as an ordinary Montana rattlesnake near your cot at night. This is the class of people who make it a business to trade on their supposed acquaintance with public men. One of them will approach you in the street, manage to walk with you a block, and then go out and point to the fact that he is on chummy terms with you; and so pointing out, will seek to profit, when your acquaintance with him is limited and your confidence does not exist at all. This sort of creature when foiled in his purpose or deflected from his course shows the venom fang of the reptile.

This individual, Sidney Bieber, seems to be an expert hand. I am informed he had himself placed on the retirement roll of the firemen's fund in the District of Columbia at \$90 per month for life, on the ground that he was totally disabled. If he were in possession of all his faculties and full strength, I think really he would get the Capitol away from us in a very short time. [Laughter.] So there is some compensation in this man's misfortune and disability. He appears to me, from the general description, to be the Abe Ruef of the city of Washington—capable, slick, unscrupulous, and persistent, trading upon his acquaintance and imposing upon the confidence of men, and obtaining for himself unconscionable advantage through enactments surreptitiously passed in the closing hours of a session of Congress.

Now, Mr. President, in order to escape, this individual here in question would have it understood that all the land south of the blocks named in his deeds might not reach as broad an area as claimed and might not strike at vital public interests as deeply as claimed, but that is not the fault of Mr. Bieber. He did the best he could, and I venture to predict that if he had not been discovered, he would have come back again to get another slice of this country along the Anacostia River, which, according to Government projects, is to be improved by the expenditure of something like \$3,000,000 of money taken from the people of the United States in taxation. If he does not threaten

to cut off the navy-yard with the bill we have voted to repeal, it is so much the better for the Government, but it is no credit to him, because he got all he could.

Finally, Mr. President, I think this ought to lead to a clear understanding here that a gang of tax-title sharks, said to have been operating in this District for a long time, should be in some manner, by the District authorities, disposed of and rendered innocuous, at least. This great Government of ours is an impassive, though mighty force. If its public officers do not protect it, it will be plundered. The most extreme vigilance is evidently necessary in and about this District, which has no legislature of its own, in order to protect private right and public property as well.

I wish that Mr. Wayne MacVeagh, through whose pamphlet or brief these facts were brought to light, might get due credit, notwithstanding the fact that he happened to be the employee of a corporation at the time he did the work. I am sure that everyone desiring to prosecute an inquiry into this matter will be interested in reading what he wrote. What he wrote caused the Secretary of War to hold the enactment of 1907 up, and in his own language, as quoted to me, the Secretary ordered the Sidney Bieber bill to be kicked about the Department until Congress could further consider it. It was first passed from one division of the War Department to another, and finally referred to the Attorney-General for an opinion as to whether the Secretary of War was compelled by the act to make any conveyance at all. I ask, Mr. President, that that statement, which is instructive and exhaustive, be printed as a document, to the end that anyone desiring to become familiar with the facts as set forth by Mr. Wayne MacVeagh may do so. I ask that it be printed only down to the appendix.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator one question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. If I correctly understood the reading of section 21 of the prior law, there is a provision that the Secretary of War should pay such an amount of money as he might deem to be proper after an investigation. That substantially is the provision. Has the Senator any information as to whether there was an investigation, and to what extent it proceeded?

Mr. CARTER. I understand there was quite an extensive investigation with reference to the act of 1907, which proposed to convey an indefinite area of land.

Mr. BACON. I am speaking of the provision which required an investigation to determine how much should be paid by this man, and under which, as I understood the Senator to say, some three thousand and odd dollars were paid.

Mr. CARTER. I do not know what investigation was made in that case, but for the Senator's information I will make this statement: It appears by the record, as presented by Mr. MacVeagh, that Mr. Bieber offered to sell his tax-title claim to block 1131 in 1898 for \$2,000. Later on he acquired full title to the property from the United States, together with the other block named. This line of proceeding was finally brought to light by his refusal to sell a small stretch or corner of two blocks, probably a third of one block and a sixth of another, on which the tracks of the railroad company rested, for the sum of \$15,000. The statement is made that when they offered him \$15,000 for a quitclaim deed of the land he had thus acquired, on which their tracks rested and had rested for a generation, he simply laughed and said he would bring them to time and get good round figures, or words to that effect.

Now, Mr. President, so far as this raid on public property is concerned, I have no information except that which I have given. The Senate will observe that the phraseology of the law did not direct an investigation by the Secretary of War, but said "considering all the circumstances of the case"—and the land grabber was to detail the circumstances regarding his fictitious claim to title, for surely no one else had been favored with any information.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the Senator from Montana a question?

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I am a very patient man, but I must demand the regular order.

MATERIAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PANAMA CANAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine demands the regular order, which is Senate joint resolution No. 40.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 40) to provide for the transportation by sea of material and equipment for use in the construction of the Panama Canal.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 10, after the word "purchase," it is proposed to insert the word "construct."

Mr. FRYE. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator who has this joint resolution in charge to some objections to it. The joint resolution provides—I am referring to what is left of it:

That this resolution shall not apply to any foreign steamship chartered by the Panama Railroad Company to take the place of any of the present fleet destroyed or undergoing repairs, etc.

Then it provides "That the Isthmian Canal Commission is hereby authorized to purchase," etc. Mr. President, it seems to me that if the canal authorities are to purchase, it is hardly worth while to spend much time over the question as to what ports will have the benefit of this act. For myself, I am not in favor of authorizing the Canal Commission to do work that I think somebody else can do a great deal better. I do not know, of course, whether the Canal Commission would avail itself of this provision. But I think it is objectionable in the first instance, and I wish simply to register my objection against it. As the Senator from Maine, who has the joint resolution in charge, seems somewhat anxious to get a vote upon it, I merely desire to say a few words on another proposition.

Mr. President, the other day when this matter was up a question was raised whether it was better for the Canal Commission to manufacture its own cement or to buy it. I suppose the Canal Commission has the authority to manufacture cement if it sees fit. I stated the other day that I did not think there was sufficient material available on the Isthmus which could be used, economically at least, for making cement. Since that time I have gone over all the suggestions made in the report as to the character of the material that may be expected to be found. I find that the Commission is very hopeful, or their engineers are, that there is a vast quantity of material which may be used for the manufacture of cement. If you go carefully over the report itself you will find that it is a mere guess on the part of the engineers. There has been more guessing on this canal than on anything I have ever had anything to do with or any knowledge of.

I am not quite willing to take the suggestion of any engineer that there may be, or possibly is, plenty of material there, and that the Government shall expend a million and a half of money to erect a plant and then find, perhaps, that it has not the material, when there is an abundance of cement material in this country which can be manufactured at a reasonable rate and transported to the Panama Canal line, I believe, for one-half what it will be possible for the Canal Commission to make it for there. The Canal Commission's report, on the evidence of some engineer—and I do not remember who—says they think they can make the cement for about a dollar and thirty-four cents a barrel. They base that upon the theory that coal would cost them \$4.50 a ton. Everywhere, practically, where they have fixed the price of coal, they have paid from \$7.50 down to \$6.50, instead of \$4.50, and upon that basis, with coal at \$4.50, instead of \$6.50 or \$7.50, they conclude they can make cement for \$1.34 a barrel. Of course, in that they give the Government credit for the plant. If that can be done, it may be as cheap as they can buy the cement; but it is very uncertain whether it can be done.

I do not know that it is worth while to discuss this question, because we have no control over the Commission. I do not know whether a suggestion made here by the Senate that we should prefer to see them buy the cement than to make it would have any influence with them, because on several occasions Congress has abandoned control over the canal. However, I am not certain but that if they studied economy they would buy the cement and not make it.

Mr. President, I said the other day that I thought the estimate of 5,000,000 barrels, or about a million tons, of cement was grossly inadequate. I made that statement upon my general knowledge of what they proposed to do there and because it seemed to me that they must use a very large amount of cement. Since that time I have, as with the other question, gone over the matter, and I do not believe they will ever get through with the canal by the use of a million tons of cement. I should say it is very much more likely to be two and a half or three million tons. They have several enterprises for which they have made no estimates at all. They have a diversion canal, as to which they say they have not had sufficient time to make an estimate. That diversion canal must be composed very largely of cement or else the canal will wash away. The canal is for the purpose of taking care of the extra floods which are going to occur in the Chagres River, when it will not be safe to let it go into the dam.

Mr. President, I have not much confidence in these suggestions. In the first place, we were told after the Commission had been organized that they had found a place to build the dam where it would be eminently safe, and they made an estimate of the cost of the dam. Later they found that the engineers had been mistaken; that it was not possible to maintain a dam at that point. They abandoned that point and went down the river about 6 or 7 miles—I can not state it exactly, but somewhere in that neighborhood—to build another and a different dam. It is not so very astonishing that men may make mistakes, but we were told that there had been such a thorough examination by borings and otherwise that they knew the dam could be built at the first point. Now we are told with the same certainty that it can be built at another point 6 miles farther down the river.

They have the most extraordinary proposition I believe that ever was submitted to any people, which will require an immense amount of cement, as much I should say to make it perfectly safe as it will take to build these locks, or at least the first locks on the eastern side. The spillway in this case is in the middle of the dam, a thing most astonishing, I think, to any man who has ever given any attention to the question of dams and the dangers that come from them, from floods and so forth. Of course they have had engineers, and we are depending largely upon the engineers, but when engineers make a calculation one day and within a very short time make another and show absolutely that they were at fault at first, we naturally lose some confidence in their judgment.

The other day when we were talking about this question the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] called my attention to the Chagres River. That is the black feature of this whole thing, I know. It is the threatening feature of the whole canal, especially is it the threatening feature of a lock canal. Of course I do not want at this time to go into the question whether it should have been a lock canal or a sea-level canal. That has already been determined by the Senate; nor do I want to go into the character of the lock canal. There might have been a different lock canal, but I believe the Senate did not pass upon the question as to what should be the character of the lock canal, whether it should be a 60-foot canal or 85-foot canal, or whether it should be a canal 30 feet in height. But I regard that as left now to the Commission, and the Commission has established an 85-foot canal.

I have gone over with some care again the matter of the Chagres River, and while I knew for several years that it had been the doubtful feature of the canal when the French were building it, it seems to me that every time you look it over it grows more doubtful whether you can build a canal there and maintain it with that river. I desire to say now that, in my judgment, it can only be maintained by the use of a tremendous amount of good cement. The Commission say the whole enterprise depends upon the character of the cement used. Every business man, every man of common sense, knows that. If you put an inferior cement in the locks, there will be trouble in the future; and if you put inferior cement in the spillway, so that the spillway may break at any time, the dam would go out in two hours under that head of 85 feet of water. So the important question in the whole matter of the construction of the canal is what kind of cement you are going to get.

The matter of cement is as well settled in the United States as it is anywhere in the world. For a great many years we bought our cement from England or Europe. We now manufacture cement that we call Portland cement, because the Portland cement, which was the first cement we used in this country, came from Europe. We are making large quantities of cement in the State of Kansas, some in Missouri, some, I think, in Iowa, and in other States. Our cement has now reached a point where we know it is just as good as any other cement. There may be a little difference, but it is very small.

We have in this country an abundance of material from which to manufacture cement. I will venture to say that the Oklahoma region can produce all the material needed in order to make the cement for the canal, even if it takes twice as much as is estimated. They have the fuel and they have everything else there. They are only hampered by the fact that they are not on a water line. It can be manufactured undoubtedly in the Oklahoma country cheaper than in any other place on the American Continent, because they have natural gas in great quantity, and where they do not have gas they have an abundance of coal which is very cheap.

Kansas is to-day making large quantities of cement. We have been using it in Colorado in large amounts. The most important dam that has been built in this country for a good many years was for the Denver Water Company, in which they used entirely cement from Iola, Kans. Every barrel of that

cement when it came there was opened and a competent man made a test to determine whether it was a proper barrel of cement or not, because in manufacturing cement you will frequently have good cement in one barrel and poor cement in the next one. No barrel of cement was accepted that did not come up to the standard, and when they got through they had a dam 210 feet high, holding a rapid stream and setting the water back 8 or 10 miles, and practically it was as solid as the adjoining hills. The cement set properly, and it had been built in with very large stones taken from the adjacent hills, and it is a solid barrier. You can make cement which will be just as good as the surrounding hills; but you do not always do it, and I doubt very much if you should attempt to make cement on the Isthmus with the character of labor they have and with the uncertainty as to the material, whether you would get a cement which would stand the test that the engineers of this country insist that every barrel of cement shall stand before it goes into an embankment or for any other purpose where force is to come against it.

So, Mr. President, I want to put myself on record in favor of the use of American cement, and if it costs \$2 a barrel it will be cheaper than cement for nothing that does not come up to the standard. About the wisest thing I have heard from the Commission is the statement that the whole canal depends upon the kind of cement that goes into the locks. It is equally true in making these diversion canals. They have a scheme to carry the Chagres River at one point into the Pacific Ocean and at another point into the Atlantic Ocean. That river, with the rapid rise, which is sometimes as much as 40 and 50 and 60 feet above normal, going up to 80 feet frequently, is of such a character that it will not do to allow the water to run through an earth channel. It will have to be lined with cement and stone and masonry in order to make it perfectly safe, whether it goes east or whether it goes west.

The French had a scheme, which I think an absurd one, but I see that the Commission have indicated that they may follow it, of putting a trestle over the canal which would be 180 feet above the water. The great trouble is when you turn your river over there, and when you drop it on the other side you will wash away the whole country, or you must make calculations to drop it down by degrees.

The spillway of this dam, in my judgment, threatens the foundation of the dam unless for some distance below the dam there shall be a cement conduit to carry off the water. I can not find that they have calculated on anything more than dropping it just below the dam. That is in a gorge 268 feet deep with nothing but mud; no stone. No man living knows how deep it is from the surface of the bottom of the gorge, 268 feet deep, before you come to a solid foundation, and that is why I say no condition exists there which justifies them in saying that 5,000,000 barrels of cement is all they want.

It may not be a very practical suggestion as to the pending joint resolution, but it is an opportunity that I did not like to neglect, and I have taken it to call the attention of the authorities who are doing this work to the facts I have presented. Later, when we come to the question of an appropriation, I mean to call attention to some other things which I think the authorities ought to examine and consider before they go on with this work.

As I have said on former occasions I know the canal is going to be built. I do not know when. But I do believe the American people, after spending so much money, will go on at all events. I was somewhat surprised to see in the public press that Mr. Stevens, who was the engineer, says the canal will be of no value to the commerce or the country when it is built. I do not agree with that. I do not believe it will be of as much value to the country as people have supposed, but it will be of some value provided, and provided only, it is an effective and useful canal. You may build a canal that will be of no use to commerce because the shipmasters of the world will not use it.

People talk about sending our battle ships through it. If it was built, it would be infinitely safer for the Government of the United States to send its battle ships where it has sent our fleet than to take the chance of putting one of those battle ships in those great locks. A slight movement of one of those battle ships would sweep the whole line of locks off, if it occurred in a top lock. Nobody can imagine what would happen, except to say that it would mean the total destruction of the flight of locks on both sides, where they are in duplicate. Both parts would be torn out from top to bottom by a battle ship.

Mr. President, I hope I shall not speak so often on this subject that I shall be regarded as a bore. But it is a matter of great concern to the American people that they shall get a canal which will meet the demands of the commerce of the

world, not only as a measure of profit, but as a measure of honor. We have assumed the authority to build it; we have denied everybody else the right to build it; and it becomes our duty to build such a canal as will meet the demands of the world's shipping.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the joint resolution is one which will affect the industries of the section which I in part represent, and it is to them a matter of very decided importance. It is important, if it is to pass, that it be put in shape where it will not be practically impossible for parties to furnish material for the construction of the canal without, in the effort to do so, incurring risk of loss. I have once or twice before endeavored to point out the practical difficulties in the way. Each time it has happened, unfortunately for me, there was an interruption before I could succeed in presenting them. I shall endeavor to do so now from a practical standpoint.

The two materials which are to be largely furnished from the South in the construction of the canal are lumber and cross-ties. As is suggested to me by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER], cement also. That possibly is from Oklahoma. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] also suggests Texas.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And Alabama.

Mr. BACON. The section from which I come, or rather I will say the State which I in part represent, is more interested in lumber and cross-ties for the construction of the canal. The Senators around me can represent the industries from their States which will be thus interested, and doubtless they will do so. I know it is not confined to my State, but includes South Carolina, North Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, all of which will be interested in the furnishing of lumber and cross-ties, and those materials will be shipped from half a dozen to a dozen different ports.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand that this is one of those questions of the character described by a late Democratic candidate for the Presidency in a notable letter as a "local question?"

Mr. BACON. No; I think not. I am trying to get rid of the burden which this joint resolution—

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought the Senator was discussing it from the standpoint of how it affected his State.

Mr. BACON. I do not want a burden laid upon that industry. I want to have it so that those who are engaged in that industry will be permitted to bid for the furnishing of lumber and cross-ties, and have the information at the time they bid, whether those bids are to be based upon rates of transportation charged by foreign vessels or upon the higher rates of transportation to be charged by American vessels. That is the exact point.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the purpose of the joint resolution is to protect American industries generally—

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. ALDRICH. And not those of any particular State.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is usually very correct as to anything which relates to matters of this kind; but the joint resolution relates exclusively to the matter of transportation. It is simply a joint resolution—I presume the Senator has not read it—which requires that with certain exceptions named or with certain qualifications, all material and equipment for the canal shall be shipped in vessels of American register. That is substantially what it is—

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I supposed.

Mr. BACON. Without going on to speak of the different classes of ships.

The particular point I am after is this. I stated it yesterday, but in order that I may have the connection I will state it again very briefly. In order that one who has lumber and cross-ties or any other material which he wishes to furnish to the canal may make a bid for the furnishing of those materials to be delivered at the Isthmus, it is necessary for him to be able to form a correct estimate as to what will be the cost of transportation, because that must enter very largely into the cost to him of the material when delivered, and he must be able to add to the original cost the cost of transportation in order that he may figure upon a reasonable profit. The point is that there should be as far as possible certainty to enable the producer of lumber and cross-ties to make his calculation as to the price he will bid at which he will deliver the goods at Panama. If he has to pay a high rate of freight he must add a high rate of freight to his bid. If he is to be permitted to have a low rate of freight he must add the low rate of freight to his bid.

Now, the trouble with the joint resolution, even with the amendment proposed, is that one who wishes to make a bid will be in doubt and uncertainty as to whether he has to ship by American vessels or whether he will be permitted to ship by foreign vessels.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is there any competition in cross-ties from Mexico or Honduras or any other country?

Mr. BACON. We are not discussing that question now.

Mr. ALDRICH. It seems to me important to look at both sides of this question.

Mr. BACON. Two years ago we passed a law which required this material to be taken from the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is my recollection.

Mr. BACON. That is not the question now before us.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I had something to do with that measure.

Mr. BACON. Yes; the Senator did.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not know but that the Senator would like to have that changed, so that we could have foreign competition.

Mr. BACON. Yes; I should like it, and I shall have something to say about that before I get through.

Mr. ALDRICH. If we are to have foreign competition in transportation, why not in materials?

Mr. BACON. I will discuss that if I do not occupy too much of the time of the Senate. I am now on the question of transportation. I will come to the question whether or not the canal should be built with material wherever we can get it cheapest or whether it should be built under such conditions that an increased price is to be paid. But I am not on that question now. We had that question two years ago. It is a cognate question, it is true, but it is not the one before us now. The one before us now is transportation, and I have endeavored to point out the fact that the joint resolution should be made so certain that a man who wishes to bid can with accuracy tell how much to the original cost of the material he must add for transportation. If it were certain that there were going to be American ships at each of the ports from which this material is to be shipped, of course there would be no difficulty in the party who desires to make the bid adding the necessary amount to the cost of the material, so that he could make his bid advisedly and have the assurance of a reasonable profit in the price which he was to receive from the Government. But if it is uncertain whether or not he is to have a high cost of transportation or a low cost of transportation he can not possibly bid without danger of loss.

Now, the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], and which I understand has been agreed to by the committee, is one which says that this restriction as to American vessels shall not be enforced—this is substantially what it is, I understand—unless American vessels are available. Am I correct as to the substantial meaning of it? I do not pretend to quote the exact words.

Mr. McLAURIN. Substantially.

Mr. BACON. Now, it will be understood that in practical operation an advertisement is put in the papers that at a certain time bids will be received for various articles, and I will illustrate it by lumber and cross-ties, although there are many other articles. An advertisement is put in that bids will be received for lumber and cross-ties to be furnished at a certain time, probably months ahead, necessarily months ahead. The owner of the lumber is desirous to make his calculation as to what bid he shall put in. He is to ship from the port of Savannah or the port of Brunswick. It is to be four months from the time of the bid up to the time when the contract is to be carried out by him or when he is to start his cargo from Savannah or from Brunswick for shipment to the canal.

How can he tell when he makes that bid whether there are going to be vessels available or not? How can he tell when he makes that bid whether he is to make it upon the basis of the cheap rate of a foreign vessel or upon the basis of the high rate of a domestic or American vessel? It is to meet that condition of affairs that I ask for the adoption of an amendment which will permit the bids to be made in the alternative.

I want to say, however, one word in response to the question propounded to me by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] as to the practical operation of the joint resolution as it is now before the Senate. The Senator asked me yesterday the question whether there was not more or less of risk and uncertainty in all business transactions and whether or not all shippers, when they made contracts which involved transportation as a part of the bid, did not have to bow to this uncertainty, and I was proceeding to answer him at the time when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived and the debate was necessarily suspended.

The reason is this. I illustrate it again by the simple matter

of lumber, although there are many other articles, of course, which would be interested in this line of business. When an American makes a contract to deliver lumber in South America or in Spain, or in any European port—and a great many of these contracts are made for the delivery of lumber under the circumstances which I have named, and yellow pine is shipped to all of them—he knows he is to pay the freight that is charged by a foreign vessel, because there are no American vessels running from South Atlantic ports to those ports. He knows as a certainty that the rate of freight that he is to include in his estimate is the rate of freight of the foreign vessel, and while those rates vary in some small degree they are so reasonably regular that there is no difficulty in the lumber merchant making his estimate and including in it the cost of transportation to the foreign port.

On the other hand, if lumber is to be shipped from Savannah or Brunswick to a port of the United States, as is done every day to Philadelphia, or Boston, or New York, or to Maine—if such a thing as lumber is shipped to Maine—the shipper knows that he must send it by a ship under American registry, because a foreign ship is not permitted to carry freight between those ports in the United States; so there is no hesitation and no doubt. In the one case it is absolutely certain that the freight is going to be the freight of a vessel under foreign registry at a cheap rate. In the other case it is an absolute certainty that it must be a ship under American registry, at a high rate, which is also so reasonably regular that the shipper can without difficulty estimate what would be the increased cost to the original cost of the material.

But when it comes to the shipment to Panama, under this bill, unless he is permitted to put in an alternative bid—so much in case it is shipped by a foreign vessel and so much, on the other hand, if shipped by an American vessel—it is an absolute impossibility for the shipper of lumber to make his estimate with any degree of certainty as to whether, if he gets the price he asks for it, he may not incur great loss as a consequence thereof. I do not see how there can be any escape from that proposition.

Mr. HALE rose.

Mr. BACON. It all rests at last, if the Senator will pardon me until I finish the sentence, under the bill, in the discretion of the President. Of course we know that means the discretion of the Department, necessarily so and properly so. The President is the proper officer to be named, though the work must necessarily be done by the departmental officer, and being in his discretion, it is an impossibility in advance for the shipper or the bidder to know whether his discretion is going to be exercised in favor of the American vessel or the foreign vessel. It is an impossibility for him to know what the President or his subordinate may consider to be reasonable or unreasonable, and he will have to go at a guess and move at a venture.

Now, I will with pleasure yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I think, as I intimated yesterday, the Senator is seeking to make by statute a provision that shall cover all the vicissitudes and chances of trade. The situation depicted by the Senator of his constituents producing lumber and ties is not confined to his locality, and he said, which admits the difficulty in providing for specific articles, that there are other articles beside lumber and ties affected by this uncertainty.

In my own neighborhood in the State of Maine we are largely interested in the shipping of lumber and railroad ties and sleepers to foreign ports, to Panama, and wherever the product can be sold. It is an everyday occurrence in Maine that a contract is made in April, May, or March for the shipping of these products to foreign countries months afterwards. The shipper does not know what he will have to pay when the time comes around. The rates of freight in the fall are sometimes very greatly larger than they are in the spring, and the shipper takes that chance. You can not cure, as I have said, all the vicissitudes of trade by provisions of law, and when the Senator seeks to make an exception here for lumber and ties—

Mr. BACON. No; I do not seek anything of the kind.

Mr. HALE. He invokes—

Mr. BACON. I used that for an illustration. It will apply to any material.

Mr. HALE. Is the Senator's proposition general or does it apply to lumber?

Mr. BACON. Certainly, it is general.

Mr. HALE. It is general?

Mr. BACON. Of course.

Mr. HALE. Applying to all products?

Mr. BACON. To all material.

Mr. HALE. Of every kind?

Mr. BACON. Of every kind. Of course it is. I will ask that the amendment may be read.

Mr. HALE. No; I will take the Senator's word. I have not read it.

Mr. BACON. I did not suppose for a moment that the Senator or anyone else would presume that I would ask that a particular class of products should have a different rule from any other class of products.

Mr. HALE. The Senator had talked about this one product.

Mr. BACON. I used it as an illustration, and I said that those two materials I had a special interest in.

Mr. HALE. The Senator had talked about that and I supposed he was confining his amendment to it.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will let it be read, and then if the Senator has a question to ask me I would be delighted to answer it. But if the Senator desires to answer my argument I hope he will let me complete it first.

Mr. HALE. No; so far as the point that I make is of any force, you can not provide by law what a shipper will have to pay some weeks or some months ahead, and that is just as pertinent and just as strong a consideration before us as whether the Senator's amendment applies generally or only to lumber and ties.

Mr. BACON. I ask that the amendment be read.

Mr. HALE. We must take some chances in trade.

Mr. BACON. I wish to say that I wrote the amendment as a proviso, but some Senators have suggested that instead of being put in as a proviso it ought to be put in as an independent section, which is agreeable to me.

Mr. CULLOM. Let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That in every such contract the party or parties, bidding on the same shall be authorized to submit bids to deliver said material and equipment, in the alternative, either—

First. On docks within reach of the ship's tackle at seaports of the United States named by the bidder.

Second. On docks, at the option of the bidder, at Colon or La Boca (1) in ships of American register; (2) in ships of foreign register.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say that that amendment, proposed by me, is copied with a very slight variation from the order of the Secretary of War under which bids are now made, and while, if the Secretary of War should continue that order, there would be no necessity for this amendment, the amendment is offered out of abundance of caution to prevent any change in that particular. I hope I may have the attention of the Senator from Maine. The order of the Secretary of War uses the word "steamships." I have changed that to "ships," because we have a number of sailing vessels, some of which come down from the country of the Senator from Maine—schooners—sailing vessels that land on our coast and carry freight largely. The three-masted schooner is now one of the most popular vessels on the coast. With the exception of changing the word "steamships" to "ships" it is a copy of the order which the Secretary of War has himself issued on the subject.

I do not know whether the Senator heard the remark which I made, as the two Senators from Maine were talking. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] referred the other day, when we first had this matter up for discussion, to the order of the Secretary of War in which these alternative bids are permitted. I asked that it be read in order that I might get the language, and it was put in the RECORD. I have taken it from that order with the simple change of the word "steamships" to "ships." With that change in the order, as I said, a great many three-masted schooners which come down from Maine to our country, may be allowed to engage in this trade.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator allow me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. FRYE. If this bill should become a law, would not the Commission or whoever had the authority necessarily make the bids in the alternative, in order to compare the difference in cost between one and the other, and to determine whether the American bid, for instance, was unreasonable?

Mr. BACON. I do not know whether it would be made in the alternative or not; and if the Senator is certain that it would be, why should he object to its being incorporated in the law?

Mr. FRYE. I have not yet objected. I am making up my mind.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, I think this proposition, which I had never read and I did not know what was in it until it was read from the desk, is a very different proposition from what I supposed the Senator was arguing.

Mr. BACON. I knew the Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. HALE. As to lumber and ties, I think it is interfering rather too much with taking the chances of trade, but still I

do not see how it can do much harm, because, as my colleague said, the alternative must be considered in reaching a decision as to whether the rate is reasonable or not.

Mr. BACON. It can not do any harm, and it may do a great deal of good. There is an estimated difference, I understand, of some 30 or 33 per cent between the cost of carriage by a ship under American registry and the cost of carriage by a ship under foreign registry. I do not know personally about that, but that is what I am told. If so, the danger of any complication growing out of that difference ought to be minimized as much as possible.

Mr. HALE. As my colleague has said, I do not see—and I am trying to look at it in a practical way—how the deciding power—we call it the President; it will be the Commission—can get at whether the difference is unreasonable or extortionate in the price demanded until they have an alternative bid. So I do not think the Senator's proposition does much harm.

Mr. BACON. I am glad the Senator concedes that much. I think it will do a great deal of good. I do not want it in the bill as a spineless measure, without any energy or force. I think it is important to have it. A man sits down six months or four months before the time when he is to furnish the material to make his calculation as to what bid he can safely make for himself, and it ought not to rest in the uncertainty and discretion of some other person as to whether he shall be required to arbitrarily send it by an American vessel as against a foreign vessel unless he is put in a position where, if such a requirement is made of him, his bid will be certain as to the one and as to the other.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator allow the amendment to be read once more?

Mr. BACON. I will, with pleasure.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That in every such contract the party or parties bidding on the same shall be authorized to submit bids to deliver said material and equipment in the alternative, either—

First. On docks within reach of the ship's tackle at seaports of the United States named by the bidder.

Second. On docks, at the option of the bidder, at Colon or La Boca (1) in ships of American register; (2) in ships of foreign register.

Mr. BACON. Now, if the Senator will pardon me, he will notice there are two distinct propositions there. One is that the party is going to deliver not on the Isthmus, but at the port to be named by him within reach of the ship's tackle.

Mr. HALE. That is a very different transaction.

Mr. BACON. Of course, I wish all the contracts were that way. Then all this trouble would be avoided and the Government itself would determine in what shape it would carry the products or material to the Isthmus. While the alternative is divided into two, it relates simply to two different coasts. One is on the Atlantic side and the other is on the Pacific side; but, in fact, there are but two classes of bids to be made. One is a bid for delivery on the dock within the ship's tackle at a port to be named in this country, and the other is on the dock at Panama, either on the Atlantic side or the Pacific side.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. FRYE. If I will accept that amendment, will the Senator allow a vote to be taken on the joint resolution?

Mr. BACON. The vote will certainly be taken this afternoon.

I will not occupy very much time of the Senate after that. I will say, however, that I will be glad to strike out the word "*Provided*" and make it an independent section. Some Senators thought possibly if the word "*Provided*" were in, it might have some relation to other provisions which would not be desired.

Mr. FRYE. I think a separate section is the better way.

Mr. BACON. Very well. If the Senator will prefer that I will have no more to say on that subject and, to that extent, the Senator will get closer to his vote, and I will say nothing more about it.

I want to say one word, however, Mr. President, because the Senators on the other side have asked me on a former occasion, and the Senator from Rhode Island to-day, something as to this general policy. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said something to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] indicating the idea that the Senator from South Carolina, and possibly those who were associated with him on this side of the Chamber, had voted for the bill which was passed two years ago, which required that all material furnished for the construction of the canal should be bought

within the United States, and some little question arose as to whether or not those of us on this side did support that measure.

Mr. TELLER. I did.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Colorado says that he did for one. That is true. I have examined the vote, and he is the only Senator on this side of the Chamber who did vote for it; the Senator, I have no doubt, being influenced by the very best of motives and voting according to his conviction as to what he should do.

Mr. TELLER. I stated it.

Mr. BACON. Yes; the Senator stated it. As I stated a few days ago that was my recollection, the question the other day having been raised as to whether or not I had voted for it upon that occasion. As I stated the other day, I not only voted against it, but spoke against it. I took the position then which I take now, that, regardless of the question whether a man believes in protection or not and whether he advocates and maintains the policy of protection as the proper policy of this country, it was not a subject where that principle should be invoked or where it should be applied; that here was a great enterprise, an enterprise which required not only a tremendous expenditure, but a tremendous sacrifice on the part of the people of the United States; that it was not an enterprise for money or for gain, but a great world-wide enterprise in which all the nations of the earth were to have equal advantage and equal benefit with ourselves, in which we had solemnly stipulated to the world in our treaty with Great Britain on the subject that there should be no discrimination in favor of the people of the United States, but that that canal should be free to the world upon equal terms with ourselves.

I took the position two years ago, and I repeat it now, that whatever a man may think about protection, concede, if you please, the correctness of the principle, both as a principle and as a practice, the construction of the Panama Canal was not an occasion where one dollar should be taken from the people of the United States for its construction more than was absolutely necessary for its construction.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. FULTON. Does not the Senator think that we are taking less from the people of the United States than we would otherwise take, by providing that they shall have the preference in furnishing the material?

Mr. BACON. I do not think so.

Mr. FULTON. In paying them for the material rather than paying citizens of foreign nations makes it cost the people of the United States less than it otherwise would. The Senator will see—

Mr. BACON. The Senator asks me a question and then discusses it afterwards. Having asked the question will he please let me reply to it?

Mr. FULTON. Very well.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not think so at all. If, of course, every particle of the material was furnished uniformly by all the people of the United States, then you might say that it was taking it out of one pocket and putting it in another. But the Senator well knows, and every Senator knows, that that is not the fact; that the great body of the people do not and can not participate in whatever benefit may come to those who sell this material. In that debate, Mr. President—

Mr. FULTON. If the Senator will allow me right there—

Mr. BACON. I will yield as soon as the Senator will let me answer his question. What I am now saying is in reply to a question, and he must let me finish, please.

Mr. FULTON. Of course, if the Senator insists I will have to yield.

Mr. BACON. I will answer another question from the Senator after I answer this one.

The debate on that question brought prominently to the attention of the Senate the fact that upon the mere subject of the purchase of two dredges—one of them for the Pacific side and the other for the Atlantic side—bids had been invoked and had been received by the United States Government—one from an American manufacturer and the other from a Scotch manufacturer—in which, after the most careful investigation by the Secretary of War and with the aid of the opinions of those officers engaged with him in the prosecution of the work who had investigated it, there was estimated to be a loss to the United States of \$70,000 in accepting the American bid. Calculating every element of cost, transportation, marine insurance, and everything else, there was \$70,000 difference. In the debate which preceded thereon, I find by reference to the Record, which I have examined to-day and which is upon my desk, that I stated

the fact that, upon investigation by parties whose familiarity with the matter led me to confide in the correctness of their judgment, upon an estimate of \$250,000,000 as the cost of the Panama Canal, the purchase of the material in the United States would make the Panama Canal cost \$32,000,000 more than it would if the purchases were made wherever the material could be obtained cheapest. That was upon a basis of cost of \$247,000,000 for the canal, if I recollect correctly, and nobody now thinks the canal is going to be built for any such sum as that; and in proportion as the cost of the canal is increased, in the same proportion is going to be increased the additional cost to the people of the United States of the construction of the canal, by reason of the fact that the material has to be bought in this country and can not be bought where it can be had cheapest.

The joint resolution which is now before us, and which we all know is to pass, is to add still more to the unnecessary cost of this gigantic work to the people of the United States. I do not know how much it will add, because I am not familiar with the proportion of the cost of transportation to the original cost of the material, but if it is a very small amount, with the increased cost of the canal and the consequently increased cost of material, and added to that the increased cost of transportation, I have no doubt but that the canal is to cost fifty or sixty million dollars, at least, more than it would otherwise cost if those who are to construct it were permitted to buy the material in the cheapest market and to ship it at the cheapest rate of ocean freight.

This increased cost must be paid by the entire American people. The money for this purpose will not drop from the skies. It must come out of the pockets of all the people without distinction. There is not a man who toils in the field, or works with his hand or brain in any occupation in the United States, who will not be required to contribute his part to pay this unnecessary and extra cost of building the canal.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia allow me to make a suggestion?

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

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to know whether or not the principal cost of the canal will not be labor?

Mr. BACON. I am coming to that, if the Senator will permit me. I know exactly what he was going to ask me.

Mr. TILLMAN. The point is this: That if we are going to confine this Government in its expenditures for material to the home market absolutely, then—

Mr. BACON. Why not apply the same principle to labor?

Mr. TILLMAN. Why not have American laborers, of whom there are so many hundreds of thousands now roaming up and down hunting for soup kitchens?

Mr. BACON. I will say that the Senator from South Carolina has simply anticipated exactly what I was coming to right at the very minute.

I ask Senators on the other side, if the home market is to be protected, if home interests are to be those which are to control, why is it, when material is to be bought at higher prices in the United States and is to be shipped at higher prices than it can be gotten for elsewhere, that labor, of all things, while it is protected in this country, should not be protected there by those who have control and who dispose of such matters?

Mr. HALE. I suppose the simplest answer—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I suppose the simplest and most straightforward answer is that you can not get sufficient American labor to go there to do the work, but that you can get an ample supply of American material to be employed in the construction of the canal.

Mr. BACON. And American ships. Did I understand the Senator to say "American ships?"

Mr. HALE. That remains to be seen.

Mr. BACON. But the Senator when it came to labor—

Mr. HALE. We are talking about material.

Mr. BACON. We are talking about material; we are talking about transportation; we are talking about labor—all three of them.

Mr. HALE. What the Senator meant just now and what was raised by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] was the question of material.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. HALE. The answer to the question is simply that you can get American material and plenty of it, but you can not get American labor. American laborers will not go there.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. One second. Let me show the inconsistency of the Senator from Maine and those whom he represents. There is no greater urgency on the part of the Senator from Maine in the case of material than there is in the case of the shipping. The matter before us to-day is a matter of shipping, and I asked the Senator to see if he would follow me out and complete his own sentence when he said there was plenty of material—whether he would say that there is plenty of shipping, because if there was plenty of shipping, it would not be necessary to frame this joint resolution with any qualifying clause in it.

Mr. HALE. I would certainly utilize American shipping so far as I could get it.

Mr. BACON. Exactly.

Mr. HALE. I certainly would.

Mr. BACON. I understand that.

Mr. HALE. I would give it a preference, and a large preference.

Mr. BACON. The point as to which I ask the Senator is this: It is assumed that there would be no sufficiency of American labor without any effort to procure it, with an absolute repudiation in the very beginning of the effort of those who were interested in American labor to have it laid down as a rule that American labor should construct the canal.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I tried to answer the Senator's question by a very few words. Now, let me ask the Senator whether he believes that American labor—labor in the United States, such as it is—could be obtained to go down and do the work under the conditions that at present obtain and will always obtain on the Isthmus of Panama?

Mr. BACON. I will only say this to the Senator—

Mr. HALE. What does the Senator think as to that?

Mr. BACON. I will say this to the Senator: That there is scarcely a week passes, possibly scarcely two days pass, that I do not get letters from men in my part of the country seeking positions on that canal.

Mr. HALE. Not from laborers?

Mr. BACON. Yes; from laborers. Men who have to work—mechanics who have to labor.

Mr. HALE. I can tell the Senator—

Mr. BACON. And I have not a doubt in the world that there are all along the southern tier of States in the United States an abundance of laborers who can be induced to go there.

Mr. HALE. I should doubt that very much.

Mr. BACON. Very well. The effort should at least have been made, and none was made. We know it is a fact that the labor organizations in this country appealed to those in authority to make that restriction, and that it was refused.

Mr. HALE. But they did not agree to furnish the labor and never would furnish the labor.

Mr. BACON. You did not try it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me right there?

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

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. It appears that, so far as the cost goes, it is left entirely to competition in the United States, and we are compelled to pay whatever price is charged. Now, if you put the same restriction on labor and say that we shall employ none but American labor, and a price is fixed, first, at a dollar, and if that does not bring them, go to \$2, and if that does not bring them, go to \$3, and if \$3 does not bring them, then go to four, five, six, or ten dollars—just simply say that you will pay whatever is necessary and you will get them.

Mr. BACON. And that is what you say as to the material; that is what you say as to transportation—that, regardless of whether it will cost more or less, you shall use domestic material and you shall use ships of domestic register.

Mr. HALE. This joint resolution does not provide that.

Mr. BACON. The joint resolution adopted two years ago did as to material.

Mr. HALE. This joint resolution does not provide that as to transportation any amount shall be charged. If there is an improper discrimination—

Mr. TILLMAN. But, if the Senator will permit me, the law compels us to use American material regardless of the cost. Now, if we say that we shall use nothing but American labor regardless of cost, we can get that, too.

Mr. FULTON. We know we can get material.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BACON. I yield to a question, but not to debate.

Mr. FULTON. Very well.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Oregon desires to ask me a question, I will yield to him with pleasure.

Mr. FULTON. I want to ask a question.

Mr. BACON. But if the Senator wishes to make an answer, I prefer that he should answer in his own time.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to ask the Senator a question, and I will have to premise it with a very brief statement of what the Senator has said. The Senator says that we have declined to extend the same protection to labor that we do to material.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] answered that by saying that the labor market in this country will not supply the demand; but the Senator now is contending that he would protect the labor market in this country, and he proposes that all the vast supplies necessary for the construction of the Panama Canal shall be purchased in foreign markets.

Mr. BACON. Purchased in the open market.

Mr. FULTON. Very well. The Senator admits that it would come from the foreign market because we would save \$32,000,000 in that way.

Mr. BACON. A large part of that amount.

Mr. FULTON. But does not the Senator realize that by such a policy he would be doing labor a greater wrong and a greater injury than could possibly be done it by shutting it out of the labor market in Panama? What would be the effect on the laborers in the factories, the mills, and the forests of this country if we should always buy the vast amount of supplies required by the Government in other countries?

Mr. BACON. The vast amount of supplies that we have to buy, while it is a very vast amount and while in the aggregate the increased cost is very great to the American people, is but a drop in the bucket compared to the work that the American laborers do in the production of things in our own country for our own consumption and the influence upon our general production is insignificant. The point that I intend to make in the beginning was that however correct the principle of protection may be—and that is what the Senator now alludes to—it has no application to this case.

Mr. FULTON. Will the Senator allow me right there to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BACON. I yield if the Senator wants to ask a question, but I do object to debate. If the Senator desires to answer me, I want him to answer in his own time.

Mr. FULTON. There is no time as good as right now.

Mr. BACON. The Senator can ask a question, but I shall decline to yield for more than that, because I desire to go on with some connected presentation of the matter.

Mr. FULTON. This is a question.

Mr. BACON. Well.

Mr. FULTON. Now, the Senator must admit this—

Mr. BACON. That is not a question.

Mr. FULTON. I ask the Senator—protection being the policy of the country—if there is not a good reason for requiring the Government to purchase its supplies in the home market, in the protected market? If the Government requires the individual in this country to purchase his supplies in a protected market, should not the Government be required to purchase its supplies in the same market?

Mr. BACON. That might be true, Mr. President, as to material which the Government intended to use in this country in its ordinary operations, but I have endeavored to differentiate. This is a different matter altogether.

Right in that connection I want to call the attention of the Senate—I say the Senate in order that I may not arouse my learned and distinguished friend to rejoinder immediately—to the fact that that is not the policy that we pursue as to other matters. I have before me here a letter which was written by the Secretary of War to the President of the United States on this very question—and this letter was read in a former debate here two years ago—in which the Secretary of War called the attention of the President of the United States to the fact that we did not pursue that policy as to material necessary for the support of the Army in the Philippines; that, while all the material and supplies could be purchased in this country, that was disregarded in the purchase of supplies for the support of the Army in the Philippines, and materials and supplies were

purchased wherever they could be obtained cheapest. Right in that connection, Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate—

Mr. FULTON. I ask the Senator if it would not be different in the case of war?

Mr. BACON. This was not war. I am not speaking of war.

Mr. FULTON. That might necessitate a different rule.

Mr. BACON. I am speaking of a time of peace. There is peace in the Philippines now, and there was two years ago when the letter was written. I had no reference to a time of war. But I want to call the attention of the Senate right in connection with the question as to the purchase of material and supplies by the Government to the fact that when this matter was before the Senate two years ago I offered an amendment, which I will read. It was an amendment to the bill, which provided that all of the supplies and all of the material for the construction and equipment of the Panama Canal should be purchased in the United States. I offered this amendment:

Provided, That in making said purchases a larger price shall not be paid for any such article of domestic production or manufacture than the price at which the same or similar articles of domestic production or manufacture are sold or offered for sale in foreign markets or for export to foreign markets.

Does anybody contend that the Government of the United States ought to be made to pay to producers of the United States, the manufacturers of the United States, for material which is to be used in the construction of the Panama Canal a greater price than the same parties sell to foreign governments? And yet that amendment was voted down—all the Democrats with one exception voting for it, and all the Republicans voting against it—and to-day it is a fact that the very people that you say should be so protected are selling to the people in foreign countries articles at one price and asking and receiving from the Government of the United States a higher price for the same articles to go into the construction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. FULTON. Does not the Senator from Georgia realize the fact that in selling goods manufactured in this country at a lower price the transaction is oftentimes—more frequently than otherwise—influenced by the fact that the material which is used in manufacturing that article, the raw material, is imported from a foreign country, and then a drawback is paid when it is shipped out? Consequently in many cases it may be that they can afford to sell in the foreign market cheaper because they get that rebate of duty on the imported raw material.

Mr. BACON. The Senator now wants to go into a discussion of the question of the sale of goods in foreign markets at lower prices than they are sold in this market. That would take a very wide range and would occupy much longer time than the Senator from Maine would be content that I should occupy.

Mr. FRYE. A much wider range than the present discussion has taken?

Mr. BACON. Yes; a very much wider one.

Mr. FULTON. I will say, Mr. President, that if the Senator is desirous to accommodate the Senator from Maine and close the discussion, I will join with him.

Mr. BACON. No; the Senator is his own judge. He can answer to his own heart's content and at as great a length as he wishes after I conclude; but I will say that the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon as to the reasons why articles are sold in foreign markets at a cheaper rate than they are sold in our own country does not in anywise apply to the question whether the Government of the United States should be required to pay to those same manufacturers a greater price than those manufacturers sell in foreign markets.

Mr. FULTON. I did not say that was the only reason.

Mr. BACON. Oh, no. We have had that matter discussed in the Senate enough to know that there are a great many reasons, and it would take a very long time to state them.

Now, Mr. President, in order that I may not weary the Senator from Maine by occupying too much of his time, I am going to call attention to one or two things which are a little pertinent here.

I said that whatever might be the correctness of the principle of protection, it ought not to be applied in this case; that, in my opinion, the reward, if you please, or the fruits that the producers, the manufacturers, in this country reap from the present tariff law are sufficient without their grasping for more; and, as an evidence of that, I am going to read something that a Republican said. On the 3d day of February,

1908, there appeared in the Washington Herald a series of interviews with a number of manufacturers who were here at the time when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] was to make his heralded speech on the subject of a tariff commission. Those manufacturers were here in the interest of the appointment of such a commission and in the interest of a revision of the tariff. I will read what one of those manufacturers, who said he was a Republican, said on that subject. After several other interviews with other parties the article in the Herald goes on to say:

Even more outspoken than Mr. Van Cleave is Mr. H. E. Miles, chairman of the tariff committee of the Manufacturers' Association and president of the National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers.

I hope I may have the attention of Senators to the words of this Republican manufacturer who was here upon that business. I repeat these are the words of Mr. H. E. Miles, chairman of the tariff committee of the Manufacturers' Association and president of the National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers. He further says this:

The annual output of the manufacturers of the United States, as shown in the last census, is valued at \$14,800,000,000. The tariff which covers the prices is inexact, antiquated, and inapplicable at the present time. Scarcely a single schedule has any honest and direct application at this time to the principle of protection. Under present conditions the tariff is not a protective tariff in any sense.

I hope Senators will listen to this language:

Under present conditions the tariff is not a protective tariff in any sense. It is a tariff of graft and discrimination, hurtful in a thousand ways.

From one-half to two-thirds of the stuff made under this tariff bears to the consumer an unjust and unreasonable price because of the tariff.

Now listen to these words:

It is estimated by competent authorities that the graft, overcharge, and wrong done the American public because of the present tariff reaches \$3,000,000 a working day.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. From what Democratic stump speech is the Senator reading?

Mr. BACON. Let me finish it and then I will answer the Senator's question. I will repeat the last sentence for fear the Senator from Rhode Island did not hear it. I hope he will listen to me. I want the Senator from Rhode Island to hear this:

It is estimated by competent authorities that the graft, overcharge, and wrong done the American public because of the present tariff reaches \$3,000,000 a working day. We have the facts, schedule by schedule, and are prepared to make the details public should we receive opposition to our demand for a permanent tariff commission, through the appointment of which a proper adjustment of the tariff can be procured.

We are not agitators or reformers. We are mostly Republicans, and all protectionists.

That is the kind of a Democratic stump speech it is. It is from Mr. H. E. Miles. The Senator will pardon me. I will read it over again, as he did not seem to hear it.

Mr. ALDRICH and others. No, no.

Mr. BACON. I am simply going to read his name and designation. I am not going to read his interview over again. I know it is very unpleasant to Senators to hear, and I will not be cruel enough to again impose upon them by reading it to them twice. But I must again tell you who Mr. Miles is. Mr. Miles is the chairman of the tariff committee of the Manufacturers' Association and president of the National Association of Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers, and he says he is a Republican and a protectionist.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. The only doubt I had about whether it was a Democratic speech or not was the mildness of the statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. BACON. The mildness of the statement! Well, Mr. President, if this is mild, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] suggests to me, what would it be if it were more extreme?

But, leaving all jesting aside, is not that enough to give every man pause? Three million dollars of graft and overcharge and wrong done to the American public every working day by the present tariff law! It rises up a good deal higher than the question whether or not they have enough of remuneration, to put a very mild term upon it—I will not use the offensive term—as an effect of the operation of the tariff. Have they not a sufficiency without saying to the American people,

"You must make this canal cost \$60,000,000 more than it otherwise would in order that we may have more graft on the same lines?"

Mr. President, I saw a very interesting statement in a newspaper yesterday—the Washington Post, I think it was—as to the legislation that the President intended that Congress shall enact before it adjourns. It is true this is not issued by the President, but it is issued by someone who states it as a fact. I have waited a day, because I know that if it were not a fact, and if it were not recognized by the President as true, he would be swift in its denial with the shortest of all English words to mark the line of division between him and the one who had misrepresented him. These are the great subjects that the President orders that we are to legislate upon before Congress adjourns prior to the meeting of the Republican national convention:

An emergency currency—and, by the way, that seems to be assured, because I see it stated in the newspapers that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] has been in close conference with the President, and as a result, I suppose, of that conference, I saw in yesterday's Washington Herald, I think it was, a cartoon in which the President is represented with a big stick and an extinguisher, under which he had some dozen Senators. You could only see their feet, and consequently I can not say who they were, but the President was a Brobdingnag and they were Lilliputians. As the Senator from Rhode Island now has not simply the active cooperation, but the active coercion, if the cartoonist may be believed, of the President of the United States, there can be no doubt about the fact that the currency bill is to pass. But I am trying to read about the number of things which you Senators have got to attend to before you leave here whether you will or no, and I just want to call attention to the fact that the revision of the tariff, unfortunately, is not among them, although every day it is taking in graft and overcharge \$3,000,000 from the American people. Here they are:

Emergency currency.

Employers' liability.

Abuse of injunctions in labor cases.

Strengthening of laws regulating labor conditions.

Increase of Federal power over railroads.

Authorization of railroads to form traffic associations.

Modification of the Sherman antitrust law.

Elimination of bucket shops and gambling in stocks and commodities.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator think that we are going to have another message ordering our brethren over there to do those things?

Mr. BACON. The newspaper says that a message is to come. I do not know whether the fact that that has been published will prevent its coming or not, but that is certainly what we have every reason to believe is correct, for the reason, as I have already said, that if it were not correct, one day having passed, we should have had a denial of it in no uncertain terms.

Nothing is said about Brownsville, as Senators around me suggest, but the order had already been issued in regard to that, and I presume will be obeyed.

Now, Mr. President, I would have very grave doubt as to the ability of even the very able and distinguished and large majority on the other side of this Chamber, as well as of the House of Representatives, to successfully deal with so large a number of subjects and to successfully enact them into law before the end of the present session, if it were not that I have from either to-day's or yesterday's Washington Post, I believe, another article, which shows the new régime, the new methods through which the Government of the United States proposes hereafter to swiftly enact legislation. Our very short-sighted forefathers, in framing the Constitution, supposed that they had correctly laid down the framework of this Government when they set up the President and gave him a very short command, to wit: That he should see to the execution of the laws; and when they, in an enumeration of the powers, conferred upon the two branches of Congress all the legislative power, and when they went further and marked out the line of division so that there should never be the transgression by one into the field of the other.

But that seems to be all changed; and I see by a statement which came out in the Washington Post this morning, the correctness of which we can not doubt, because it has gotten so that no man would dare to publish anything in the newspapers and attribute it to the President of the United States unless it were true, and scarcely then, because he would be liable to be met by a denial which he could not himself stand up against—but here, Mr. President, is the statement of a law which has been framed for enactment by Congress. It is with reference

to that that I say I have been encouraged to believe that whether I favor all these measures or not, the great majority of the two Houses would be able to cope with them in a very short time because of the great assistance and guidance they get in the consideration and construction and preparation of these laws and in the direction as to the passage thereof.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a historical question?

Mr. BACON. I am not sure I can answer it. I may have to refer to the Senator from Massachusetts. But I will do my best.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is there a campaign going on now in Georgia?

Mr. BACON. I do not think there is, and I do not see much prospect of any.

Here is what the Washington Post published this morning of the preparation of a law which we are informed is soon to be passed. It is not simply to be introduced, but the command has gone forth that it is to be passed. Even the Representative who is to introduce it is designated. It is already arranged for. I will read it:

In pursuance of the recommendation made to Congress by the President in his last annual message, and also in the special message which he transmitted to that body several weeks ago, a bill will be introduced in the House by Chairman HEPBURN, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, providing for radical modifications of the Sherman antitrust law. This measure is now being drawn up, and its general provisions have been determined upon—

Mark the words—

at a series of conferences held at the White House, at which were represented the Government and the various interests affected. The concluding session was held last night.

Representing the Administration were the President, Secretary of State Root, Attorney-General Bonaparte, Secretary of Interior Garfield, and Commissioner of Corporations Smith; Victor Morawetz, general solicitor of the Santa Fe Railroad, and F. L. Stetson, one of the counsel for J. P. Morgan & Co., the New York bankers, were there in the interest of the railroads and industrial and financial combinations; President Samuel Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, was present for organized labor, and former Mayor Seth Low, of New York, represented the Civic Federation, which has been active in harmonizing the relations between capital and labor.

At former conferences there were present men prominent in the business and financial world, such as E. H. Gary, the dominating factor in the steel trust; George W. Perkins, a partner of J. P. Morgan, and others.

I hope Senators will carefully mark the fact that as the culmination of a series of conferences, when the final features of the bill were determined upon, when its limitations were marked out, and when even the gentleman who was to introduce it into another House was selected, in all the enumeration of those who were present, there is not a single Senator or Representative—not a single Senator or Representative in a series of consultations as to a law to be passed by Congress. Does any Senator doubt the correctness of that statement? Is there any Senator who has in his heart an instant of hesitation in the belief of the correctness of it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator from Georgia prepared to express regrets that he was not invited?

Mr. BACON. If I were, the regrets would be in vain, because I am never invited and I never expect to be. I have no right to expect to be. But I do say this: The Senator from Rhode Island had a right to expect to be invited, and the two Senators from Maine and every other Senator on the other side of the Chamber had a right to expect to be invited, even if those of my heretical political faith were excluded.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. Are we to understand from the statement the Senator from Georgia has made, that every Senator on this side had a right to expect to be invited to such a conference, that, in his opinion, legislation should be framed in the White House in the manner suggested in the article rather than in the halls of Congress by the men elected to legislate for the country?

Mr. BACON. I accept the reproof, a proper reproof, which the Senator from Ohio gives me, and I can only excuse myself by the fact that this usurpation—because that is the smallest word that will apply to it—the assumption and the usurpation of the right of the executive department to dictate legislation has been going on not only so unblushingly, but so boastfully,

that we have become accustomed to it, and even one like myself, indignant beyond the expression of words that such should be the fact, was betrayed into the error from which the Senator from Ohio so correctly calls me back to the proper limitations.

Mr. President, it is not simply in the framing of law. It is in the dictation of law; and it is not simply there. Senators will pardon me if I say it. I recollect some months ago reciting in this Chamber a little experience I had had in which I had seen the passage of laws in the halls of the congress of another government, where there never had been a vote in the negative in the several visits I made to that hall and never a word said in debate, and where, as an explanation to me, a member of that house had said that there was nothing to debate about and nothing to vote against, because the laws had been sent to them by the President. Mr. President, I do not believe what I am going to tell now—at least I trust it is not yet true—but nevertheless it is the truth that I heard it, that in speaking along this line and expressing wonder that legislators in the American Congress would submit to such usurpation as we have witnessed, it was said to me by a Member of this Senate that there was a power—I will not say what it was—that could defeat any Senator or any Representative of his reelection. I want to say in this connection that in that same country where I saw laws passed without a word and without a negative vote it is true the chief executive officer of the country designates who shall come to congress and who shall not come to congress.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is that Mexico?

Mr. BACON. I decline to answer the question, because it would not be proper for me to answer it. I will not specify the country. But there is such a country, and I myself have been there and seen it and heard these things which I now narrate.

Mr. President, that is the fate which awaits us if we are to progress along present lines. That is the fate which awaits the American people if it be true that the Executive can be closeted with parties representing certain interests, and can frame laws in their interest and send them here and they can be passed at his bidding.

Mr. President, possibly I owe an apology to the Senate. I had no expectation of being led into saying all that I have. Possibly some things I have said are imprudent or impolitic to be said. Nevertheless they are true.

Mr. TILLMAN. Before the Senator from Georgia takes his seat I should like to ask him whether or not it ever entered his mind that this alleged conference—I have been called down recently about my bluntness and directness and warned that I ought not to blurt out things at first hand; so I am getting a little cautious. I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks this interview or conference, whether actual or alleged, indicates a determination to coerce or compel or persuade our brethren on the other side to pass such a law or such a series of laws, or whether it indicates that the President himself, after out-Heroding Herod in the denunciation of the predatory rich, after exciting the admiration of the unthinking throughout the land as to his being the last and the only honest man and patriot, is at this very moment making his peace with these captains of industry with a view to have them cease their opposition to the nomination of his lieutenant or of himself in June?

Mr. BACON. I will not express any view on that point, because I have no right to without further information.

Mr. TILLMAN. Could not the Senator guess? I guessed as soon as I read it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BACON. I prefer to state facts rather than to attribute motives.

I will state another fact which is a very remarkable one. I have been chided by some of my friends for having apologized for what I have said. I apologized to the Senate for my possibly undue vehemence, but I coupled that apology with the statement that what I have said, while it might be imprudent or impolitic, was true. To that extent—

Mr. TILLMAN. Why imprudent if it is true?

Mr. BACON. Possibly it may not have been imprudent. We will pass that by. But in addition I want to say this, that it is not simply in the matter of framing legislation that we find these conferences. If the newspapers are correct, some months ago, when it was proposed by the greatest trust in the United States—certainly one of the greatest trusts in the United States, and one, by the way, that has never been proceeded against—to take over a competing iron and steel industry of large proportions in the South, and before it was done those who were about to accomplish it came to the White House and had it well understood beforehand that they would not suffer any prosecution—I will not use the word "prosecution," because

I do not know that that word was used, but that there would be no outcry, no condemnation of it if it was done—and in a few days thereafter it was done. We have heard no single word of condemnation of it. It may be that that is an absolute, utter untruth as published by the newspapers. I can only repeat that it was published in the newspapers, and I give credence to it because we have been led by our experience to know that when anything is charged, we will say, if it is not true, there is no delay in the denial of it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask whether or not in this case about which the Senator has just spoken, of the steel trust taking over the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company—

Mr. BACON. Yes; that is what I mean.

Mr. TILLMAN. At the show down did not Mr. Garfield get an order from the White House to go and investigate it?

Mr. BACON. I have not been so informed if he did.

Mr. TILLMAN. Wonderful! Wonderful!

Mr. BACON. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina if he has any such information?

Mr. TILLMAN. I have never heard of it myself, but, then, I have seen so many instructions to Mr. Garfield to investigate this trust or that, or the iniquity of this millionaire or that multimillionaire, that of course I take it for granted that some secret order was issued to that effect, and we will get the fruits after a while in a report.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about labor on the Isthmus of Panama. The Commission reports that all skilled labor comes from the United States, and then it gives a list of the men and their pay. Common engineers on a steam shovel get as high as \$210 a month. The man who handles the crane gets \$185 a month. Recently there was a general strike there, and a large number of men who had been getting those salaries left the canal work. Practically all of the skilled labor comes from the United States and is on a list called the gold list.

Mr. McLAURIN. Does the Senator state that there is a law requiring that the skilled laborers shall be citizens of the United States?

Mr. TELLER. No, sir; there is none that I am aware of.

Mr. McLAURIN. That is a regulation of the Commission?

Mr. TELLER. No. They take those who come and are qualified, and the Commission says the skilled labor comes from the United States. I do not myself believe that any common labor in this country, including the colored people, if they go there, will remain any length of time. The common Jamaica negro will not do as much in three days as a common white man will do in one up here. I do not believe any white man will work there for any length of time.

I have some knowledge of ancient conditions on the Isthmus, when the railroad was built. When I was quite a young man a large number of young men from my neighborhood in western New York went down to work on the railroad. I would not undertake to say how many, but I should say several dozen of them went from the neighborhood in which I lived. Some of them I had personal acquaintance with and some I had not. I have recollection of but one of them returning. They died off there in a way that was simply frightful. Now the condition is not so bad there. It is better than it was then. But there is not a white man there who does not now take his preventive medicine practically every day. It is no place for common American laborers to go, and they would not go there if they were invited to go.

Mr. President, I am one of the few men on this side who voted that we should buy our supplies in the United States. I made a statement then. I had two reasons for it. In the first place I have always believed in patronizing American industries. I believe in home industries. I made another statement which I am going to repeat. I said I believed practically all of the benefits which would be derived from the canal would be the market there for American products, and I do not intend to deny the American producer that market, if I can help it.

Mr. FRYE. I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia as a separate section.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Bacon] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section the following:

Sec. 2. That in every such contract the party, or parties, bidding on the same shall be authorized to submit bids to deliver said material and equipment, in the alternative, either—

1. On docks within reach of the ship's tackle at seaports of the United States, named by the bidder.

2. On docks, at the option of the bidder, at Colon or La Boca (1) in ships of American register; (2) in ships of foreign register.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of moving that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next. But I think the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Aldrich] has a proposition with regard to the currency bill which he desires to present to the Senate, so that for the moment I will withhold the motion.

GEORGE S. PATTEN.

Mr. FLINT. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 17277) for the relief of George S. Patten, of Williams, Coconino County, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to issue a deed of conveyance to George S. Patten to the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter and lots 1, 2, and 3 in section 18, township 23 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona Territory.

Mr. KEAN. Inasmuch as we have had some trouble to-day about the granting of land, I suggest that the report be read.

Mr. FLINT. I can make a statement which I think will enlighten the Senator.

This piece of land was filed upon by Mr. Patten fourteen days before the land was, by proclamation, made a forest reserve, and the settler remained upon the land for five years without notice from the Land Department. Then he made an application for a patent, and he ascertained that the land was within a forest reserve. The recommendation of the Land Department is that the bill be passed and the title be granted to Mr. Patten.

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

COMPANIES B, C, AND D, TWENTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move an executive session.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a moment in order that I may get an order for printing?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. There seems to be a large demand for a document which has not yet been printed, so I can not give its number. But it is the document authorized yesterday or the day before at the request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]; that is to say, the one containing the President's messages and the reports of the committee on the Brownsville affray. I ask the adoption of the order I send to the desk.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That there be printed and bound in paper covers, 10,000 copies of Senate Document No. —, Sixtieth Congress, first session, relating to the Brownsville affray.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. TILLMAN. 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 five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1908, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13, 1908.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

James M. Shoup, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for the first division of the district of Alaska. A reappointment, his term expiring June 5, 1908.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Daniel McArthur to be postmaster at Glencoe, Cook County, Ill., in place of Daniel McArthur. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1908.

MAINE.

Harry P. Jameson to be postmaster at Cornish, York County, Me. Office became Presidential July 1, 1907.

MISSOURI.

Charles L. Harris to be postmaster at Harrisonville, Cass County, Mo., in place of Charles L. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1906.

George H. Kunkel to be postmaster at Mexico, Audrain County, Mo., in place of George H. Kunkel. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1908.

NEVADA.

Q. W. Hull to be postmaster at Ely, White Pine County, Nev., in place of William B. Graham, resigned.

NEW YORK.

Joseph J. Keenan to be postmaster at Potsdam, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., in place of Merrill Hosmer. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1908.

Charles H. Whitson to be postmaster at Briarcliff Manor, Westchester County, N. Y., in place of Charles H. Whitson. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1908.

OHIO.

Samuel Bailey to be postmaster at Beverly, Washington County, Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1908.

Lewis Nikolaus to be postmaster at New Matamoras, Washington County, Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1908.

Henry B. Wisner to be postmaster at Berea, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, in place of Henry B. Wisner. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1907.

OREGON.

Alfred F. Linegar to be postmaster at Coquille, Coos County, Oreg., in place of Alfred F. Linegar. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1908.

John F. Miller to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Jackson County, Oreg., in place of John F. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1908.

Alonzo M. Woodford to be postmaster at Medford, Jackson County, Oreg., in place of Alonzo M. Woodford. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1908.

RHODE ISLAND.

John A. Allen to be postmaster at Peace Dale, Washington County, R. I., in place of John A. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1907.

TEXAS.

Joseph W. Barber to be postmaster at Ranger, Eastland County, Tex. Office became Presidential January 1, 1908.

John J. Bartlett to be postmaster at Hughes Springs, Cass County, Tex. Office became Presidential January 1, 1908.

VERMONT.

Herbert E. Taylor to be postmaster at Brattleboro, Windham County, Vt., in place of Herbert E. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1908.

WASHINGTON.

William R. Baker to be postmaster at Colville, Stevens County, Wash., in place of William R. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1908.

Fred E. Kirby to be postmaster at Friday Harbor, San Juan County, Wash. Office became Presidential January 1, 1908.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1908.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, WITH RANK FROM FEBRUARY 14, 1908.

Corps of Engineers.

Cadet Glen Edgar Edgerton.
Cadet Charles Lacey Hall.
Cadet Virgil Lee Peterson.
Cadet George Rodman Goethals.
Cadet John Wesley Niesz Schulz.
Cadet Clarence Lynn Sturdevant.
Cadet Earl James Atkisson.
Cadet Richard Tide Colner.
Cadet Robert Starrs Aloysius Dougherty.

Field Artillery.

Cadet William Eugene Dunn.
Cadet James Henry Burns.
Cadet Everett Strait Hughes.
Cadet Thomas Jefferson Smith, jr.
Cadet Roger Sheffield Parrott.
Cadet Telesphor George Gottschalk.
Cadet Harvey Douglas Higley.

Coast Artillery Corps.

Cadet Halvor Geigus Coulter.
Cadet West Chute Jacobs.
Cadet James Wilbur Lyon.
Cadet Harold Geiger.
Cadet Rodney Hamilton Smith.
Cadet Albert Lawrence Loustalot.
Cadet Richard Donovan.
Cadet Sanderford Jarman.
Cadet Clair Warren Baird.
Cadet Edward Willis Putney.
Cadet Gilbert Marshall.
Cadet Louis Lindsay Pendleton.
Cadet Thomas Alexander Terry.
Cadet Edward Nicoll Woodbury.
Cadet Ray Longfellow Avery.
Cadet Edward Alexander Stockton, jr.
Cadet James Hutchings Cunningham.
Cadet Your Montefiore Marks.
Cadet Allison Barnes Deans, jr.

Cavalry.

Cadet Lawrence Wright McIntosh.
Cadet Richard Edgar Cummins.
Cadet Robert Clive Rodgers.
Cadet Philip Gordon.
Cadet Alexander Long James, jr.
Cadet John Thomas Kennedy.
Cadet Horace Meek Hickam.
Cadet Homer McLaughlin Groninger.
Cadet Charles Shattuck Jackson.
Cadet Stewart Oscar Elting.
Cadet John Kimball Brown.
Cadet George Washington Beavers, jr.
Cadet Richard David Newman.
Cadet Elbert Lynn Grisell.
Cadet William Henry Garrison, jr.
Cadet Sumner McBee Williams.
Cadet Henry Wallace Hall.
Cadet Edwin Vose Sumner.
Cadet Henry Fairfax Ayres.
Cadet Gibbes Lykes.
Cadet Arthur Earl Wilbourn.
Cadet Nathan Crary Shiverick.
Cadet Ernest Grove Cullum.
Cadet William Walter Erwin.

Infantry.

Cadet Oliver Andrews Dickinson.
Cadet Homer Havron Slaughter.
Cadet Henry Clinton Kress Muhlenberg.
Cadet John Francis Curry.
Cadet James Eugene Chaney.
Cadet William Jay Fitzmaurice.
Cadet Carl Cogswell Oakes.
Cadet Blaine Andrew Dixon.
Cadet Owen Riggs Meredith.
Cadet James Clifford Williams.
Cadet Robert Emmett O'Brien.
Cadet Francis Ludwig Sward.
Cadet Edward Seery Hayes.
Cadet Simon Bolivar Buckner, jr.
Cadet Charles Hartwell Bonesteel.
Cadet Thomas Jefferson Johnson.
Cadet Robert Howe Fletcher, jr.
Cadet Frederick Ambrose Barker.
Cadet Agard Hyde Bailey.
Cadet Chester Amos Shephard.
Cadet George Cleveland Bowen.
Cadet John Hutchinson Hester.
Cadet Franklin Langley Whitley.
Cadet Alfred Harold Hobley.
Cadet Arthur James Hanlon.
Cadet Olin Oglesby Ellis.
Cadet Elmer Cuthbert Desobry.
Cadet Emile Victor Cutrer.
Cadet Harry Bowers Crea.
Cadet Robert Christie Cotton.
Cadet George Barrett Glover, jr.
Cadet Henry John Weeks.
Cadet Roy Alison Hill.
Cadet Arthur Edward Bouton.
Cadet Enoch Barton Garey.
Cadet Leonard H. Drennan.
Cadet Charles Kilbourne Nulsen.

Cadet Lawrence Campbell Ricker.
 Cadet Leighton Wilson Hazlehurst, jr.
 Cadet John Harold Muncaster.
 Cadet Theodore Kendall Spencer.
 Cadet Edwin Martin Watson.
 Cadet Charles Dudley Hartman.
 Cadet Edgar Simpson Miller.
 Cadet Thomas Clement Lonergan.
 Cadet Albert Lee Sneed.
 Cadet Lester David Baker.
 Cadet George Auguste Matile.
 Cadet Walter Reed Weaver.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Lieut. Col. William Paulding, Eighteenth Infantry, to be colonel from March 8, 1908.

Maj. William A. Nichols, First Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 8, 1908.

Capt. Tredwell W. Moore, Twenty-first Infantry, to be major from March 8, 1908.

First Lieut. Reuben Smith, Eighteenth Infantry, to be captain from March 5, 1908.

First Lieut. Chase Doster, Twenty-first Infantry, to be captain from March 8, 1908.

POSTMASTERS.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James W. Johnson to be postmaster at Marion, Marion County, S. C.

Julia M. Merrick, to be postmaster at Walhalla, Oconee County, S. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *March 13, 1908.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, my attention this morning was called to a publication in the Post, under the startling headline "Bribery charge falls." In these days of lightly made charges, when the air is rife with suspicion, I naturally read the article with great interest; and was surprised to find when I had got into it a little way the statements as follows:

Some time ago Mr. SLAYDEN of Texas made a speech in the House in which statements were made that there was in the possession of the Department of the Interior evidence of this misconduct, and that no effort had been made to investigate and punish the guilty if guilt were established. Following this, Mr. TILLMAN offered resolutions in the Senate calling upon the Attorney-General for all information in the hands of the Department of Justice and upon Secretary Garfield for such information as the Department of the Interior might have.

Mr. Speaker, this has reference to improper conduct against a court in the Indian Territory.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that this is not a question of privilege.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to the Speaker if when my name is associated with charges of a serious character against a branch of this Government, that the Secretary of the Interior says is unfounded, is it not a question of privilege?

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the paper has simply made a mistake in the use of my name. Just to whom it refers I do not know. I never heard of the charges; I never heard, in fact, of the court in any specific way until to-day.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware that the other morning paper, the Herald, gives his colleague from Texas, Mr. SHEPPARD, the distinction of making the speech, making one paper say that Mr. SHEPPARD made the speech and the other that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] made the speech, while in fact the speech was printed and was made by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STEPHENS? [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I assume that if the charges were made by any of my colleagues from Texas, it was by

Mr. STEPHENS, who represents the minority on the Committee on Indian Affairs. I want to say for him that he is a man of unusual prudence, and would not prefer charges against any man without foundation. He does not make unfounded statements.

Mr. MANN. In justice to Mr. STEPHENS—

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose this discussion is by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. This is a proceeding by way of unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. Let the RECORD show, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. STEPHENS did not make the charges, but the charges were made in a brief by attorneys in the case, which brief was included in Mr. STEPHENS's speech, and which charges were not vouched for by Mr. STEPHENS at all.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, my only purpose was to acquit myself in the minds of fellow Members of the habit of making charges against public officials that could not be substantiated.

FISH-CULTURAL STATION IN UPPER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file the views of the minority of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the bill (H. R. 13659) to establish a biological and fish-cultural station in upper Mississippi Valley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that matters on the Private Calendar in order to-day shall follow immediately the conclusion of the bill now pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that business in order to-day shall follow the conclusion of the post-office appropriation bill, now pending. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether, if the post-office appropriation bill should be concluded fairly early to-day, the gentleman intends to proceed to-day with the pension business?

Mr. SULLOWAY. We will endeavor to do so if the House will stay with us.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

RETURN OF A BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request from the Senate, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 903) to amend section 2, chapter 433, 30 Statutes at Large, entitled "An act to confirm title to lots 13 and 14, in square 959, in Washington, D. C."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I move 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. 18347, the post-office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the post-office appropriation bill, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of agent and assistants to examine and distribute registry envelopes, agent, \$2,000; chief clerk, \$1,000; one clerk, at \$900; and one laborer, at \$600; in all, \$4,500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that provision creating a new division under the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, late yesterday afternoon I explained that by reason of the change of contracts for the registry envelopes and the stamped envelopes and the official envelopes it becomes necessary to increase the number of these agencies. Under the present law all of the contracts for the manufacture of these three different character of articles were let in one city, the city of Hartford, Conn. Hence but one agency was necessary. By reason of the fact that different contractors have secured the contracts for stamped envelopes and official envelopes, the first being at Dayton, Ohio, and the other at Cincinnati, Ohio, it becomes necessary to continue the agency at Hartford for the registry envelopes. This is not a new agency which is now before the committee, but is merely the same agency that has remained at Hartford for the exam-

ination and distribution of the registry articles. The new agency was the one created for Dayton and Cincinnati, which I explained yesterday.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I withdrew the point of order yesterday on the statement of a member of the committee on this side of the House that the other provision would effect considerable economy in the administration of the office.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The gentleman will appreciate that following the contracts for registry envelopes and stamped envelopes and official envelopes there must be some representative of the Government to examine as to the quality of the paper used and to supervise the distribution. As long as all of those contracts were in one city one agency could supervise all of the contracts, but now there are three different contracts in three different cities. We have created only one additional agency, permitting the Dayton agency to supervise the official envelope contract at Cincinnati. The heaviest part of the three several contracts is the stamped envelope contract, but the registry envelopes are more important than the official ones, and therefore we are obliged to maintain the agency at Hartford.

Mr. TAWNEY. How do the salaries compare with the salaries of the other institutions?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The salaries at Hartford we have reduced, the agent being reduced from \$2,500 to \$2,000, because there is less work for him to perform than when all the contracts were supervised under the one agency.

The salaries of the agency at Dayton are the same as the original agency at Hartford. We made no change in that schedule of salaries because we placed the contract for official envelopes at Cincinnati under the supervision of the agency at Dayton.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What was the amount of saving upon the contract by distributing it among different departments?

Mr. OVERSTREET. As a matter of fact, the increased volume of the business requires a larger appropriation to carry out the contract. I do not recall what the difference was in the bid upon the specific items of the contract. The gentleman realizes that in the registry service the volume of the business actually increases and naturally it requires more money to pay for the contract for that service. But we have reduced the expenses of the agency for the reason that a part of the work which has gone to Dayton and Cincinnati is no longer discharged at Hartford.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is not for service in the city of Hartford?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No; this is at Hartford. This is the agency located at the point where the contract for the registry envelopes is in process of manufacture.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the chairman of the committee whether the work of this agency goes to the extent of examining the character of the paper that is furnished?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. With the view to determining whether it is up to the contract?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to ask also in respect to this matter. I see by the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations, and I know by the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, that both the Bureau of Standards and the Bureau of Chemistry are claiming credit for having detected the fact that paper much below the standard contracted for was being furnished to the Government, and I wonder if it appeared before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads whether both of those Bureaus were really entitled to that credit, and, if not both of them, which one was entitled to it?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I really do not know. So far as the agency at Hartford is concerned, I regret to say that the agent did not discharge his duty as effectually as he ought, and a great deal of paper was passed at a lower grade than should have been accepted. That agent has been removed.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the agent a chemistry laboratory at his command?

Mr. OVERSTREET. They have at Dayton, Ohio, where the contract is located for stamped envelopes and newspaper wrappers. They have a laboratory there by which they can test the quality of the paper.

Mr. SCOTT. At the other places how do they make the test?

Mr. OVERSTREET. At Cincinnati they would make the test from the Dayton agency, and my understanding is that there is also a laboratory at Hartford for the registry office.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentlemen if there is any agency for the inspection of mail bags? The mail bags used by the Government are manufactured in my district, and have hith-

erto been inspected by the local postmaster, assisted by an inspector sent out from the Department here. Only a few months since the local postmaster told me that he had been relieved from the onerous duty, having spent about perhaps a third of his time in the personal inspection of every mail bag that was manufactured.

Mr. OVERSTREET. There is no special distinct agency for that purpose. The inspection of the mail bags is under the direction of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and the work is performed either by the officials of his office or by post-office inspectors who are detailed for that purpose.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to know why these other inspections could not be performed in the same way by inspectors sent out periodically from the Department here.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That would be a very lax method of inspection where the quality of the paper would have to be followed as closely as it does in the manufacture of stamped envelopes and registry matter. It does not require the same technical scrutiny of the material that enters into mail bags.

Mr. PAYNE. He informed me he had to handle every mail bag and look it over and see if it was perfect. Now, it seems to me that there might be a periodical inspection of the paper, and so forth, used in the manufacture of envelopes, and perhaps there would not be the same mistakes or laxity of inspection that have hitherto occurred under the system at Hartford, for instance.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Another thing I would suggest, that in the manufacture of the papers of envelopes and the stamped envelopes and the stamped newspaper wrappers the supplies are sent to the various offices directly from the place of manufacture under the direction of these agencies, while in the case of the mail bags they are sent to a common point, from which they are given distribution.

Mr. PAYNE. I have got the idea that they are distributed from the place they are made.

Mr. OVERSTREET. My understanding is that they are distributed from the repair shop at Washington.

Mr. PAYNE. That is an extraordinary expense that should not be incurred.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The manufacturer pays the expense of delivering them here.

Mr. PAYNE. Why, of course the manufacturer does not do it unless he gets it back from the Government. There is nothing saved in that way. He is not doing it for his health.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, in the latter part of February I received a letter from Mr. John W. Coble, postmaster at Sugar Tree, a town in my district. The letter reads as follows:

SUGAR TREE, TENN., February 21, 1908.

Hon. T. W. SIMS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

FRIEND: Can there be any plan devised to prohibit a rural carrier or a postmaster from selling a money order to a minor for which to buy whisky with when they know that they are buying the order for this purpose?

A large majority of the whisky that comes here is drank by minors. If we could stop them from buying money orders to whisky houses they would only have one other way, and that is to register the money. And if you could stop the money order you could stop the register just the same.

Our citizens are well pleased with the move you have made against whisky, and would be better pleased to have you carry it a few steps farther, as you know that it is dangerous to our boys to have them dabbled with whisky houses.

It was only last evening our rural carrier applied for a money order to be sent to a whisky house. And this was not the worst. The minor is an orphan, his parents both dead, and he is only 16 years of age. Do all you can for us along this line and we are solid for you. Hoping that you may accomplish a great work along this line, I am,

Your friend,

JOHN W. COBLE, Postmaster.

Mr. Chairman, the condition described in the letter from Mr. Coble exists in many places in my district, as well as in many other localities in Tennessee not located in my district. The laws of Tennessee forbid the selling or giving away of intoxicating liquors to minors, but this law is circumvented in the way pointed out by Mr. Coble. I sent Mr. Coble's letter to the Postmaster-General and asked him if he could, by regulation, provide for the situation and prevent the issue of money orders to minors, where it was known to the postmaster issuing the order that it was intended to be used in the purchase of intoxicating liquors.

I further asked him that, if he was not authorized to make such regulations as the situation required without additional legislation, to kindly suggest what legislation was needed. I have just received his reply to my letter, which I now read:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 11 1908.

The Hon. T. W. SIMS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In compliance with request made in your letter of February 25, receipt of which was acknowledged on the 27th ultimo, herewith is returned the communication addressed to you under

date of the 21st ultimo by Mr. John Coble, postmaster at Sugar Tree, Tenn., suggesting that measures be taken to prevent the use of the money order and registry systems by minors in the purchase of intoxicating liquors.

Replying further, I beg to say that, in its judgment, this Department under existing law has no right to intervene by forbidding the use of the money-order and registry systems under circumstances like those stated in your letter and in the communication of the postmaster at Sugar Tree; and that in considering your suggestion as to possible need of additional legislation along this line it is impressed with the impracticability of any measure which would exclude remittances of funds from the ordinary mails in cases of the kind mentioned. If under the law as it stands an order could be issued forbidding the use of the money order and registry systems by minors in negotiating for supplies of interdicted goods, it would still not prevent the transmission of money, checks, or express money orders by them for the same purpose in letters not registered, and in my judgment it would be exceedingly difficult, if at all possible, to frame an act which would stop recourse to this method in cases of this kind and not hinder legitimate or proper use of the mails. It is thought that legislation for the purpose of restraining delivery to minors by carriers (transportation and express companies) of consignments of liquor sent in the form of original packages or otherwise might be of more effect in preventing traffic of the sort referred to in your letter and that of the postmaster at Sugar Tree than any addition to or amendment of the laws governing the use of the mails.

Faithfully, yours,

G. V. L. MEYER.

Mr. Chairman, the reply of the Postmaster-General emphasizes the great importance of such legislation as is proposed in the Littlefield bill, and I take this opportunity to beg of the Judiciary Committee to report that bill or some other that will meet a situation that can be met in no other way.

Mr. HINSHAW. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the provisions of the bill.

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

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to have order and should like to have the attention of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing pending.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I move to strike out the last word. If I can have the attention of the committee, I would like to answer an inquiry that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] made of me yesterday. The committee will remember that I was discussing the question of a reform in our transportation service in hauling public moneys, bonds, and securities, because of the excessive charges paid by the Government and the people. The gentleman from Ohio stated, from general information, of course, that bonds were not hauled in the mails.

Mr. KEIFER. By express from the Treasury to the depository. That is my recollection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact the Register's report, fiscal year 1907, which I have here, contains language very clear and unmistakable. I read from that report, page 461, of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, fiscal year 1907, under the heading "Register of the Treasury," the following:

There was received by registered mail 2,401 packages, containing bonds amounting to \$26,378,651. There were sent from the office by registered mail 4,435 packages, containing bonds amounting to \$53,000,000.

Mr. KEIFER. That has nothing to do with the question I suggested, that of private persons sending bonds.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, that language is all right here.

Mr. KEIFER. That has nothing to do with the question of the Government transmitting bonds from the Treasury to the depositories and from one depository to another.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I said sent in and sent back to the office.

Mr. KEIFER. To the individual.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. These bonds were sent to and from the Register's office by registered mail, and they were Government property or held in trust by the Government and sent to and from by mail.

Mr. KEIFER. It is not Government property at all.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Whether that is true or not these bonds were carried to and from the Treasury by mail. I also find that the expense incurred by the Government in transmitting by express is very large and by mail very small, and that the amount sent by express is very large and that sent by mail is infinitesimal. I find also that the Treasurer of the United States in the transmission of currency backward and forward to the Treasury recommends that it be transmitted by registered mail insured. The national banks, he says, are doing that and the Government should do the same thing, of course to save money, secure of competition, and to give the people clean money, as far as possible.

I also find that we pay for hauling silver dollars by express about \$260,000 annually. Here are the figures right here. I will not take up the time of the committee to read them, but will place them in the Record. I insist again, gentlemen, that we should reform this forty-year-old express contract and refix

these rates and arrange the law to carry a part of these moneys and properties by mail.

As I recall it, we have had a deficiency for the last ten years because of this transportation, each and every year. Now there is practically only one company, the United States Express Company, which extends clear across the continent. All the other intersecting lines, the Adams, the Southern, and the Wells-Fargo, are dominated by this great concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I move to close debate in two minutes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like one minute.

Mr. KEIFER. I should like one minute in reply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit it as a request for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in two minutes, one minute to be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] and the other minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. This report also states that the Comptroller states that it costs the Government \$264,000 for the transportation of standard silver dollars, and he further states that in 1888 we transferred \$28,000,000 at \$1.89, and that in 1907 we transferred \$37,000,000 at a cost of \$2.40. So it seems, Mr. Chairman, that as we give the express company more business to do the charges increase, and the Government foots the bill, not only in the regular appropriations, but by coming in here every year, as I state and charge, calling for a deficiency of \$25,000 or \$30,000. When is this going to stop, Mr. Chairman? Not until Congress takes it up as it should do. [Applause.]

Mr. KEIFER. One minute is abundant time to answer this explanation which does not explain. I referred to the carriage of bonds between the Treasury Department and its depositories; but the gentleman has read a lot of things to show that the people of the United States use the mails. I never controverted that.

The gentleman is mistaken about the amount of money that is appropriated from year to year to carry silver dollars. Since I have been recently in Congress \$125,000 annually has been the limit, and for this year only \$50,000 has been appropriated.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 24 of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment that was offered yesterday and objected to because it was not understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to page 24 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the proposed amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. The amendment I propose is in the paragraph found in the bill on page 24, following the word "dollars," in line 8, and striking out in that paragraph, beginning with the word "deposited," in line 11, to the end of the paragraph, and substituting therefor the words "covered into the Treasury of the United States," so that it will read:

That hereafter all moneys recovered or collected on account of loss of first-class domestic registered matter which in the course of adjustment are not restored to the original owners, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 8, after the word "dollars," strike out all of lines 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, and insert in lieu thereof the words: "That hereafter all moneys recovered or collected on account of loss of first-class domestic registered matter which in the course of adjustment are not restored to the original owners, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to the page indicated for the purpose of offering this amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether the verb in line 10 should not be "is" instead of "are?" Does it not refer to the domestic registered matter which, in the course of adjustment, is not restored to the original owner? I do not want to have a grammatical error here, which might lead to the provision being held to be unconstitutional. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. No; the subject of the verb is the word "moneys," in line 8.

Mr. OVERSTREET. If the gentleman from Wisconsin assumes the responsibility for the grammar, I shall not worry about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I will assume the responsibility, inasmuch as I had the privilege of drafting it in the original bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Wisconsin informs me that the moneys that are collected are not collected by reason of any existing law, but are fines arbitrarily imposed by the

Post-Office Department upon the clerks who it is claimed are negligent, and as a result of which these registered packages are lost.

Section 4050 and section 4059 of the Revised Statutes expressly provide that all fines and penalties imposed for the violation of the postal laws shall be covered into the Treasury. Upon the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, that these fines and penalties are not imposed because of any law, but because of the arbitrary action of the Post-Office Department, I am withdrawing the objection previously made. I believe that moneys collected, no matter how, should not be held by any official, but should be turned into the Treasury, only to be appropriated by Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think the present statute covers the case, and therefore I offered the amendment.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a page of the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1907, and, as I understood, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] said we paid only about \$25,000 a year for the transportation of silver coin.

Mr. KEIFER. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. KEIFER. I said the appropriation was \$125,000 a year for the carriage of silver dollars.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All right; I will reply to that.

Mr. KEIFER. For this year, and that the appropriation was only \$50,000 for next year.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All right. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary says:

The circulation of silver dollars at the end of July, 1904, was \$70,581,561, and at the end of June, 1907, \$81,710,444, or an increase of \$11,128,883, which represents the results accomplished by the distribution of \$124,051,692 of these coins in the meantime at a total expense to the Government of "264,838" for "transportation charges." It will readily be seen that the average expense attending the increase in circulation was at the rate of \$23.80 for each \$1,000.

This same report, in a table on the same page, says that in 1888, when the Department transported \$28,000,000, the rate was \$1.80 per \$1,000. When the Department transported \$37,000,000 in 1907 it cost \$2.40 a thousand. The more these express companies are given to haul, the greater the rate they charge.

Now, that plain language read from page 14 of this Republican report, the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, shows these facts. I am satisfied that the gentleman from Ohio has not studied this question closely, or he would be for this reform. And I am reasonably certain that after I have brought it to his attention sharply he will use his great mind, he will use his great body, and use his great eloquence in making his committee bring in a reform measure that will stop the robbery of the American people and the American Treasury by this express octopus that hauls these coins. [Applause.]

I will insert the extract from the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1907, as follows:

Attention is invited to the following comparative statement, showing the maximum and minimum circulation and the amount distributed at the expense of the Government during each fiscal year for the past twenty years:

Standard silver dollars.

Fiscal year.	Maximum circulation.		Minimum circulation.		Distributed at expense of Government.	
	Month.	Amount.	Month.	Amount.	Amount.	Rate per \$1,000.
1888	November	\$64,261,714	June	\$55,545,303	\$28,953,654	\$1.89
1889	December	60,779,321	do	54,417,967	26,427,496	1.99
1890	do	61,296,501	July	54,220,255	27,283,457	1.99
1891	do	67,547,023	do	56,981,298	29,299,237	1.89
1892	November	62,097,204	June	53,799,484	24,614,586	1.93
1893	December	62,822,936	do	57,029,743	27,098,582	1.84
1894	August	61,654,630	do	51,191,377	24,516,980	1.98
1895	December	57,889,090	July	50,959,540	27,155,466	2.01
1896	do	59,205,927	do	51,746,706	28,412,800	1.93
1897	do	58,581,819	do	51,999,797	29,600,035	1.93
1898	do	61,491,073	do	51,655,722	33,270,610	2.26
1899	do	65,183,553	do	57,293,336	33,305,262	2.22
1900	October	71,351,740	do	63,158,273	36,281,791	2.25
1901	December	76,182,326	do	65,759,341	38,338,519	2.12
1902	do	73,239,983	do	66,588,628	40,404,325	1.99
1903	November	78,700,912	do	68,906,465	41,182,154	2.03
1904	December	81,573,223	June	71,313,826	41,032,715	1.93
1905	November	80,522,832	July	70,581,561	44,988,746	1.90
1906	December	83,736,227	do	73,583,898	41,562,828	2.15
1907	do	85,377,835	do	77,115,655	37,500,118	2.40

The circulation of silver dollars at the end of July, 1904, was \$70,581,561, and at the end of June, 1907, \$81,710,444, or an increase of \$11,128,883, which represents the results accomplished by the distribution of \$124,051,692 of these coins in the meantime, at a total expense to the Government of \$264,838 for transportation charges. It will readily be seen that the average expense attending the increased circulation was at the rate of \$23.80 for each \$1,000.

I also insert a kindred table from the same report, in point:

Movement of minor coins.

Office.	Fiscal year 1905.		Fiscal year 1907.	
	Amount.	Expense of transportation.	Amount.	Expense of transportation.
Washington	\$74,719.40	\$1,658.05	\$46,710.25	\$300.22
Baltimore	29,814.00	482.49	28,085.00	353.05
Boston	170,455.00	2,622.60	127,325.00	1,235.65
Chicago	532,233.00	7,643.72	677,424.80	9,153.65
Cincinnati	189,067.80	1,819.26	197,739.25	1,975.50
New Orleans	74,489.00	479.20	50,770.00	594.75
New York	356,005.90	4,982.38	316,870.00	4,214.53
Philadelphia	221,620.00	5,995.60	287,479.40	4,900.30
San Francisco	74,125.00	832.75	147,840.00	1,895.80
St. Louis	299,507.00	5,428.81	303,740.00	5,481.60
Mint, Philadelphia	1,741,492.40	39,426.33	1,435,133.70	*51,920.09
Mint, San Francisco	1,650.00	27.95		
Total	3,762,178.50	71,309.14	3,619,117.40	82,425.14

Office.	First quarter of 1907.		First quarter of 1908.	
	Amount.	Expense of transportation.	Amount.	Expense of transportation.
Washington	\$19,811.50	\$294.17	\$20,087.10	\$338.29
Baltimore	10,230.00	128.50	12,620.00	150.55
Boston	54,040.00	501.30	50,570.00	503.05
Chicago	227,321.00	3,197.02	220,285.00	\$,011.88
Cincinnati	80,834.00	834.09	53,665.00	555.45
New Orleans	44,110.00	510.45	760.00	14.30
New York	118,085.00	1,157.13	90,490.00	957.20
Philadelphia	100,904.40	1,458.79	76,035.00	1,100.04
San Francisco	39,935.00	558.90	37,970.00	499.77
St. Louis	120,245.00	2,461.95	98,575.00	1,687.90
Mint, Philadelphia	177,635.00	*15,162.98	463,395.10	14,478.38
Total	1,002,230.90	26,295.33	1,124,392.20	23,000.71

* The charge against the mint, Philadelphia, covers the expense of transfers from that point to supply other offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For blanks, blank books, printed and engraved matter, binding and carbon paper for the money-order service, \$225,000.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. According to the report of the hearings before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, the division of adjustment of railway mail pay produced before the committee two sets of papers. The first consists of copies furnished by the Second Assistant Postmaster-General specifying the route and the authorization of railroad mail service, and a copy of the letter accepting the same, and a copy of the order authorizing the transportation of mails over the Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburgh Railway Company, and so forth. (Route No. 110255.)

The papers produced show an acceptance of an offer by the railroad company and an order establishing the service February 13, 1905, and yet on page 303 of the hearings is a statement of what purports to be an order of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General that from July 1, 1901 (three years and a half before the service was instituted), to July 30, 1905, the Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburgh Railroad Company is to be paid quarterly for the transportation of the mails between Ridge Junction and Iselin, Pa., at the rate of \$824.22 per annum, being \$42.75 per mile for 19.28 miles, and so forth. It seemed to me a most startling proposition that payment should be given to a railroad company for three and a half years before any service was rendered, and at a rate of compensation in excess of that agreed upon, to continue from the date of establishment to the end of the period.

I accordingly called at office of the chief of the railway adjustment division and saw the record of order No. B 5667, contained in daybook 142, and according to the record that order reads from July 1, 1905, to June 13, 1909, and therefore there was no such case of maladministration as is presented by the order as printed on page 303 of these hearings. It seems to be but simple justice to the Post-Office Department, particularly to W. S. Shallenberger, then Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and to this House that this explanation should be made. The question is very naturally suggested, whether an inquiry as to the manner in which this gross error occurred, whereby injustice is done by the appearance of crime being cast upon Department officials, and the House and country are deceived, may be made. If the perversion was malicious, the author of the misstatement should be severely punished. These

official reports from Departments ought to impart verity and be such that we may rely upon them. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, just a word. The criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER], which undoubtedly leaves it to be inferred that the committee in its hearings is responsible for this error—

Mr. WANGER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not mean to charge or insinuate that.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I say the gentleman's language leaves that impression.

Mr. WANGER. It may be that my language was unhappy; the idea was not in my thought.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I merely wish to say that in all the hearings that the committee has of Department officials we invariably follow the practice of permitting the officer who has appeared before the committee to revise the stenographer's minutes, and if there are any errors or misprints, as finally printed, it is quite as much the error of the Department in not carefully examining the stenographer's minutes as anybody else.

Mr. WANGER. May I add that Mr. Stewart declared that the error must either have been the error of the clerk in the Department or an error in the Government Printing Office? He imputed nothing to the committee, and I did not intend to impute any connection with the error or responsibility for it to the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Supplies for the city delivery service, including letter boxes, letter-box fasteners, package boxes, posts, furniture, satchels, straps, baskets, time cards, time-card frames, time-recorder supplies, maps, transfer designs, and stencils, \$90,000.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 24, after the word "dollars," add the following: "Provided, That letter carriers may be permitted to use other straps than those supplied by the Government if they prefer them, and buy and pay for them out of their own money."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I wish first, if I can get the attention of the committee, to say a few words about this amendment on its merits. Mr. Chairman, the request embodied in this amendment does not impose upon the Government one dollar of expense in any possible way. It does not subject the Government or the Post-Office Department to any possible risk of expense in any way. The Government now buys its supplies. All of the straps are alike. They are single straps, and for a right-handed man the pouch is at the right side.

The single strap goes over his right shoulder and is fastened to the pouch. A man named Frank A. Felts, in my district, made this strap which I have in my hand. It is a double strap, and it goes over both shoulders.

Mr. MURDOCK. As a matter of fact, does it go over the head as the gentleman has placed it upon himself? Does it not go over one arm?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Of course all carriers are not as large as I am, and it will fit some better than it fits me. I went to the Department and asked simply this, that men who have tried this strap, and who like it, and who want to use it and are willing to buy and pay for it out of their own money, be permitted to buy and pay for it out of their own money and use it. My request was denied on the ground that it did not give satisfaction; that it was tried out in Baltimore and also in Washington, and the postmaster of Baltimore and the assistant postmaster of Washington said it did not give satisfaction. I have a letter from an eminent physician and surgeon in my district, Dr. Martin Cavanaugh, and he says that he has tested this strap and that it equalizes the weight, putting exactly half on each shoulder, and that it tends toward health, because it permits a man to carry his load and stand up straight. I have the letters of thirteen or fourteen men who have used this strap. One of them used it for eight months and another for nine months, and others have used them for different periods. I have letters from various carriers in our State and also from the State of Pennsylvania, and they all say that they would not do without this strap, even though it cost several times as much as it does. It can be bought for a dollar or less. It seems to me there can be no question about the merits of this proposition. I do not ask any man to wear this strap who does not want it. I do not ask the Government to adopt it. I do not ask the Government to recommend it. I simply ask that any man who is willing to pay 60 or 70 cents or a dollar for it be permitted to buy it, if it helps him, makes it easier for him to carry his load.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported, and then I hope the gentleman from Indiana will withdraw his objection.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment does not apply to that particular strap, but to any strap?

Mr. DRISCOLL. To any strap.

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

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If this provision should become the law, would not the effect be that the people behind this strap and the people behind other straps would instantly commence to flood the mails and send to every letter carrier in the United States glowing descriptions, telling them how they would preserve their length of years and health by the purchase of those straps?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I do not think so.

Mr. MANN. Would not a great many letter carriers, believing the glowing descriptions, purchase a strap which the Government officials think is no better than the strap that the Government furnishes?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I do not think so—first, because there is not money enough in it, and second, because a variety of straps can not be made. You have got to have a strap that goes over one shoulder or over both shoulders. What difference if the men want to buy them and pay for them?

Mr. SULZER. Is that a patented strap?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it is. I am not sure about it.

Mr. WANGER. Does your amendment permit the carrier to wear the strap irrespective of the discretion of the Postmaster-General or whatever wishes he has in the matter, or does it only permit him to purchase and use the strap with his permission?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I dare say if this amendment is adopted the Department will permit the men to buy this strap or any other strap in use, provided they pay for them.

Mr. WANGER. Would not your amendment compel the Department to permit the carriers to wear this or any other form of strap that the carrier's idiosyncrasies might lead him to select?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am not sure about that. It is not a question of idiosyncrasy. When a man has to carry a load of 50 pounds he wants to carry it in the easiest possible way. He wants the burden on both shoulders, if he can have it, instead of on one shoulder. As it is now, a man can not walk up straight under the heavy load, but by the use of this strap he could do it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not a fact that the principal objection of the Department in adopting this strap is its cost—that it would cost so much that there would be very serious objection to its being adopted for general use?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The letter I received from the Department, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put in the Record as a part of my remarks. I received permission from the Department to do so. I also ask permission to put the letters from those men who used this strap in the Record as a part of my remarks. I have permission from the men to do so.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand your theory is, inasmuch as the carrier must carry the load and not the Department, that the carrier's wishes in the matter and his convenience ought to be consulted rather than that of the Department?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I certainly think so. If, for instance, the Department should prescribe a certain kind of shoe, and that a man could not wear the kind of shoes prescribed without difficulty and discomfort, he should be permitted to purchase shoes that do not hurt him, especially if he pay for them with his own money.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

UNITED STATES POST-OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., August 6, 1907.

Hon. F. H. HITCHCOCK,
First Assistant Postmaster-General.

SIR: Complying with the instruction contained in your letter of June 17 last, the two samples of the Felts shoulder straps were used by several of the carriers of this office with the result that the straps proved to be uncomfortable, continually getting under the collar and pinching the flesh.

The continual shifting of the satchel when filled with mail caused the wheel to slip from the chain. These straps are too heavy of construction and have proven to be generally unsatisfactory. They do not equalize the weight of the satchel. The chain of one strap broke on the sixth day of its use; the other strap has been in use since June 22. Both are being forwarded to the Department under separate cover.

Very respectfully,

POSTMASTER,
By MADISON DAVIS,
Assistant Postmaster.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
Baltimore, Md., September 11, 1907.

Hon. F. H. HITCHCOCK,
First Assistant Postmaster-General, Free Delivery System.

SIR: Under date August 9th ultimo (DH) there was forwarded to this office a sample of the Felts shoulder strap for use by carriers, which was directed to be placed in experimental service at this office and report submitted. This has been done thoroughly and carefully; the result is unfavorable. While it might be advantageous to adopt some method of supporting the weight of carriers' satchels from both instead of but from one shoulder, the device submitted is insusceptible of adjustment to different sizes and shapes of figures; it is heavy; it confines the free action of the body; it causes the wearer to suffer from the heat, and its metal traveling wheel and chain may be expected to wear uniforms rapidly.

The device has been tried by quite a number of the carriers at this office, and their reports are unanimously disapproving, in which conclusion I concur.

The sample is returned under separate cover.

Very respectfully,

W. HALL HARRIS, Postmaster.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF FIRST POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, December 18, 1907.

Mr. F. A. FELTS, Oneida, N. Y.

SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 9th instant requesting that you be permitted to furnish a number of the Felts shoulder straps for trial by the carriers of the Washington, D. C., post-office.

In reply you are informed that a thorough test of your shoulder strap was recently made by the Department, in which it was demonstrated that it was not superior to the one now being used by the carriers, which can undoubtedly be purchased at less cost.

In view of the information obtained by the Department, it is not deemed advisable to have a further test made.

Respectfully,

F. H. HITCHCOCK,
First Assistant Postmaster-General.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, January 12, 1908.

Hon. M. E. DRISCOLL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to your recent call with reference to the Felts shoulder strap and to your request that you be advised whether carriers would be permitted to use such shoulder straps if purchased by themselves, I have to inform you that inasmuch as a thorough test of these straps by the Department has demonstrated that they are not superior to those now being used and that they do not equalize the weight on both shoulders as claimed, it has been decided that it would be inadvisable to permit of their use by carriers.

In compliance with your request, I inclose copies of the unfavorable reports received concerning the shoulder strap in question.

Very truly, yours,

F. H. HITCHCOCK,
First Assistant Postmaster-General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1908.

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,
First Assistant Postmaster-General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have received yours of the 22d instant declining to permit letter carriers to use the Felts shoulder strap if they purchased it themselves, and also the copies of unfavorable reports as to the same.

I have read and can submit many testimonials in favor of this strap, and had them with me when I called at the Department, and can submit them at any time if you will consent that this matter be opened up for reconsideration.

If I were asking the Government to buy these straps or for anything which would cause the Government or Department any expense or any risk of expense I would not be surprised at my request being denied, for the Department should move as conservatively and economically as possible. But all I have asked is that men who know this Felts strap and like it and prefer it to the other may be permitted to buy and use it. If, with respect to them, it eases the load or causes it to bear on both shoulders instead of one, or make their work easier, it seems to me permission should be granted to them to do so.

I remain, very truly, yours,

M. E. DRISCOLL.

SYLVAN BEACH, N. Y., February 11, 1907.

Mr. FRANK A. FELTS, Oneida, N. Y.

SIR: The Felts double shoulder strap sent me for inspection and experiment I herewith return. I am pleased to report to you that the end sought by you in this device, that of distributing the pouch load between the two shoulders of the body, has been fully achieved. With a pouch loaded with 50 pounds weight (which I understand is about the average weight of the ordinary carrier's load), I have weighed the tension on each of the three pouch attachments in your belt, with the following results: Tension on the rear strap attached to the left ring of the pouch, 25 pounds, less 4 pounds friction upon the body; tension on the right and left straps, which are attached to the pulley and right ring of the pouch, I have found to be 12½ pounds each, less a friction of 2½ pounds against the body in each of the two straps, with the body of the carrier perfectly poised. Changes of the position of the body varies the tension of the two front straps, shifting by means of the pulley, from one shoulder to the other, according to the poise or position of the body, thus accommodating the pouch weight carried to the two shoulders of the carrier and maintaining a prac-

tically even pressure upon the anatomical structures of the shoulders and chest, and enabling the carrier to transport his load with about 50 per cent less lateral muscular strain than that required with the two-hooked common strap, which compelled the suspension of the entire burden on the right shoulder and chest structures, and an equalizing muscular counter strain on the muscles of the right half of the body trunk.

The merits of your invention can not but be readily appreciated by all who examine the same, and I predict the early adoption of the double shoulder strap by our Federal postal authorities when they are made aware of its valuable features.

Respectfully, yours,

M. CAVANA.

UTICA, N. Y., December 17, 1906.

Mr. FRANK A. FELTS.

DEAR SIR: I have used your strap for about two months and I do not hesitate to recommend it to all carriers, especially those who are obliged to handle heavy loads.

I have always been troubled with pains in my shoulder, caused mostly from carrying heavy loads with the single straps most carriers are now using. But after using your strap for a short time I was not troubled in this respect, and besides I could carry the load much easier.

The relief I get from the use of your strap is worth more to me than the small amount you ask for them.

I believe that all carriers giving them a satisfactory trial will think as I do.

I am, fraternally, yours,

JOHN F. BRAND.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., January 16, 1907.

FRANK A. FELTS, Esq.

DEAR SIR: I am using the double shoulder strap of your manufacture and like it very much. A heavy load can be carried with much greater ease than with the old style of single strap. It never slips out of position, and the letter bag will not wear the uniform nearly as fast as with the old-style single strap. It is easily adjusted to fit any carrier, and is, in my opinion (after having given it a practical test), a very decided improvement over the old style. I believe that any carrier who has once used one of your double straps on Monday morning will never wish to go back to the old style.

I am, respectfully,

W. P. COUCH,
Carrier No. 50, Rochester, N. Y.

ALLEGHENY, PA., January 19, 1907.

The FELTS DOUBLE SHOULDER STRAP CO.,
Oneida, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I received the strap you mailed me some months ago, and have refrained from answering your former letter as I wished to give it a good trial. Having done so, I find it is about what is needed in the letter-carrying business. It answers the requirements and equalizes the load to a nicety. It is a little awkward at first, but after one becomes used to it he finds that it is about the proper article. Wishing you success in your venture, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

ARCHIE S. NICHOLS,
47 Taggart street.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., December 22, 1906.

FRIEND FELTS: Now have a first time to answer your letter. Several of the boys tried out the strap and think well of it, before a prohibitive order was received. I presume a similar order has been received by Hodge with reference to trying out such things without permission from the Department. I have the strap, awaiting your order. Would suggest that you write direct to the local carriers' association.

Best regards,

S. M. SMITH.

CANASTOTA, N. Y., December 1, 1907.

Mr. FRANK FELTS, Oneida, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have used your patent carrier strap for three months and find that it goes far ahead of my expectations. I would recommend it to any carrier who is looking for something to add to his comfort when carrying a heavy load.

Yours, truly,

JAMES V. KNOWLTON, Carrier No. 1.

Mr. C. A. LEE, Oneida, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: The Felts shoulder strap I find, after a thorough test of several months, to be far superior to the single strap furnished by the Department. With it the load rests evenly on both shoulders and carrying the heavy loads with much more ease. Moreover, the Felts, shoulder strap allows the sack to hang free from the person, thus preventing the wearing of the coat. I would not return to the single strap for double the price of the Felts strap.

Yours, truly,

O. M. YOUNG,
Carrier No. 3, Oneida, N. Y.

DECEMBER 10, 1906.

Mr. C. A. LEE:

After nine months' use of the Felts shoulder strap I find it meets the requirements in handling heavy loads, and the longer I use it the better I like it. I consider it a great boon to letter carriers and would not be without it for ten times the price it cost me.

Yours, sincerely,

U. S. JOHNSTON, Carrier No. 5.

ELMIRA, N. Y., March 3, 1905.

Mr. FRANK A. FELTS, Oneida, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your pouch strap, would say that it is certainly a winner for the comfort of the carriers, equalizing the weight on both shoulders without pressure on the lungs.

Fraternally, yours,

N. EARNEST SPENCER,
Carrier No. 7, Elmira, N. Y.

NOVEMBER 10, 1906.

Mr. C. A. LEE, Oneida, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: It is with much pleasure that I, as one of the carriers in the Oneida post-office, add my name to the list of testimonials relative to the good qualities of "the Felts shoulder strap." Having used

the Felts shoulder strap for the past eight months, I certainly can not speak in too high terms of its superiority over any other strap on the market to-day. For ease and convenience in carrying a heavy load it is not excelled, for it equalizes the weight on the whole body instead of one certain spot, as is the case with all other straps used by Uncle Sam's employees to-day.

I would not be without the Felts strap for fifty times its cost.
Yours, very truly,

PETER E. BIRD,
Letter Carrier No. 2, Oneida Post-Office.

ONEIDA, N. Y., November 10, —.

Mr. C. A. LEE.

DEAR SIR: I have used the Felts shoulder strap for several months, and would not part with it for the price of ten straps if I could not replace it. It equalizes the weight of the load of mail on both shoulders, and it is much easier to carry a heavy load with a Felts shoulder strap than the one furnished by the Post-Office Department. It also minimizes the wear on a carrier's clothes.

Yours, truly,

LEO G. WIXSON,
Substitute Carrier.

ELMIRA, N. Y., March 3, 1906.

Mr. FRANK A. FELTS, Oneida, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your pouch strap, I would say cheerfully, "It is the best ever," and the carrier's friend.

JOHN CRUNSE, No. 12.

ELMIRA, N. Y., February 8, 1906.

Mr. FRANK A. FELTS, Oneida, N. Y.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I have tried your shoulder strap and think it is immense. I could carry a heavy load with double the ease of the old-fashioned arrangement. With best wishes for your success.

I am, yours,

M. BRETT,
Carrier 23, Elmira, N. Y.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I shall before I take my seat again invoke the point of order, which I hope the Chair will sustain. However, I would say just a word upon the merits of the amendment. The amendment would permit the letter carriers to use any kind of a strap which they might desire to use, irrespective of departmental supervision or approval. The language of the amendment is broad enough to quite cover what I have suggested it would cover. There ought to be some sort of uniformity in the character of straps and satchels used by more than 25,000 employees in the service. If you adopt this amendment, it will enable one carrier to take a piece of rope if he desires and use that for his strap, and another one to use a basket or other method for carrying his load. That may be said to be the business of the carrier who must carry the load, and let him answer for the method. But the service, Mr. Chairman, has for many years been developing along lines of uniformity of administration. The Department now has ample authority for the purchase of this or any other strap after it has given the subject care and consideration. The appropriations are under the authority of law for the making of contracts for these supplies, leaving to the Department under the direction of the head of that service the investigation and test of the better devices and methods of meeting the burdens which are placed upon the carriers.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] yield for a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield.

Mr. TAWNEY. If this provision is adopted, the rule of uniformity now prescribed by the Department would be varied only to the extent that a carrier would obtain at his own expense a strap that would afford him more comfort and convenience than the one which is furnished by the Government. So that the "rope" question would not possibly be an objection, because no one would substitute a less convenient method than that furnished by the Department.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the exhibition before the committee of what is regarded as a very excellent device is very fascinating. I do not know when the gentleman from New York was first introduced to this strap; but it has been familiar to me since early last summer, and at my request it was called to the attention of the First Assistant Postmaster-General to see if it would not be advisable to consider bids for its purchase; but the contract then under negotiation was let, and the price fixed by the owners of this strap was too high, in the judgment of the Department, and the strap was not accepted.

Now, are we, by an amendment to the law, to relieve the owners of this particular strap, who have failed to make good in competitive bids, and provide that the carrier may be importuned by the owners of the device and persuaded to purchase it at his own cost? I have no doubt but that this and other devices will be considered from time to time as contracts shall be let, and I hope to see improvements made and the purchase of those devices which will relieve to the utmost the burden upon the carrier. He deserves the aid of the Depart-

ment, Mr. Chairman. He is entitled to the machinery of that great service to discover devices for his relief. Are we to withdraw that aid and to put upon his shoulders not only the burden of the mail, but necessitate him meeting the importunities of all sorts and characters of salesmen for their devices?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist upon his point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The matter is very clear. The amendment proposes a change of existing law, in violation of the rule. The point of order is therefore sustained.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 24, after the word "dollars," add the following:

"Provided, That no part of this appropriation of \$90,000 shall be expended for straps unless letter carriers are permitted to use other straps than those supplied by the Government, if they prefer them, and buy and pay for them out of their own money and at no expense to the Government."

Mr. OVERSTREET. I make the point of order against that amendment. It is subject to the same rule.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Indiana desires to be heard on the point of order, the Chair will first hear him.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I merely want to direct the attention of the Chair to the general law, which puts in the hands of the Postmaster-General authority to purchase these supplies according to his best judgment. Under the act of March 2, 1889, the law provides:

The Postmaster-General may, when in his judgment the good of the service so requires, make contract for necessary supplies for the free-delivery service for a period of four years.

This amendment now offered is to permit the use of straps other than those which the law authorizes the Postmaster-General to purchase.

Mr. DRISCOLL. It is not as broad as that.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is the very language.

Mr. DRISCOLL. It is a limitation on this appropriation.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the doctrine of limitation on appropriations is exceedingly broad and elastic, but I do not think that a limitation which, however circuitous the windings of its devices, can be framed where it really would be of any force unless the law were changed.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to page 356 of the Manual, and to this ruling in the Fifty-eighth Congress. It reads as follows:

While it is not in order on an appropriation bill to require lettering on public vehicles, it is in order to withhold the appropriation from all not lettered.

Now, following that, it would not be in order to offer an amendment that would require that these straps—the Felts straps—be used; but it is in order to withhold appropriations for the purchase of straps which are not double straps, or Felts straps, like this. Now, the greater power includes the less; and if this House has the power to limit the appropriation to the purchase of these Felts straps, certainly it has the power to permit some of these to be used on the election of the men themselves, and it seems to me that it is a clear limitation and not new legislation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while the amendment offered is in the form of a limitation, it seems to me, as a matter of fact, to be a change of law. The law now provides how straps shall be purchased. That is a matter confided to the control of the Postmaster-General. The proposition now is to change that method of providing straps, and authorize the carriers to purchase straps themselves.

No doubt Congress can refuse to make an appropriation for the purpose of carrying out the existing law. They can limit the appropriation in any way they please; but I take it that in limiting the appropriation they can not change the law. We can say, "We will not appropriate," but, as I understand it, we can not say, "We will not appropriate unless the Postmaster-General shall violate the existing law." And that is what this amounts to. It indirectly accomplishes a change of law, because if that provision goes into the bill it will be taken as a direction by the Postmaster-General that Congress has changed the law giving to him the power over the purchase of straps and taken away that power from him and given to the carriers themselves the power over the purchase of straps.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I should like to ask the gentleman if he can distinguish between this amendment submitted by me and the

ruling that I have referred him to, at page 356 of the Manual, where Congress was not permitted to say that all vehicles must be lettered, but it was permitted to say that no money should be spent for vehicles which were not lettered? That is the same question as this.

Mr. MANN. The distinction is just as broad as the Capitol is wide, and the gentleman himself, who is a good student of parliamentary law, would recognize the distinction if he had not offered the amendment. There was no proposition to change the law in the precedent which the gentleman cites.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Were not those things furnished by the Department?

Mr. MANN. That is a matter absolutely in charge of the Government, and no doubt Congress could say here that there should be no strap provided unless it was lettered so and so; but the law now provides who shall have control of the purchase of straps, and the gentleman's amendment proposes absolutely to change that law. It is what it is there for. It is not there for the purpose of limiting the appropriation. It is not there for the purpose of putting a limit in any way upon the expenditure of the appropriation. It is not expected to have anything to do with the appropriation. The gentleman's amendment is offered, under the guise of a limitation, for the purpose of changing the law, and hence is and ought to be obnoxious to the rule, in my judgment.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is there any law saying that the carriers shall use such and such a strap?

Mr. MANN. There is a law providing that the straps for carriers shall be purchased by the Department, and that they shall be used under regulations of the Department.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. There is no law saying that a particular form of strap shall be used?

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is governed by regulation?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the law provides that the Postmaster-General by contract shall purchase the straps and furnish them to the carriers.

Mr. OVERSTREET. And under that law contracts are made for four-year terms. A new contract was made this last fall or the first of the present year.

Mr. DRISCOLL. But this does not affect the making of that contract.

Mr. OVERSTREET. No; but the amendment is obnoxious to the rule which provides that you can not legislate on this bill.

Mr. DRISCOLL. How can it affect the rule or the action of the Department? The Department can buy these straps just the same and go on furnishing them just the same. All we ask is that the individual carriers be permitted to buy these straps or other straps if they want to pay for them and use them. It is simply an alternative. It does not change the functions or duties of the Postmaster-General. It simply says that in a particular case a man may buy a strap and pay for it. It strikes me it is entirely a limitation.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is there any law saying that the carrier must wear the straps which the Federal Government buys for him, or that he shall do it?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I do not think there is any such law. I have not found any.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think that helps to elucidate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Indiana to say that the law now required the use of certain straps.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The law, in effect, places the power in the hands of the Postmaster-General and directs him to make the purchase under four years' contract. This amendment permits the purchase by the carrier, notwithstanding the Postmaster-General's selection. The law is as follows:

The Postmaster-General may, whenever in his judgment the good of the service so requires, make contracts for the necessary supplies for the free-delivery service for a period not exceeding four years.

Under that law a contract has been made and the kind of strap has been chosen. Now, this amendment seeks to give to the carrier the right to choose another strap, a strap other than the one the Postmaster-General has purchased under the contract authorized by the law of March 2, 1889. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the effect of the law is that the Postmaster-General takes the responsibility, conferred upon him by the law, relative to the contracts for the straps and their distribution. The amendment seeks to give the carrier the privilege of selecting for himself, even at his own expense, whatever strap he may care to purchase. I can not read that amendment in any

way at all without its being construed that, no matter what the law is, the carrier may select and pay for his own strap. There is nothing in that amendment which gives the approval even to the Postmaster-General. Regardless of the law, he may select and purchase whatever strap he pleases, while the law directs the Postmaster-General, under the contract, to purchase straps for the carrier. It may be in form a limitation, but it lacks the substance.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, the law does provide that the Postmaster-General may prescribe the kind of uniform that is used by the men, but it does not prescribe or say anything about the strap. The section that has been read simply provides that the Postmaster-General may buy supplies, but it does not mention straps. Congress has been appropriating for supplies year after year, and the Department has bought supplies year after year. Among those supplies are straps. The men furnish their own uniform, and, therefore, the Department prescribes the kind of uniform that they must wear; but it has never prescribed the strap except by buying it—a single strap worn over the right shoulder.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there is no law, or at least I have not heard of any, that says that a letter carrier shall wear the strap that the Government furnishes. I know of no law that says he shall not buy a strap and wear it. He may be a hunchback, he may be lame, he may have only one arm, or be otherwise deformed, and I say that law and conscience and fair consideration would not force him to wear any sort of a strap that the Government might buy. Let him go and buy what suits his own back, what suits his own shoulder, what suits his condition, and let him hang up in the garret the one that the Government buys that does not suit his condition. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The question is a fairly close one; but it seems to the Chair that there is this distinction between this case and the one which has been cited concerning the lettering of vehicles. In that instance there was no law requiring that vehicles should be lettered or prohibiting it; but it was in the discretion of the Department having charge of the vehicles. The proposition which in that case was sustained as in order, as a limitation upon the appropriation, did not control that discretion or change the law. It simply withheld the appropriation for vehicles that were not lettered.

The Chair understands that there is a law on the subject, which vests in the Postmaster-General the authority to provide the paraphernalia which shall be worn by letter carriers. The Chair thinks that this provision, if enacted into law, would be held, and quite properly be construed, by the Postmaster-General, as requiring him to permit the use of straps in the discretion of the carriers themselves, which he is not now required to do. If so, it would not be merely a limitation, but would give him a legal authority, which he does not now possess. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows.

For facing slips, plain and printed, including the furnishing of paper for same; and for card slide labels, blanks, and books of an urgent nature, \$60,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the words "facing slips," line 10, page 26, insert: "and slips for the distribution of weather forecasts on rural free-delivery routes."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is clear that this is subject to the point of order, but will hear the gentleman from Louisiana if he desires to be heard.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the Chair has considered the question, but I ask permission to divert from this and read something which I have hastily prepared.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana reserve his point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WATKINS. I desire to state, Mr. Chairman:

"WHAT IS TO COME."

I.

Upon this floor the other day
The honorable Mr. CLARK
Held Republicans to the light,
And made their party look quite dark.

II.

"Omnis Gallia in tres partes,
Divisa est," we heard him say;
Then into one of the parties
He plunged his two-edged sword to slay.

III.

The "Grand Old Party" is not dead;
The Elephant still has his trunk;
His goods are packed safely away,
Consisting of his flimsy junk.

IV.

At the bottom, prosperity;
On the top they are mostly nix;
All around is adversity,
In the middle of a bad fix.

V.

The tariff is to be reformed;
Hoarded gold is to be dug up;
And a lot of official pap
Will be thrown to the party pup.

VI.

Railroads are to be controlled;
Rebates come to a speedy end;
The thirty-million fine be paid;
The people have a trusted friend.

VII.

Before all this shall come to pass,
The Elephant's trunk, now so full,
Fastened with Democratic rope,
Will be given a hearty pull.

VIII.

His tail will have to get a twist;
He must be punched with a prod,
And must be punished fore and aft
With a stout Democratic rod.

IX.

A Cannon must be first shot off;
Fair banks must then be tunneled through;
The skies must change their azure Hughes,
And Billy Taft put up the dough.

X.

The people must all go to sleep,
Until Gabriel blows his horn;
Americans must sure forget
That William J. was ever born.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines, envelope-opening machines, and computing machines, and for the purchase of copying presses, numbering machines, and miscellaneous articles purchased and furnished directly to the postal service, \$105,000.

Mr. WILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. One day last week I listened with astonishment to the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHANEY]. As is the habit with a multitude of Republican politicians, they conceal from their view the needs of the people and the errors of their party, and then in beautiful, glowing generalities endeavor to beguile the simple voter into believing that black is white and that panic is joyful prosperity. This may have been possible under peculiar conditions in the past, but I am profoundly convinced that in the face of hard facts and dire need even the artful sophistry of Republican past masters can not longer deceive the people. Standing upon the floor of the House with a carefully prepared manuscript in his hand, showing that his remarks were the result of deliberate thought and not the flight of passing fancy, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana stated:

This Republican panic lasted three months; the Democratic panic lasted forty-eight months, just sixteen times longer than the Republican panic. The panic is over now and the country will soon be over the panic.

This statement, made in all seriousness, brought several Members of the House to their feet. The gentleman from Indiana was requested to state the exact date at which the panic terminated, as a great many people in the country labor under the delusion that it is still on. He answered that it ended just three months and one day from the time it started in; and he accounted for the fact that so many people throughout the country are still out of employment by stating that it was because of the necessity of these people making other arrangements, now that they have satisfied the money centers of New York, so that they can get the money with which to continue business. Then the following colloquy took place:

Mr. WILLETT. I will ask the gentleman if he does not consider that the large number of men now unemployed is one of the elements of the panic.

Mr. CHANEY. It is not one of the elements of the panic, but simply one of the results of the panic.

Mr. WILLETT. So, then, the gentleman will have us to understand, when he says that the panic ceased in three months after its inception or beginning, that the panic itself is separate and apart from the results and that we are now suffering the results.

Mr. CHANEY. I mean you to understand that I said that the panic is over and we will soon be over the panic.

Mr. WILLETT. That does not mean anything to me unless you connect the panic with results. A panic means nothing unless we have results. It is the results of the panic that are affecting the people of this country and that is what we are talking about. Now, if you do not mean the effect of the panic on the people, why do you not say so, and say that the results are still upon us and we are still suffering from them and that the cause has ceased?

Mr. CHANEY. I thought I had said something like that for the benefit of the gentleman. I simply said that the panic is over. There are a few places here and there where the effects of that panic will be felt until those people can adjust their conditions and get business going again.

Mr. WILLETT. And you, as a Member of this House, would stand up in front of the bread line in New York City, where thousands of men every night are trying to get stale bread, and tell them, "Gentlemen, the panic is over." Is that what you mean?

Mr. CHANEY. No; I would not go to New York at all, because we are very much afraid of that place.

Mr. WILLETT. You do not have to go to New York, you can go to any large city. But the condition in New York to-day is such as has never been seen in its history before.

Mr. CHANEY. I do not know about that.

Mr. WILLETT. That is what I want to find out, whether you know about it.

This colloquy fairly illustrates the state of mind of a large number of the Republican Representatives who would have the country understand, if it were possible, that the trouble is all over and it is simply a matter of trifling adjustment when prosperous conditions will return. How perfectly absurd it is for a public speaker, before an intelligent audience, to declare that the panic, the distressing effects of which every one of us feels, does not exist. And then, how unreasonable it is, when hard pressed, to sidestep the whole proposition by stating that the panic has ceased and terminated, but the results are still with us. A panic, in the common acceptance of the term, means more than the sudden collapse of public confidence. It means the continued unrest and lack of stability in financial affairs. What need we care for a panic if the bank in which our funds are deposited immediately opens, or the merchant with whom we deal continues to extend credit, or the firm with whom we are employed continues our employment? Panics may come and panics may go, but they will have no biting effect upon us; but if the bank in which our funds are deposited, along with a score of other banks in our city, closes its doors and refuses to honor our drafts and continues closed until this time; if the merchant with whom we deal refuses to extend to us credit, and if our employer is still unable to give us work, would you have me understand that the panic is over? The panic is still on; the full results of this panic are unknown; none but a prophet could tell what they will be. The crisis in some financial institutions may be past, but the panic, in all its unrest, in all its horror, and in all its heart-breaking reality, is still present in the workshop, the store, the office, and the home. Covering up with a multitude of words the extreme need of our constituents will not assist us in affording them relief. Using an expression which the creator of the panic delights to use, "Let us turn on the light," and see what havoc he has wrought. I am not surprised that the meddling Republican President and the time-serving politicians desire with all their hearts and brains to cover up and conceal the wrecks which a fantastic and mischievous Chief Executive has wrought. If what we observe in labor circles and in workmen's homes is an indication that the panic has stopped, we can then understand something of the spirit of the Irishman's remarks when he said, after falling from the roof of a five-story building, that "he did not mind so much the fall as he did the stopping."

There seems to be a conspiracy of silence on the part of the Republican Members of this House on the subject of the cause and effect of the present panic. They have spoken so often to the text "With the Republican party is prosperity and with the Democratic party is panic" that they are at a loss for appropriate words to express their true feelings. They dare not attack the President for fear of his big stick. And why should they? In all fairness, Members who went home to their districts, each with a little piece of the "Roosevelt halo" pinned to the lapel of his coat, and appealed to their constituents to return them to Congress so that the Roosevelt halo could be restored to the President's brow perfect and complete—how can they, in all decency, now come out and condemn and abandon their preserver when he is reaping the reward of his own reckless misconduct? Two years ago business men in this country referred to the President's talk as oratory; now, facetiously, they refer to it as a display of cheap dentistry.

Notwithstanding the fact that the President is a usurper, in that he attempts to control all branches of government.

Notwithstanding the fact that he is imperialistic and arbitrary in his methods and manners, as evidenced by his reference to the constitution of Cuba, an instrument which our Government had helped to frame, on September 28, 1906, when he telegraphed to Secretary Taft, with reference to adjustment of Cuban affairs: "I do not care in the least that such an agree-

ment is unconstitutional." An ancient maxim of benevolent despotism was, "Let my subjects say what they like so long as I do what I like;" but even this privilege is not granted "my people," for we have learned in many different cases that he who differs from our President finds himself involved in great difficulties.

Notwithstanding the President has taken over the supervision of about the whole of life. Though not a lawyer, he criticises the decisions of the United States Supreme Court; though not a business man and never having been engaged in a profitable personal business, he undertakes to direct the most minute details of the business world.

Notwithstanding the President would have "my people" appeal to him personally on every subject. Should a trust be prosecuted? "Ask me," says the President, not the Attorney-General. Should we have other legislation with reference to railroads? "Ask me," and not Congress. Should football be played at the universities? "Ask me," not the faculty.

Notwithstanding his imperialistic methods, as evidenced by the un-American discharge of whole companies of American soldiers without trial, without proof of guilt—a thing which can hardly be realized as possible in America—it sounds more like the edict of an African chieftain or Russian despot than the command of an American President. As evidenced by the suspension of the Mississippi River steamboat pilot, which is also fresh in the minds of all American people and is another demonstration that illustrated the trend of our President's mind.

Notwithstanding the President has done more than all other Presidents and all other public men in the history of the country to shake the confidence of the people in our form of government, and has done more than any one man in our nation's history to destroy legitimate business, shatter confidence among the people, and bring utter panic into every countingroom, factory, shop, office, and home in the land, and has exhibited a greater degree of self-consciousness and egotism, which are the natural results of power and flattery, than any President who has occupied the White House.

Nevertheless, the clarion tongues of the great Republican party are silent; the people's rights may be trampled upon, but party interests must be protected. We hear no protest from them. Occasionally a reckless one steps out and cries: "Peace, peace!" but he soon learns there is no peace.

Since we have become a world power, as described by President Roosevelt, the characteristic conditions of imperialism have been appearing in our own country.

I will recite some of them: It magnifies the executive power; it acts upon the passions of the people; conciliates them in classes and localities by lavish expenditure; it occupies men's minds with display and amusement; it inspires a thirst for military glory; it captures the electorate by false assertions and illusory promises, and then, having by these means obtained control, it crushes opposition and extinguishes liberty. And the irony of the thing is this: That all this is done in the name of the people themselves and under the authority of their voice, so that the people, while boasting of their supreme power, are enslaved. Ask yourselves whether these conditions exist in our country. If the usurpations as I have described pass unchallenged by the people of America, they will soon create the force of precedent. Now is the time, and we are the people to watch with jealousy such beginnings, to indignantly attack them, and, if possible, to destroy them. Wiser words were never spoken than those of President Cleveland: "It is not the business of a government to support its people, but of the people to support the government." The people must fight their own battles for better conditions.

Every time they call upon that great central deity, the President, to fight an evil, they surrender their God-given right to grow strong by fighting it themselves.

By and by, if recent tendencies continue, they will surrender all their duties and all their rights, so dearly bought, to their rulers.

By and by the Government, like that of Germany, will dog the citizen's footsteps at every turn, provide him with old-age pensions, recompense him for all injuries received through negligence, destroy his manhood while alive, and bury him when dead.

After the colloquy that took place between the gentleman from Indiana and myself, and to which I referred a moment ago, I find that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] made some remarks referring to the financial situation in New York.

The gentleman is a Republican and represents one of the New York City districts and should be informed of the true situation in New York. His remarks indicate that he is en-

tirely ignorant of the true situation as it there exists. He says that he has sent out 51,000 letters to his constituents, which letters I understand contained an expression of willingness on his part to assist his constituents in any way in his power, and that of the appeals from men out of work he received fewer than thirty. He also states, for the purpose of indicating further the true situation among the working people in New York City, that the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor has investigated the condition of the homeless men and reports that less than 1 per cent of the homeless men in New York City would work if they could get it, and also, as a further indication of the situation in New York City, he states that for the month of January the postal receipts fell off about 6 per cent as compared with last year, and for the month of February, leaving out the extra day, that the receipts fell off less than 3 per cent, and then in the full flush of his manly independence he declares, "We are not asking any help in New York City or appealing for any charity and do not want anybody's sympathy and have not asked anybody for a public collection." How is that for Republican independence and Republican prosperity? I understand these declarations were greeted with loud applause on the part of the Republican Representatives in the House. Now, let us thoughtfully and deliberately analyze the statements made by my distinguished colleague, Mr. BENNET. In the first place, he says that he wrote 51,000 letters, and that he has received less than thirty applications for work from men who would work if they had it, and that he secured employment for these applicants. What is the logical inference to be drawn from this statement? The inference Mr. BENNET would have you draw is that in the city of New York all men who are willing to work have employment. The difficulty with this statement and the inference drawn from it is that it in no way gives a fair indication of the number of unemployed in the city of New York.

In my own district I have not had more than about fifty direct personal appeals for employment; but without the slightest exaggeration I say to you, as a result of careful investigation, that there are at least 10,000 men in my district who are able and willing to work, but are unemployed. It is therefore perfectly clear that the number of appeals made to him from New York personally is no fair indication of the number of unemployed in his district nor in the city of New York. He submits to us a report of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor upon the condition of homeless men. Any reference I made to the unemployed in the city of New York had no reference to the tramp or ordinary loafer found on the streets of a great city, but did have reference directly to men with homes, men with trades, and men who are willing to work, but could not find it, and these are the men who are numbered not by tens of thousands, but by hundreds of thousands in the city of New York to-day. I sat in the council room of the board of estimate and apportionment when representatives of the unemployed were before the mayor and board requesting that certain public improvements be commenced so that the great army of unemployed men who are on the streets of New York looking for work could find employment, and it was there stated that over 250,000 men were in the city of New York seeking employments. I have in my hand at least fifty letters from labor unions in the city of New York, and they tell the story that between 75 and 90 per cent of union labor in New York City is now unemployed. I desire to read extracts from a few of these letters to simply inform you as to the true condition.

The secretary of the Emmet Association of Rock Drillers and Tool Sharpeners says:

The trade that we represent is in bad state at present. Out of 1,300 men we have about 150 men working at present, and the condition in the other trades is just as bad as in our trade, and the prospects are very poor. I have been talking to mostly all of the secretaries of different trades, and we figure that 187,000 men are idle in New York.

Mr. Daniel Harris, secretary of the cigar makers' joint label committee of New York, writes:

In our trade there are about 3,000 unemployed and about 7,000 working about half time.

The secretary of the Stone Masons, No. 74, of New York City, writes:

Out of a membership of 2,000 men there are less than 200 employed, and this condition has prevailed for four months past, with no prospects for change for better conditions. Other unions report 90 per cent of other trades are idle and the condition of their families the worst they have ever experienced.

Mr. William B. O'Neill, secretary of the Wholesale Dry Goods Teamsters' Local No. 708, New York City, says:

Forty-five per cent of our members are unemployed, and such has been the condition of affairs for the last five months. Our organization in New York and vicinity consists of thirty local unions, and the same can be said of our affiliated locals. Men who have not been idle in twenty

years are walking the streets at the present time unable to find work. We received the same report from all our locals throughout the country, and from reports the prospects do not look any brighter at present.

Mr. E. J. Gibbons, secretary of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, says:

We have 2,000 men unemployed and have been for some time. We have never seen the conditions of labor in our branch so distressing as they are this year.

Mr. C. H. Bauscher, secretary of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Bronx Borough committee, says:

It has not been so dull in the entire building industry as it has been since last October since 1893. In consequence 60 to 70 per cent of the building trades mechanics and laborers have been and still are out of work. I will refer to the carpenters in particular. We have between 18,000 and 19,000 carpenters in our organization, and according to reliable information from the various carpenters' locals 60 to 70 per cent is a very conservative figure of our trades unemployed.

Mr. P. E. Farrell, secretary of the United Housecarpenters and Bridgemen of New York City and vicinity, says:

Conditions have not been as bad in the building industry at this time of the year in over twenty years, and the outlook is very gloomy for the near future. Fully one-half, if not more, of the members of this organization of 4,000 are idle at present.

Mr. J. E. Pritchard, general secretary of the International Union of Pavers, Rammermen, Flaggers, Bridge and Stone Curb Setters, says:

We have in the neighborhood of 2,000 members and can safely say that in the past three months there has not been 100 of those members working. This does not include hundreds of other men not affiliated with this union who are also idle.

Mr. W. A. Coakley, president of the International Protective Association of Lithographic Apprentices and Press Feeders of New York, says:

Our association in this city has more members out of work at this time than they ever had for the past nine years (my term of office), and it has been so for the past four months, and what I say of this trade can be truthfully said of any other trade in this city.

Mr. Edward J. Duffy, general secretary of the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Gas Fitters, Local No. 498, of New York City, says:

This local union, with a membership of 1,000, has 35 per cent of its members out of work at the present time. This condition has prevailed in the plumbing and gas-fitting industry for the past six months, with no immediate prospect of a change for the better. I may add that not in ten years have there been so many unemployed in the building industry in this city.

Mr. M. Zuckerman, general secretary of the United Cloth, Hat, and Cap Makers of North America, says:

The number of unemployed in our trade amounts to-day to about 75 per cent.

I will not weary you with further citations of reports from other labor organizations, as those I have mentioned include a sufficient variety of trades to fairly show the distressing labor conditions in the city of New York. Of course, these reports give no record of the unemployed who are not members of labor organizations, but from the labor organization reports a fair inference can be drawn of the number of nonunion unemployed. The gentleman from New York would have us understand from the fact that the post-office reports indicate a falling off of only 6 per cent in January and 1 per cent in February that the business conditions were sound and unaffected by the financial depression which is now upon us.

The condition of these reports, upon a very slight investigation, shows that business houses which during the times of prosperity had very little advertising are, during these times of panic and difficulty, doing a very large amount of it, therefore increasing the returns of the Post-Office Department materially, thereby affecting any falling off because of bad business conditions. But how fruitless is such discussion in the face of these labor reports.

Before I take my seat, I desire to call the attention of the House to a little amusing incident which occurred a few days ago. A foreign-born citizen, one of the children of sunny Italy, who came to this country and is trying to make a home for himself and secure a standing in the community in which he lives, and one who also is the councillor of a great many of his own countrymen, had quite a considerable sum of money on deposit in one of the Brooklyn banks during the first stages of our financial difficulty. He was about to withdraw his money, but listening to the counsels of the President, he allowed his money to remain, with the result that the bank has since failed and the probability is that in the final adjustment he will lose considerable money. He had an interview with me and suggested that he had a proper case against the President of the United States, but I explained to him that it was impossible for him to sue the President; that the President was one of our citizens who practically says anything and does anything he pleases without personal responsibility.

I have been repeatedly asked which bill now before the House and Senate I approve as the measure best adapted to restore confidence among the business men and remedy our defective financial system. I am satisfied that there is no bill before Congress which, if enacted into law, would accomplish this result, but, on the other hand, I am assured by bankers all over the country that if any one of them was adopted conditions would be worse.

Remove the cause of the unrest, silence the ceaseless, senseless clamor for spectacular effect on the part of the man in the White House and quiet will be restored.

The business men of the country are like the inhabitants of a country village turned out to see and hear a passing show—new wonders captivate their attention, new feats of daring are being performed before their eyes.

Let the business world shake off the slavery created by the methods of one man during the past few years, assert their independence and disregard the Niagara of verbal protest made by the President against malefactors of great wealth, which has become a mania with him.

Tell him that we have a Department of Justice for the purpose of prosecuting malefactors of great wealth, malefactors of little wealth, and malefactors of no wealth.

Tell him that his high office must not be used for the striking down of any class of our citizens—rich or poor, high or low.

Tell him that the multitude of unemployed in all our large cities are calling their empty dinner pails "Teddy bears" as a token of appreciation for their creator.

Tell him that he is not like Washington or Lincoln; they brought order and rest out of discord, while he has produced discord and unrest out of peace and prosperity.

Tell him to step back out of the spot light in the center of the stage and give the people a chance. [Loud applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

To defray expenses incident to the shipment of supplies, including hardware, boxing, packing, cartage, freight, and the pay of one carpenter and three laborers for assignment in connection therewith, \$125,000.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, after the word "dollars," in line 3, insert as a new paragraph, the following:

"To cover cost of installing shelving, files, and conveyors in the building occupied by the division of supplies in the city of Washington, D. C., \$3,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of letter carriers, substitutes for carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of substations, and tolls and ferrage, rural-delivery service, \$35,373,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$12,000 of the amount hereby appropriated may be used for compensation of clerks in charge of substations: *Provided further*, That in the discretion of the Postmaster-General the pay of any carrier on a water route who furnishes his own power boat and is employed during the summer months may be fixed at an amount not exceeding \$900 in any one calendar year.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after the word "year," on line 14, page 27, the following:

"*Provided further*, That a sum not to exceed \$500,000 of this appropriation may be expended by the Postmaster-General, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, in improving the conditions of rural delivery routes to be selected by them for the purpose of ascertaining the possible increase in the territory which could be served by one carrier, and the possible increase of the number of delivery days each year, the amount required for proper maintenance in excess of local expenditure for rural delivery routes, and the relative saving to the Government in the maintenance of rural delivery routes by reason of such improvements: *Provided further*, That the State or county, or counties, which may be selected for improvement of rural delivery routes therein under this provision shall furnish an equal amount of money for the improvement of the rural routes so selected."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] want to speak to his amendment?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Then, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago in discussing this bill I stated the reasons why I thought this amendment ought to pass the House. On that occasion I said that in my opinion it was subject to the point of order, being new law, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET]

now makes the point of order. I expressed also the hope at that time that the point of order would be withheld in order that this question, one of such importance as I think it is, could come before the House for settlement, beginning as it does a great internal system of public-road improvements. However, I am aware that it is against the rules of the House, and, if we be not mistaken in the fact, the point of order is well taken. I therefore will have to resort to that other method that I intimated on the day that I discussed this question, in order to obtain a hearing for the people, now denied by the technical rules of the House. I have never thought it a proper thing to discuss at any length an amendment or other proposition which is subject to the motion that has been made by the gentleman from Indiana—that is, to the point of order. I therefore will not take up the time in the discussion of the question, but will ask the gentleman from Indiana if he intends to insist upon the point of order before proceeding further?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I desire to insist upon the point of order.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. If the gentleman insists upon the point of order, I have nothing more to say at this time upon the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment very clearly changes existing law, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 27, line 6, after the word "million," I move to strike out the word "three" and insert the word "five."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 6, after "million," strike out "three" and insert "five," so as to read "five hundred."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting at end of line 14, page 27:—

"SECTION 1. That beginning July 1, 1908, there shall be a parcels post limited to 11 pounds on every rural route in the United States. Said parcels post shall be confined exclusively to the rural route upon which the parcel originates and its rural-route connections, and shall not extend beyond said route upon which it originates and routes with which said route connects directly, without the intervention of railway mail service, star route, messenger, or any other form of mail service.

"SEC. 2. That the rate of postage on such packages shall be 5 cents for packages weighing not more than 3 pounds, 7 cents for packages weighing not more than 5 pounds, 10 cents for packages weighing more than 5 and not more than 8 pounds, and 15 cents for all packages weighing more than 8 and not more than 11 pounds.

"SEC. 3. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to matter which is classified by law as first, second, and third class, nor affect existing rates of postage thereon; nor shall there be accepted for transportation and delivery, as mail matter, by rural mail carriers, any intoxicating liquors (ardent, vinous, spirituous, or malt), habit-forming drugs, explosives, liquids liable to explosion by shock or jar or to spontaneous combustion, or any matter exhaling bad odor, or which from its nature or constituency is liable to contaminate or damage the mails.

"SEC. 4. That the compensation of rural carriers be increased to the extent of all receipts for such parcel-post service hereby established, on each route, respectively, not to exceed \$300 per annum to each carrier, to be paid under such rules and regulations as may be established by the Postmaster-General.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Against the amendment the gentleman from Indiana reserves the point of order.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I submitted some remarks to the House in general debate on this question. It is unnecessary, therefore, for me to-day to take very much time in further discussion of it. This amendment is not exactly the bill as introduced by me in the House. It is rather a combination of two bills, one introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], from which the last two sections are taken, and one introduced by myself, which includes the first section, or composes the first section of this amendment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I criticised in some degree bills offered by other gentlemen here the other day. I criticised the bills fairly. I said the language in one of the bills—that offered by the gentleman from Connecticut—was too loose; that it could not be understood by the courts and administered as the law by the Department. My friend from Connecticut has informed me since that he did not draw it, so I am very glad to take back the apparent criticism of the gentleman himself, but leave the criticism on the bill. The bill the gentleman offered required the size of packages to be of the size of a common suit case. I might call it the "suit-case bill" and not the "Henry bill" any longer. [Applause and laughter.]

I criticised the bill of my friend from Tennessee, or rather the first section of it, for being too general likewise, and I am

very much delighted to hear since from him that he did not draw that section. Therefore another good lawyer has been saved to the house. [Laughter.] Something has been said in the newspapers about my criticism of these gentlemen and the looseness of their language. I meant no criticism of them. I merely wanted to suggest to them, and they know it is correct, that in order for a law to stand the test it ought to be like the pasture fences in Georgia—that is, "pig tight, horse high, and bull strong," and this amendment is that way. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Georgia has admitted that the two best sections of his amendment were taken from the bill I introduced [laughter], I feel it my duty to make my proper acknowledgment to him. I wish, further, to state that the first section of the bill that I had introduced, which he criticizes, was drawn by an expert in such matters, and inasmuch as the gentleman from Georgia is one of the most famous experts in postal matters that I know of, I yield ready acceptance to his language. It is results, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to reach, and if the words used get the results, I do not care whether the one or other of the two be used.

But to the merits of the bill which I introduced and the bill which the gentleman introduced and which are now combined in this amendment. It simply provides for the establishment upon rural-delivery routes of a parcels post confined to the rural routes upon which the parcel is mailed, which was recommended as a part of the general recommendation of the Postmaster-General in his last report. I have received numbers of letters from parties opposing the bill. These letters usually come from retail merchants throughout the rural sections where these routes are. This amendment will not injure the retail merchants, but will be of great benefit to them, inasmuch as they will have the exclusive privilege of using the parcels post, and it will be a great benefit to the people who are patrons of these routes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. What do you mean by "exclusive privilege?"

Mr. SIMS. When I say "exclusive privilege" I mean this, in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, that the great department stores in the cities that are not situated upon these routes can not use them, and therefore the retail merchants who are situated upon them can only use them, and in that sense it is an exclusive use.

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

Mr. SIMS. I will in a moment. The opposition has come from retail merchants, as if it was an injury to them, when, in fact, it is of especial benefit to them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why does the gentleman wish to discriminate against the department stores in favor of the retail stores on the routes? Why not give all the privilege alike?

Mr. SIMS. My reply is that the opposition is made by retail merchants situated on these "routes," to use Republican pronunciation [laughter], when in fact this amendment is in their interest.

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

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman believe it would be possible for a mail-order house, doing business outside of a particular route, to freight its goods to a town within the route, and then, by means of the route, to have them carried by mail to the people living on the route, and thereby destroy the business of the local merchant?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, to ask what is a possibility is one thing; to ask what is practicable or profitable is another thing.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman believe it would be practicable?

Mr. SIMS. I do not believe the department stores can profitably take advantage of this legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman conceive that a bill like this would do the very thing that he seeks to prevent being done?

Mr. SIMS. Do what?

Mr. MADDEN. To give all the business within the mail route to the large mail-order houses in the big cities and take away from the merchants doing a local business all the business that they could otherwise do.

Mr. SIMS. I do not see how it would be possible under this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. I should like about five minutes more.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRIGGS, Mr. GAINES of Tennessee, and others rose.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I made that motion for the purpose of seeing how many gentlemen would rise and how many amendments were in preparation.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that. This is an important matter, and we want to get as much light as possible.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not want to prevent the return of these gentlemen to this House, does he? [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. I move that all debate on the pending amendment close in five minutes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will not do that. There are several amendments yet to be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not move to close debate on all amendments. The gentleman moves that all debate on the pending amendment close in five minutes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That does not cut off any other amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SIMS. I ask unanimous consent to continue my remarks for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, in further reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I can not conceive how the great department stores in his city could send their goods down into my district or the district of the gentleman from Georgia in such a way as to deprive the merchants there of the benefits intended to be conferred under this section.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Would the gentleman favor a proposition that would permit the department stores to use the parcels post?

Mr. SIMS. I do not want them to use it upon equal terms with the local merchant, because it would destroy the local merchant. The Postmaster-General has not recommended such law.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Then is not the whole proposition wrong? If it is right to apply to the people of one place, is it not right to apply to the people of another place? As far as I am concerned, I am opposed to this whole parcels-post business.

Mr. SIMS. There is a great difference between sending a package on a rural route extending not to exceed 25 miles for 5 cents and sending a similar package of equal weight from San Francisco to my district for 5 cents. A flat parcels post would discriminate absolutely against the local merchant.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman concede the right of mail-order houses to freight their goods to any town in the United States and then mail them at the post-office within that town at the reduced rate to any person living on a rural-delivery route?

Mr. SIMS. No, indeed; and I do not conceive that this amendment provides for that or makes it practically possible.

Mr. MADDEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not ask if this amendment provided for it or not. What I wanted to know was whether the gentleman believed that the mail-order merchant could do that under this law.

Mr. SIMS. I do not think so; such is not the intention.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there anything in the law to prevent any citizen of the United States, no matter where he is located, from sending through the mails anything that may be required by any citizen in any rural district?

Mr. SIMS. He can send it but he must pay the rate now prevailing for such a service; he could not get the benefit of the reduced rate under this bill unless mailed originally on the route.

Mr. MADDEN. If he sent it by railroad, by freight, to a town within the route, would he not then have the right to mail it from that town to any point within the route?

Mr. SIMS. Not as I understand it; that would be an evasion; but if he would have such a right we will offer an amendment so as to exclude it. Now, Mr. Chairman, another point. In the parcels-postal service, as recommended by the Postmaster-General, there is no recommendation for additional compensation for the rural carriers. If the service is established, the compensation ought to be reasonably and equitably increased. The bill I introduced, and above referred to, provides that they shall have all of the receipts on the route up to and not exceeding \$300 per annum, to be paid under such regulations as the

Postmaster-General may make. I would be opposed to putting so heavy a burden on the rural carriers, as recommended by the Postmaster-General, with no additional compensation or increase of salary. As it will be experimental, I thought it was best at first not to have a flat increase, but let the compensation rest on the fees received. I thought it better not to make a flat increase of so many hundred dollars a year, but rather provide that the receipts from the service, for the first year or two, be paid the rural carriers until the service was fully established. This will make the service self-sustaining while in its experimental stage. But, if after being tried, it was found to be self-sustaining, we can then give such a fixed increase of the salaries of carriers as may be warranted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist upon his point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I insist on the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry of my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed by order of the House. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. GRIGGS. I never care to speak to the court when the court is with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I understood the Chair to say that debate was closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate is closed and a point of order is pending.

Mr. GRIGGS. I presume, by the question the Chair asked the gentleman from Indiana, that the Chair is with me on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. In order to make this perfectly plain, the Chair will again read the rule. Clause 2 of Rule XXI:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriation for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

We have now under consideration a general appropriation bill, and to it this amendment is offered. The amendment makes no appropriation at all. It does change existing law in that it authorizes a new service not now authorized by law.

It has often been held that where there is no law upon the subject an amendment proposing to make law does change existing law, and is therefore in violation of the rule.

In its second section the amendment also changes existing law by making rates of postage on certain articles different from that fixed by the present law. The third section likewise contains provisions at variance with the present law, and, finally, the fourth section changes the existing law fixing the compensation of rural carriers. When such a point of order is made, the Chair must enforce the rule no matter how meritorious the proposed legislation may be. The point of order is therefore sustained.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 14, page 27, the following:

"That from and after July 1, 1908, the drop-letter privilege now existing at post-offices not entitled to free-delivery service shall be extended to all rural routes. That this privilege shall be confined strictly to rural routes and shall not extend to the termini thereof. That the postage on all such letters shall be 1 cent for 2 ounces or fraction thereof."

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, at all post-offices where there is no delivery system there is a drop-letter privilege which gives to the people the right to send a letter through the post-office for 1 cent. This is exactly the privilege I wish to see extended to the patrons of rural routes. A rural route is nothing but a traveling post-office. The carrier sells stamps and money orders and registers letters and parcels. He does everything, in short, that any postmaster does. For these and other reasons, which I have not the time to enumerate now, I believe that this amendment ought to be adopted. This will only extend to the farmers along a rural route the same privilege as the town man now enjoys.

The CHAIRMAN. The postage is now fixed by existing law. This proposes to change it, and is therefore in violation of the rule which the Chair has just cited. The point of order is therefore sustained.

Mr. GRIGGS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia offer a further amendment?

Mr. GRIGGS. No, Mr. Chairman; that was the amendment to which I wished to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. Then I take it the gentleman from Georgia

gia asks unanimous consent to speak for the five minutes which he would have used, if the gentleman from Indiana had reserved the point of order. Is there objection?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, debate has been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Indiana to reserve his point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Not on this last point of order. It seems to me it is practically the same amendment. I desire to be courteous to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIGGS. The gentleman has made the point of order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. GRIGGS. And he will not reserve it?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No; not at this time.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve it until I can ask my colleague a question or two about the bill. The gentleman closed debate a few moments ago, and now here he is shutting off debate again.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I have been very liberal to the gentleman from Tennessee, I think.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I know the gentleman has, because the gentleman from Tennessee has always tried to do something right.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "year" in line 14, page 27, add:

"In passing upon petition for the establishment of a rural route, neither the fact that there are gates inclosing farms across the highway over which the same passes nor the fact that a part of the patrons may be supplied by the star-route service shall be considered in determining whether the route shall be established."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, on that I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve the point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I make the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will reserve it.

Mr. OVERSTREET. We must finish this bill some time.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It is an entirely new proposition.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto has been closed?

The CHAIRMAN. Only upon the amendment pending when the motion was made.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understood the motion of the gentleman from Indiana was to close debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion was changed to include a single amendment.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order with this notice, that I shall insist upon continuing under the rules strictly, after the gentleman has spoken for five minutes, not only upon this, but upon all other amendments which I think are honestly subject to a point of order. I do this in the interest of the time of all gentlemen who are anxious to conclude this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves the point of order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I think there is much in this amendment that should be considered. In the first place, I desire to state to the House that down South, especially in my State, we have what is called "stock-law" districts all over that country. One part of the county is in the stock-law section, and the other is out of it. This necessitates the construction of gateways on all roads crossing the boundary line between the two. In my own county there are a number of such districts. Now, the Department has adopted the unjust rule of denying the establishment of the rural service on highways obstructed by these gates, however necessary they may be for the protection of the crops, or however willing the carrier may be to assume the trouble of passing the gates, or however much the rural service may be needed on the route. In going a trip of 25 miles in length the carriers do not object to two or more of these gateways. Then why should the Department object? It certainly will not be contended that opening these gates would endanger the mail or materially impair the service. This is simply a fad of the Department, under which hundreds of routes have been turned down in the State of Mississippi, as well as in other States. Hence I can see no reason why the amendment to that extent should not be adopted.

The next proposition involved in the amendment is intended to cure another, I think, unjust rule of the Department. That is denying the rural service because a few of the patrons may be supplied by the star-route carriers. This often denies many people off the star route any kind of delivery service, while those on the route will not accept this kind of service, for the reason that nine out of ten of the star-route carriers in the South are unfit to handle the mail. The carrier is generally a thoughtless, ignorant negro or white boy, and the citizens along the route will not intrust them with the mail. Then, too, the star-route service does not give them many of the benefits resulting from the rural-delivery service. For instance, the star-route carrier can not sell postage nor can he register a letter nor can he sell money orders. In this manner it seems that the farmers who live in communities through which the star route passes are to be always denied the benefits of the rural-delivery service. Is this right? Can it be justified from any standpoint of reason?

In view of these facts, I do insist that my friend [Mr. OVERSTREET] having charge of this bill will withdraw his point of order and permit the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have lost a great many routes from the same reason down in my country. The gentleman has shut off debate, so we can not lay our complaints before the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk to be read the following extract from an editorial article in a paper called "The Truth Seeker," published in the city of New York:

FOR A NATIONAL CONFESSION OF FAITH.

The New York Sun, which is one of Roosevelt's severest critics, basing its hostility to the President on the ground of his recreancy to the Constitution, calls on the National Congress to pass the bill introduced by Representative MOORE of Pennsylvania, for the restoration to our coin of the motto, "In God we trust," which Mr. Roosevelt caused to be removed.

With pious unction, which we never gave the Sun credit for, that newspaper says: "We hope that so much of the bill as aims to renew the former declaration of dependence upon divine Providence, and to replace on our coins of silver and gold the time-honored motto recently stricken therefrom by Executive order, will be reported promptly by Congress and be passed at the earliest possible opportunity by the House and Senate."

There is more in the Sun's article about "faith that is quickened in dark days of national trial," with the surmise that "even the wholly godless," who "must form an inconsiderable part of the entire population," will in Rooseveltian times welcome the reappearance of the old motto.

Here the Sun is altogether in error. Many of the godless, in view of his extreme religiosity and his boasted distribution of offices according to religious denomination, are not in any sense enamored of Mr. Roosevelt, but they look upon his removal of that unconstitutional, untruthful, and unwarranted defile motto from our coinage as one of the most sensible acts ever performed by a President. They do not trust in God. They know that nobody else does who is sane, and therefore they do not see why every coin issuing from our mints should carry forth to the world an official lie.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more of the same sort in the article referred to, but what has been read is sufficient for the purposes of this address. The whole tone of the article is one of defiance to the popular belief of the people of the United States in the existence of a Supreme Being. In addition to this article, since the introduction of my bill for the restoration of the motto to the coin of the country, have come a few—happily a very few—letters and circulars from atheists and freethinkers protesting against the recognition by the Government of the propriety of the motto "In God we trust."

At the same time, in greater volume, have come letters from sincere wellwishers of the institutions of the country, pleading for the restoration of the motto and expressing the fear that its removal by Executive order would be interpreted as evidencing a national depreciation of divine authority.

Firmly convinced of the error of those who have misconstrued the purport of the President's order, but in response to a wholesome public sentiment, the bill to which my name is attached was introduced. It was the third of many others directed to the same purpose. The first bill was presented early in the session by my colleague, Mr. JAMES, of Kentucky, a Democrat, and shortly thereafter Mr. SHEPPARD, of Texas, another Democrat, who supported his measure in a brilliant speech in this Chamber January 7, also submitted a bill. Democrats and Republicans alike from other sections, voicing the sentiments of their constituencies, presented similar measures, among them Mr. BEALE, of Pennsylvania, a Republican; Mr. ASHBROOK, of Ohio, a Democrat; Mr. WOOD, of New Jersey, a Republican, and, finally, for the purpose of concentrating into a composite measure the gist of the various bills, Mr. MCKINLEY, of Illinois, a Republican and chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures.

It is Mr. McKinley's bill that has been reported by the committee for the favorable action of this House. It embraces the

best features of all the bills offered by Republicans and Democrats alike. There is, therefore, no difference of opinion on political grounds. Nor, so far as I can learn, is there any evidence of a desire on the part of anyone to make political capital of the order of the President. On the contrary, the intent of the Executive seems to be thoroughly understood, more especially as the war-time law under which the motto was first placed upon the coin is not mandatory, but gives discretion to the Secretary of the Treasury.

It is worth mentioning, although the history of the motto has been admirably covered in the address of my Texas colleague, Mr. SHEPPARD, that a Pennsylvania minister—Mr. Watkinson—first urged the use of the motto in a letter to Mr. Chase, the Secretary of the Treasury in President Lincoln's Cabinet.

What—

He said, writing to the Secretary in 1861—

if our country were now shattered beyond reconstruction? Would not the antiquaries of succeeding centuries rightly reason from our past that we were a heathen nation?

It was a time of great trial, a time which called for a new declaration of faith, a time to which we may fairly apply these thrilling words of the lamented Lincoln:

We have been the recipients of the choicest bounty of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-reliant to feel the necessities of redeeming and preserving grace; too proud to pray to the God that made us.

It was during such times and under such stress that Mr. Chase directed the superintendent of the mint at Philadelphia, a former governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to devise a motto that would signify to every holder of our coin, whether it be used for the present or be preserved through the ages, that this is a God-fearing people, and thus it was the four words, "In God we trust," became the symbol of the faith of our imperiled nation.

The enabling act under which this significant public service was performed, the act of March 3, 1863, provided "it shall be lawful to cause the motto 'In God we trust' to be placed upon such coins hereafter to be issued as shall admit of such legend;" but it did not compel the use of the motto. The act of February 12, 1873, also left it within the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, while in subsequent legislation affecting coinage certain provisions have been construed to require specific authority upon the part of Congress to place the motto upon the coin.

It is with the hope that the discretionary power hitherto lodged in the Secretary of the Treasury may have the effect of law that I urge the passage of the bill as reported. Should such a measure be passed by this body of Representatives of the people and be sent on its way to the Chief Magistrate, whose order in this instance has been so unfairly and unwisely distorted, I have no doubt of the answer that will come from that high source to the unwitting challenge of the reckless few. I do not believe any bill, such as is proposed, which shall definitely fix the authority for placing the motto on the coin will fail of the President's approval.

That the President should pander to the atheist or the scoffer is unthinkable of one whose religious tendencies are so pronounced as his and whose faith in divine authority has been so often expressed in public and private utterance. That the scoffer should seize upon an order of the Executive, intended as much to maintain the integrity of religious sentiment as to facilitate and beautify the coinage of the country, is not surprising perhaps, except as it has served to challenge the fundamental principles underlying the strength and perpetuity of our nation.

Had we only to deal with the sacrilegious, who, in their blindness, cry out their defiance of the Supreme authority, the question of having the motto on the coin might not invoke the serious attention of Congress, but in these days of enlightenment, when a Presidential deliverance is flashed simultaneously into every corner of the nation, when enterprising newspapers catch up the refrain and millions of minds are set in motion, to magnify or to minimize, the import of every word or act affecting the governmental function becomes portentous. It is because the agitation arising from the use or the nonuse of the motto has been carried into the thousands of churches and schools of every denomination—Jew, Gentile, Catholic, and Protestant—throughout the land that I believe it incumbent upon this body to pass upon this question promptly and with emphasis. I believe we should order the motto back upon the coin so that it may be heralded throughout the nations, as far as the coin of the United States shall circulate, and as long as it shall endure, that the American people reverently and unswervingly place their trust in Almighty God.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, has the point of order been passed upon?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not yet been made, the Chair will say.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOUTELL, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 69. Joint resolution granting authority for the use of certain balances of appropriations for the Light-House Establishment, to be available for certain named purposes;

S. 5656. An act for the enlargement and extension of the post-office building at Pawtucket, R. I.;

S. 5894. An act to provide for the completion of the enlargement of the Government building at Wichita, Kans., and for other purposes;

S. 5908. An act to amend an act authorizing the construction of a dam and bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana; and

S. 6028. An act to provide for safety of life on navigable waters during regattas or marine parades.

The message also announced that the Vice-President had appointed Mr. BAILEY and Mr. GALLINGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the Executive Departments; for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department."

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct attention to the suggestions made in a very able and interesting address delivered by Mr. Meyer, Postmaster-General, at a banquet of the New England Postmasters' Association, Boston, Mass., October 12, 1907, a part of which I will read:

I want to draw to the attention of you gentlemen at this time certain features and inconsistencies in connection with the parcel-post service: In the first place, it does not seem to be understood by many of our people that we have a parcel post at present. The rate is 16 cents a pound, and the limit of weight 4 pounds. To illustrate the incongruities that exist: Any individual entering the post-office here in Boston or in any other city or town in the country, with two parcels, each weighing 4 pounds, can send one parcel to New York for 64 cents, while for the other parcel, which is addressed to some one in a foreign land and goes via New York, he will have to pay but 48 cents, for the reason that the rate to foreign countries is 12 cents a pound, while the rate to our own people is 16 cents a pound. * * * Therefore, I assume that our Representatives in Congress will realize that they can not afford to stand for a policy that compels our own people to pay 4 cents more on packages to people living in the United States (and even then permits them to send only 4 pounds) than on packages to people living in twenty-two foreign lands, for which they need pay only 12 cents a pound, and which may weigh up to 11 pounds. * * *

Two interests are opposing the extension of parcel post in this country—the express companies and the country retail merchants. The latter fear that the mail-order houses will derive a benefit to their own disadvantage. It is in connection with the country retail merchants that I desire to speak especially.

I propose to recommend the establishment of a parcel post on rural routes which will meet the objections of the small storekeepers and retailers. This will be a boon to our rural population and to the storekeeper, as the latter can receive his orders by mail or telephone and dispatch the desired merchandise by the rural carrier. The farmer will be saved from hitching up his horse and losing the time he needs for planting or harvesting his crops, and it will enable the storekeeper to increase his sales and meet the requirements of modern trade. If my recommendations are adopted, it will cost 12 cents a pound for the mail-order house to send parcels to the rural-delivery patron from any city post-office, while for delivery from the distributing office of the rural route, or if mailed by a patron of any rural route for delivery to a patron on the same route or at the distributing office of said route, the charge will be but 5 cents for the first pound and 2 cents for each additional pounds up to 11 pounds, or 25 cents for a package weighing 11 pounds.

This statement is indeed misleading: not that I charge the Postmaster-General with any intent to deceive or mislead, for I regard him as a gentleman of integrity, intelligence, ability, and actuated with the highest motives and with a determination to do justice to all, and I am not questioning his motives, but will endeavor to present the facts in the light that I see them. When we have all of the facts, I will venture to assume that Representatives in Congress will realize that they can afford to stand for a policy that compels people living in foreign lands to pay more than people living in our own country. The Postmaster-General's statement as to the sending of two pieces, each weighing 4 ounces, is correct in some cases, and the domestic rate in some cases is higher than the foreign; but in

the majority of cases foreign rates are the highest. In his excellent address to enlighten members of the New England Postmasters' Association and the country, he might have gone further by saying: "To illustrate the incongruities that exist, any individual entering the post-office here in Boston, or in any other city or town in the country, with two parcels, each weighing 1 ounce, can send one parcel to New York for 1 cent, while for the other parcel, which is addressed to somebody in foreign lands via New York, he will have to pay 12 cents, for the reason that the rate to foreign countries is 12 cents per pound or fraction thereof, while the rate to our own people is only 1 cent per ounce. Therefore the rate on the parcel addressed to somebody in foreign lands is 12 times as great as is the rate on the parcel addressed to New York." And he might have referred to the report of the Second Assistant for the year ending June 30, 1907, pages 25 and 26:

THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION.

No additional countries have entered the Universal Postal Union during the past year.

FOREIGN PARCEL POST.

During the year additional parcel-post conventions have been negotiated with Bermuda (effective January 31, 1907) and Ecuador (effective February 28, 1907). The convention with Bermuda admits "parcels" up to 11 pounds, without limit of value, at the rate of 12 cents a pound; while the convention with Ecuador admits parcels up to 11 pounds, but limits the value of any one parcel to \$50 and fixes the postage rate at 20 cents a pound.

The conventions concluded during the preceding fiscal year went into operation upon the dates fixed therefor, viz, Sweden, February 1; Peru, September 1; Denmark, October 1, 1906, respectively.

The postage rates for "parcels" are 20 cents a pound or fraction of a pound for parcels which require the use of the expensive transit across the Isthmus of Panama and 12 cents a pound or fraction of a pound for parcels which do not use that expensive transit.

It should be noted that the rates quoted above are for a pound or fraction of a pound. So that as much postage must be paid on a parcel weighing only an ounce as on one weighing 16 ounces, and as much on a parcel weighing 17 ounces as on one weighing 32 ounces.

Or he might have said: "If the two parcels referred to, weighing 4 pounds each, or 64 ounces each, or 128 ounces for the two, had been divided into parcels of 1 ounce each, and one-half of them directed to parties in New York, the rate on the sixty-four parcels would have been 64 cents to New York, and the postage on the sixty-four parcels addressed to London would be \$7.68." According to the Second Assistant's report, rates on parcels addressed to foreign countries are not uniform. The rate to Bermuda is 12 cents per pound, and the rate to Ecuador is 20 cents per pound. The rate to Sweden, Peru, and Denmark is 20 cents per pound or fraction of a pound for parcels which require the use of the expensive transit across the Isthmus of Panama, and 12 cents per pound or fraction of a pound for parcels which do not use that expensive transit. So we find that rates on parcels weighing 1 ounce addressed to Sweden, Peru, or Denmark which require the use of the expensive transit across the Isthmus of Panama is 20 cents, or twenty times as high as the rate on parcels weighing 1 ounce addressed to New York. Why this incongruity in rates? Rates on mail matter between the United States, Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and Panama are fixed by treaty with each country and with all other countries by conventions of the Universal Postal Union. The last convention was held at Rome, 1906, and took effect October 1, 1907. The acts of those conventions are binding on these countries, but have nothing to do with domestic rates, they being fixed by Congress and the Department. The conventions are simply agreements as to international mail matter. The rate on parcels post is fixed with each country, or in thirty-five parcels-post conventions. The rate is generally 12 cents per pound or fraction thereof, the pound being the unit of weight. The rate is 1 cent per ounce. The rate on 5 ounces to the Philippine Islands is 5 cents and to London 12 cents.

Another statement made by the Postmaster-General, page 8: Two interests are opposing the extension of parcels post in this country—the express companies and the country retail merchants.

The first I deny. Speaking for myself, will say that I have never been approached, directly or indirectly, for or against parcels post or any other proposition by any agent for any express company. Furthermore, the express companies have nothing to fear from competition with the Government. The business of express companies is conducted by business men and along business lines and is subject to control by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The post-office business is conducted by Congress and the Department, and, like all other business transactions of this Government, it is the more expensive. Express companies carry parcels weighing 100 pounds from New York to Chicago, a distance of 1,000 miles, for \$3, and if the rates charged by the express companies are too high, it is then up to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix a reasonable rate, as the law provides. The Government pays the railroad company an average of about 4.6 cents per pound, or \$4.60 per hundred, for actual mail matter carried for an average

haul of three or four hundred miles, ranging from 1 pound to carload lots, and sometimes trainload lots; and the average cost of handling all mail matter is about 17 cents per pound. The express rate on a pair of shoes from Boston to my home town, Northwood, Iowa, is from 23 to 27 cents per pair.

The postal rate on a pair of shoes weighing 2½ pounds would be 40 cents, exclusive of the weight of the box. It is therefore evident that the express companies have nothing to fear, and there is no reason why they should oppose it; but there is one powerful interest in favor of parcels post, and that is the railroad companies, as their profits for carrying an increased mail would be much larger than for carrying express, as the Government pays a much higher rate to the railroads than do the express companies, and it would mean millions of dollars to them. The Postmaster-General further states that he proposes to recommend the establishment of parcels post on rural routes, etc. I suggest that in his anxiety to help our rural population, to save the farmer from hitching up his horse and losing the time he needs for planting and harvesting his crops, and to enable the storekeepers to increase their sales and meet the requirements of modern trade, he can best accomplish that by reducing the cost of carrying the parcels rather than to increase the cost, as he proposes to do. Under the present law those people are well cared for. The carriers may carry merchandise for hire on request of patrons residing on their respective routes whenever the same shall not interfere with the proper discharge of their official duties, and under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may prescribe. My understanding is that the regulations of the Department restrict the carrier to carrying unmailable matter only. As you will see, the privilege of carrying parcels is left to the discretion of the Postmaster-General. If he will remove these restrictions, or if Congress will provide that all parcels shall be carried by the rural carrier for hire, and, if necessary, fix a maximum rate, the service can be had at a much lower rate than the one proposed, and these people can be just as well accommodated. This privilege was granted carriers at first, and until Congress and the Postmaster-General placed restrictions on the carriers, which was done with a view of insuring the people living in the rural districts a better service. It goes without saying that a carrier carrying a light load can and will give better and more prompt service than one carrying a heavy load. If additional packages are to be carried the carriers' compensation should be increased. Under such an arrangement the carrier would get the fee, and would therefore have no claim on the Government. But if the parcels are to be carried, and the fee paid the Government, the carrier will have a just claim for an increase of salary and of course would demand it, and in justice to him his salary would have to be increased. In my opinion the increase of salary would largely exceed the increase in receipts. If the Postmaster-General does not care to assume the responsibility of impairing the service by extending it through the removal of these restrictions, Congress can do it, if in its judgment it is deemed advisable. But the contention is that this arrangement will not reduce the deficit. Why should the farmer and country storekeeper make up a deficit not caused by him, but which is due to other causes, such as the carrying of certain mail matter at a loss, especially second-class matter, the franking privilege, and the exorbitant rates paid railroad companies.

I take it that the recent order as to second-class matter will cut down the deficit, if not entirely wipe it out. As to the franking privileges, if the documents sent out and the dissemination of this knowledge is not worth the deficit, why not discontinue it? Another way to reduce the deficit is by reducing the pay to the railroad companies. Congress and the Department reduced their pay some \$9,000,000 last year; and notwithstanding the fact that Congress last year also increased the pay of clerks and carriers some \$12,000,000, the deficit in the Post-Office Department has been decreased from \$10,516,996 in 1906 to \$6,350,237 in 1907. So, if the receipts increase as they have in the past, evidently there will be no deficit next year; but I do not believe that that will be necessary in order to wipe out the deficit. I read from a report from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads submits the following report in explanation of the bill recommending appropriations for the postal service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909:

The Post-Office Department in its estimates to Congress, as appears from pages 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, and 380 of the Book of Estimates, recommends for the postal service a total of \$230,441,016.

The total amount carried by the bill, as now recommended, is \$220,765,392, being \$9,675,624 less than the original estimates of the Department.

The amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1908 was \$212,091,192. The amount now recommended for the fiscal year 1909 exceeds the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1908 by \$8,674,199, an increase of 4.09 per cent.

The appropriation for the fiscal year 1908 was 10.65 per cent increase over the appropriation for 1907 (this increased per cent was largely occasioned by the increase in salaries of postal employees) and 11.66 per cent increase over the expenditures for 1907, which expenditures were \$189,935,242.

The receipts for the postal service for the fiscal year 1907 were \$183,585,005, which was 9.3 per cent increase over the receipts for the fiscal year 1906, which receipts were \$167,932,783.

While the expenditures for the fiscal year 1906, amounting to \$178,449,799, exceeded the receipts for that year by \$10,516,996, still the receipts for the fiscal year 1907, amounting to \$183,585,005, really exceeded the expenditures for the preceding fiscal year of 1906 \$5,135,206.

The expenditures for the fiscal year 1907 amounted to \$189,935,242, or \$6,350,237 in excess of the receipts.

The average appropriation for eleven years shows an increase of 7.15 per cent, the receipts for the same period increased an average of 7.6 per cent, while the expenditures show an average increase of 6.83 per cent.

The reductions made by the committee in the last session in railway mail pay and railway postal car pay have shown good results, the saving in railway mail pay reaching almost \$2,000,000, or 3.63 per cent; in the car pay a saving of nearly \$1,000,000, or 9.65 per cent; by the withdrawal of supplies from the mails a saving of \$800,000, or 1.77 per cent, has been effected.

But if a deficit is anticipated, I believe that a further reduction of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 can be made without working a hardship to the railroads.

Now, a word as to the franking privilege. There seems to be much misunderstanding about it. Some seem to look upon the distribution of public documents and seeds as a Congressional graft; that it is in the interest of Members of Congress and Senators, and not for the diffusion of knowledge. As everybody knows, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and documents are printed, and every Department is required to make reports. We spend millions of dollars every year for scientific and practical research work; in gathering statistics and information of every kind, and reports are made as to the results of these investigations. Take, for instance, the Agriculture Department, with its corps of scientists, the ablest and most industrious in the world, pursuing their duties with fidelity and enthusiasm along their respective lines. What would all of this amount to if not published and given to the public, so that the people may know, have the benefit of the discoveries, the valuable work in general, and how the public moneys are appropriated and expended? If the documents are worth printing, they are certainly worth the price of distribution. How are they distributed? At present they are apportioned among Members and Senators. The practice may be wrong, but it is believed that Members and Senators are in a better position to place these documents where they ought to be placed than are the Departments. Lists are secured, furnished by reliable people in various parts of the districts, and care is exercised in sending such documents as is believed will prove of interest to the parties to receive them. Yearbooks are generally sent to the farmers, education reports to libraries and those especially interested in educational work, and so on. If the seeds and documents are to be sent out, some provision must be made for transporting them. I take it that it is not intended that Members and Senators should pay the postage; if they did, it would greatly exceed their salaries; if not franked, postage would have to be provided, and the cost to the Government would be exactly the same, if sent through the mail.

The policy of Congress has been to disseminate knowledge not only by the distribution of public documents, but by encouraging worthy and legitimate publications—the weekly, the semiweekly, the dailies, and other periodicals. It has given newspapers and magazines a rate of postage not with a view of making money out of transporting the periodicals, but for the diffusion of knowledge and happiness and to promote education, and in so doing it has had the welfare of our people at heart. Its object has been toward enlightenment and a march onward and upward. Are we now to take a backward step? If so, advance the rate on second-class mail matter and deprive the legitimate and worthy publishers of this low rate and discontinue the distribution of public documents. If this is done you will undoubtedly reduce the deficit. But can we afford to do it?

So much for parcels post, or this entering wedge to parcels post, and government ownership. I will dismiss the subject by saying that foreign rates on parcels post are fixed by parcels-post conventions, or rather by treaties. It is a reciprocal arrangement between two countries. I have shown that in a large majority of cases the rates on parcels sent through the mail to foreign countries are much higher than domestic rates, but if the foreign rates are too low—if too liberal concessions have been made—it is for the Executive or the Post-Office Department to correct the error, and not for Congress. I do not believe it just or feasible to adopt a plan that will compel the country storekeeper and farmer to make up a deficit which is not their fault, but which is due to other causes, but I do be-

lieve that the results desired by the Postmaster-General—that is, to extend the service—can be better accomplished by removing the restrictions on the carriers.

Now, a word as to the postal savings banks proposition. I read from Mr. Meyer's speech:

Another matter of great public interest which I shall recommend for the consideration of Congress is the postal savings banks system. * * * Our object is to bring hidden money to light—to instill life into it, and to lead it again into the channels of trade for the mutual benefit of labor and capital, and thus add to the prosperity throughout the land. * * *

It is proposed to bring this money into circulation by asking authority from Congress to place the deposits in the national banks of the country, not in a few financial centers, but in the banks of the district where the money has been deposited. I have been assured by prominent presidents of national banks that the Post-Office Department may count on receiving for such money turned over to them a rate of interest varying from 2 to 3 per cent. The Department would guarantee the depositor 2 per cent, or 1 per cent semiannually. Thus evidence is given to the savings banks to let them be not in competition with them and that our business would in nowise affect their deposits, their rates being usually from 3 to 4 per cent. The amount of money in the United States is estimated to be \$3,123,056,673, of which \$1,010,700,000 is in the banks and \$333,855,053 in the Treasury; the balance, \$1,778,501,620, being in the hands of individuals and other sources. This last amount seems large at first glance, but when we think of the wages that people are earning to-day, and that if each person in the country had in his possession \$10 in cash, \$800,000,000 would be accounted for, or about half the amount.

Postal savings bank system, the Government guaranteeing bank deposits, and the parcels post are of course all steps in the direction of Government ownership and socialism, but I will not undertake to discuss Government ownership at this time, although that is a question that will have to be met sooner or later. Bryan and Hearst have declared in favor of it. Hearst will be the candidate of his party for President. Bryan will be the nominee of the Democratic party, and that means that the Democratic party will have to swallow not only Bryan, 16 to 1, but Government ownership, not on the installment plan, but in total. In view of our experience with Government ownership I am free to say that I am somewhat skeptical of the proposition. I have already referred to the cost of carrying on the post-office business. It is generally believed that that business could be carried on more efficiently and cheaply by an individual than by the Government. Besides, we have the Government Printing Office. Notwithstanding the fact that we have the largest and best mechanically equipped printing office in the world, with millions of dollars invested, the Government printing costs, in many cases, twice as much as under a contract system. I read from a newspaper clipping giving extracts from Havenner's report, an expert appointed by the President to investigate:

PRINTING COST HIGHER—GOVERNMENT OFFICE EXPENSE 2 TO 117 PER CENT MORE—REPORT MADE TO PRESIDENT—MR. HAVENNER DECLARES COST OF COMPOSITION HAS INCREASED NEARLY 40 PER CENT—INCREASE IN PRICE ADMITTED BY PUBLIC PRINTER, WHO SAYS REAL PRICES WERE NOT BEFORE KNOWN.

FROM THE REPORT.

"It is my opinion that the cost of printing has increased both apparently and actually within the past few months, without a corresponding increase in the quality of the product."

In exhibits submitted, the Department of State shows that the Government Printing Office charged \$4.10 per thousand for embossing paper that had in other cases been bought by the Government under contract for \$2 per thousand.

The Department of the Interior submits a table showing that there has been an increase of 51 per cent in the cost of printing specifications of patents in the first six months of this year, while there is an increase of only 15 per cent in the number of patents issued for the same period.

"An investigation could best be pursued by a committee composed of practical printers, who would also be conversant with the theoretical end of the business and familiar with the conditions under which Government printing is done."

That the cost of printing at the Government Printing Office for the various Executive Departments of the Government has increased during the administration of Charles A. Stillings, the present Public Printer, is shown in the report made to President Roosevelt by George C. Havenner, chief of the division of printing in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

The increased cost varies from 2 per cent to 117 per cent on various classes of matter, and the increases apply to every Department of the Government.

MR. HAVENNER AN EXPERT.

Mr. Havenner, who is an expert in the work of estimating the cost of printing, was directed by the President to make a careful examination into the cost of all classes of printing done for the Executive Departments, with a view of ascertaining the present cost as compared with the cost of the same classes of work heretofore. Mr. Havenner's investigation showed that the cost of composition, for instance, had increased nearly 40 per cent, notwithstanding that the best modern facilities are employed in the Government Printing Office. The cost of nearly every other line of work incident to the production of printed documents showed a like increase, and in some instances a very much greater increase.

In summarizing the results of this inquiry, Mr. Havenner says:

NO INCREASE IN QUALITY.

"It is my opinion that the cost of printing has increased both apparently and actually within the past few months without a corresponding increase in the quality of the product, notwithstanding that the tendency, owing to the increased use and efficiency of typesetting and other machinery, should be to decrease."

This is a fair sample of what we may expect with Government ownership. "Government Printing Office charging \$4.10 per thousand for embossing paper that has in other cases been bought by the Government under contract for \$2 per thousand." Think of it! This and other experiences ought to satisfy every enthusiast, but, as before stated, I do not care to discuss Government ownership at this time, but will briefly discuss this postal savings-banks proposition. The suggestion is that the Government is to accept deposits and guarantee the depositor 2 per cent, or 1 per cent, semiannually, and the money thus deposited shall be turned over to national banks in the same district at a rate varying from 2 to 3 per cent; and that as banks now pay from 3 to 4 per cent on deposit, it is safe to count on the banks accepting deposits on these terms. Of course banks would rather accept money on deposit and pay only 2 or 3 per cent than to pay 3 or 4 per cent, but where does the depositor come in? Where is the advantage to him, except that a safe place to deposit his money at a much lower rate of interest is provided for where safe banks can not be found? But how about the Government? It is to deposit the money in the very banks not considered safe by the depositors.

Is the Government in a better position to know the solvency of the bank than the depositor? As a general thing the Government knows less about the standing of a bank and banker than does the depositors. All the Government knows about it is the report made by the examiner. This report is published, and the depositor has the same information that the Government has, and besides he knows something about the character, integrity, and standing of the banker, also his financial standing outside of the bank and his capacity for meeting assessments if the bank should fail, which the Government knows nothing about. But some say let the Government deposit the money in banks in other districts. If so, where would the money go? Where are the Government funds generally deposited to-day? In Wall street and in the larger cities. Gentlemen, we have too much money deposited in Wall street now, and with our recent experience with Wall street the less money deposited there by the Government the better. Let the wild-cat Wall street speculator take care of himself without this Government coming to his support.

If postal savings banks are established, and the Government has any money to offer for deposit, of course the banks would rather pay 2 or 3 per cent for deposits than to purchase Government bonds for deposit as security for Government deposits, as is now required, as it would be more profitable to them, especially in localities where the rate of interest is high.

Take, for instance, where the interest rate is 10 per cent; if a bank has \$105,000 available for loaning or investment and accepts a deposit of \$100,000 under the present regulations the bank must purchase \$100,000 of United States bonds. It has to pay a premium on an average of about 5 per cent. It first invests its \$105,000 in United States bonds; it deposits these bonds with the Government and receives \$100,000. Under the law it is permitted to loan \$85,000 of this amount, and \$15,000 must be held in reserve, but banks do not and can not loan up to the limit at all times, and the average reserve held is, say, 25 per cent. It can then only loan about \$75,000. The interest on the \$75,000 at 10 per cent would be \$7,500. It gets 2 per cent on the United States bonds, or \$2,000. Add the \$2,000 to the \$7,500 and it has \$9,500 interest, while if it had loaned the \$105,000, which was invested in the United States bonds at 10 per cent, it would have had in interest \$10,500, a loss then of \$1,000, besides the depreciation of the \$5,000 invested in premiums on said bonds, which, of course, decrease in value as the time of maturity approaches. It, of course, gets some interest on the amount of the reserve deposited with its reserve agency, but it must also take the risk of fire and burglary or pay insurance on the amount held in the vault.

On the other hand, if a bank accepts \$100,000 deposits from the Government and pays 3 per cent, against which no purchase and deposit of United States bonds is required, it can loan not only the \$75,000 of this \$100,000 deposited but it also has the \$105,000 to loan, or a total of \$180,000. The interest on \$180,000 at 10 per cent would be \$18,000. Deduct interest of 3 per cent paid on the \$100,000 deposit, or \$3,000, and it has left \$15,000.

Therefore the net profit on the \$105,000 and the \$100,000 deposited by the Government under the present regulations which require a deposit of bonds, is \$9,500; while under the proposed regulations if the bank pays 3 per cent on the \$100,000 deposited by the Government, but is required to furnish no bond, the net profit on the \$105,000 and the \$100,000 is \$15,000, or \$5,500 more than under the present regulations, besides there are no bonds or premiums to depreciate.

Again, under the proposed plan, omitting the \$105,000, a

bank accepting \$100,000 deposit and loaning \$75,000 thereof at 10 per cent would receive \$7,500 interest. Deducting the \$3,000 interest it would be required to pay the Government, it would make a net profit of 4½ per cent, or \$4,500, on the Government deposit. If the interest is low, say 6 per cent, of course the difference and profits would be less. For instance, on the first proposition, the interest on the \$75,000 would be \$4,500 and the interest on the United States bonds would be \$2,000, or a total of \$6,500; the interest on the \$105,000, at 6 per cent, would be only \$6,300, leaving a profit to the bank of \$200 in place of a loss of \$1,000 where the interest is 10 per cent. As to the second proposition, figuring interest on \$180,000 at 6 per cent, the bank would get \$10,800 interest. Deducting the 3 per cent interest paid the Government on the \$100,000, or \$3,000, it would leave \$7,800, while the interest on \$105,000 loaned at 6 per cent would be \$6,300, leaving a profit of only \$1,500. The bank would make \$200 on the first proposition and \$1,500 on the second. Omitting the \$105,000, a bank accepting \$100,000 deposit and loaning \$75,000 thereof at 6 per cent would receive \$4,500 interest. Deducting the \$3,000 interest paid the Government, it would have a net profit of 1½ per cent, or \$1,500, on the Government deposit. The bond-secured currency was devised for the purpose of selling bonds to carry on the war, and the bond-secured deposits to enable the Government to refund its bonds and to borrow money at a low rate of interest. By creating this demand for bonds, 2 per cent bonds are selling at a premium, which means a saving to the Government of at least 1 per cent, or \$8,000,000, annually, in interest on its \$800,000,000 interest-bearing debt. If a change in this regulation is to be made, and the money is to be deposited in banks, and no deposit of bonds as security for deposits is required, but interest is to be paid by the bank, what will be the result? If the Government keeps on deposit with banks on an average \$200,000,000, and receives 3 per cent on said deposits, it will get \$6,000,000 interest annually. If it has to pay 1 per cent, or \$8,000,000 annually extra interest on its interest-bearing debt, the increase in the rate of interest will exceed the interest received on deposits by \$2,000,000.

Viewing it from the standpoint of a banker, I take it that this would be very agreeable to banks and bankers, but why limit the deposits to national banks? Are not other banks entitled to as much consideration as national banks? Why class legislation? Why divert the deposits from one bank to another, or from one locality to another? If arrangement could be made for an equitable distribution of these deposits, and give to each community the use and benefit of money belonging to that community, and if the Government can be protected against loss, and if the depositor can be furnished a safe place to deposit his money, then I can see no objection to the legislation, and I know of no objection to it, and I believe the suggestion would meet with almost universal approval—certainly by bankers and people living in rural districts, were it not for this Government ownership feature of it and the fact that the Government generally makes a failure of all business undertakings, due to the red-tape, bunglesome, and unbusinesslike ways of transacting business, founded on political and not business methods.

And in making this statement I want to make myself clear. That is, in no way do I want to be understood as criticising or reflecting on any Department, or anybody in any way connected therewith, or employed therein. We have in our Departments some of the most excellent people, men and women of integrity, industry, intelligence, and ability. I yield to nobody in admiration and appreciation of our conscientious, patriotic, and worthy President; but the Departments are not altogether responsible, as the business affairs of this Government come under two branches—the legislative and executive; and its success depends not only on the just and wise administration of laws, but upon the enactment of such laws as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] make the point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state what his point of order is?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will be courteous enough to the Chair to await the invitation of the Chair.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will be courteous enough to the people of the United States, whom he thinks do not want this convenience.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] to state his point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; we want to know what it is now.

Mr. OVERSTREET. We are now proceeding in order. That was the desire which I had. Mr. Chairman, this provision

which is now under consideration is for pay of rural carriers under a permanent statute passed some time ago—I have forgotten the date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair merely desires the gentleman to state what the point of order is.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That it is contrary to existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 27 by adding, at the end of line 14, the following:

"Provided further, That service by carrier on rural delivery routes shall not be suspended on legal holidays."

Mr. SMALL. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, it is subject to a point of order, as will be disclosed by what I shall say. At present carriers on rural routes observe as holidays New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Decoration Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and such other days as are designated as holidays by proclamation or by the statutes of the several States. That is an unfair condition for the rural service of the country, and it exists only by regulation of the Postmaster-General or by special orders made from time to time in advance of these holidays. There is no similar instance under the Post-Office Department where such an inconvenience is worked as is worked on the rural routes. I have an instance in my mind of an every-other-day rural route, where the service was on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, and a holiday coming on Saturday, and therefore the patrons on that route had no service from Thursday until the following Tuesday. I say no such inconvenience is worked to the patrons of the Department in any other section, and it is an unfair discrimination against the good people who live on the farms. Take the cities, if you please, and they have on holidays at least one collection and one delivery—that is, where they have city carriers—and where they do not have city deliveries the post-offices are kept open a sufficient length of time for patrons to receive and deposit their mail, and the mails are received and dispatched as on ordinary days.

On all the railroads, steamboats, and on star routes throughout the country the mails are carried on holidays. The railway postal clerks are required to work on holidays; and it is unfair to those who live in the rural sections, and to whom the blessing of rural service has been brought, that they should be subjected to this inconvenience. Now, some may think that consideration of the rural carriers would justify them in voting against this amendment. No one feels a greater interest in the rural carriers than I. I have urged and voted for every increase in their salary. I voted to give them fifteen days' vacation with pay. I will continue to urge favorable legislation; but I will say that where there is one rural carrier there is an average of 75 to 200 patrons who are inconvenienced, and the interests of the many should be considered as superior to that of the few. The rural service was established for the benefit of all the people, and those who live on the farms are as much entitled to receive their mail as those who live in the city.

In addition to that, on all these routes there is one substitute, and that substitute may carry the mail upon this particular day, so that the regular carrier may observe the holiday. It is not that I and other Members may not feel an interest in the carriers; it is simply that I feel a greater interest in the hundreds of thousands of patrons upon these rural routes. Under a law which we passed last session, or two or three sessions ago, these rural carriers have fifteen days' annual leave with pay. I favored this and also the increase in salary, and will vote to further increase their pay; but I do say that upon these thousands of rural routes, with these hundreds of thousands of patrons upon these routes, they should receive their mail on every week day, regardless of whether it be a holiday or not.

Now, as to the point of order that has been reserved, and will probably be made, I wish to say that this is a regulation made by the Postmaster-General. It is made under no express or general authority of law; and I challenge anyone, the chairman of the committee, if he shall make the point of order, or anyone else, to point out any authority whereby the Postmaster-General is authorized to suspend service on these rural routes or elsewhere; and it is, besides, perfectly germane to the paragraph which we are considering. So that if these regulations were made without authority of law, express or general, and if it is merely the action of the Postmaster-General, then it is not in violation of the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from North Carolina briefly on the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no authority of law for suspending this service on rural routes; that it exists by regulation, and in support of that proposition I have a letter from the Postmaster-General stating in express terms that it is not by statute, but by regulation of the Department. The only authority of law by which the Postmaster-General might make regulations is contained in Revised Statutes 396.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from North Carolina if there is any law requiring the Postmaster-General to do that which is required in his amendment?

Mr. SMALL. In my opinion, there is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear any further on the point of order. In view of the fact that this amendment makes law, there being none in existence, it is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore in violation of the rule.

Mr. SMALL. The Chairman will pardon me a moment. In answer to that suggestion I desire to say it does not make law. It is simply an enforcement of existing law, which requires the mail on rural routes, whether it be a daily service or whether it be an every-other-day service, be carried at regular intervals. Therefore this amendment is only an enforcement of existing law, and can not change existing law. It is not new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is not in the nature of a limitation upon the appropriation. It appears on its face to be a new provision of law, and therefore in violation of the rule against legislation upon general appropriation bills. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, to come in at the same place.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That carriers on rural routes more than 24 miles in length shall receive for each mile in excess of 24 \$30 per annum in addition to the maximum pay now authorized by law.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I make the point of order against the amendment, that it is contrary to existing law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Will you reserve it for a minute?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. All I have to say is this: This is service on the mileage basis, the Department having fixed 24 miles as a standard. If a carrier travels less than 24 miles, then there is deducted from his maximum pay of \$900 so much per mile. There are cases where, on account of rivers, roads, and local conditions, the carriers are obliged to make a circuit of 27, 28, or 30 miles in order to get back to the distributing office. All I ask is that those people who are traveling 27, 28, or 30 miles shall receive reasonable compensation for this extra work. That is all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon the point of order?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, as the amendment clearly authorizes something not now authorized by existing law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I offer the following amendment, to come in at the same place.

The Clerk read as follows.

That rural carriers shall not be required to carry mail on the 25th day of December.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I make the point of order on that that it is subject to the same objection as the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

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

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend on page 27 by inserting, after line 14, the words "Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used to pay for carrying in the mails any malt, vinous, or spirituous liquors, or intoxicating liquors of any kind, or any cocaine or derivatives thereof."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Is this the same as the other amendment, which applied to transportation over railroad routes?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I thought possibly the gentleman would let the matter alone so far as the farmer was concerned, and would permit liquor to be carried on rural routes for the benefit of the farmer.

Mr. HOUSTON. No, sir; I do not want it carried at all.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to the amendment. I move to amend by striking out the last six words of the amendment—that is, the part referring to the carrying of cocaine on rural routes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the words "or any cocaine or derivatives thereof."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman, who is a practicing physician, will give us some reason for that.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. My reason for offering this amendment is that all over this country of ours where the mail is carried by rural delivery there are a great many country physicians who are living in the little villages away from the railroads and where there are no drug stores, and they are only accessible to their towns through these rural routes. A physician practicing in such a locality is now enabled to telephone to his druggist in the city in the morning and have a quantity of cocaine delivered to him when the mail carrier comes out during the forenoon. This is an important thing, as I can testify, having practiced medicine for a few years. Cocaine is an important medicinal agent as a local anæsthetic in the practice of medicine, and to be deprived of the privilege of securing it when he needs it is a hardship upon the country doctor.

Then there is a further reason why this amendment should be voted down, in so far as rural routes are concerned, where it was not in the other places in this bill. The great difficulty that comes from the use of cocaine and the great abuse that comes from it is almost entirely confined to the city, and does not exist in the country. There is practically none of it in the rural districts anywhere in this country to-day. So that the voting down of this part of the amendment would, I think, be of benefit to humanity and to physicians practicing in the country. For these reasons I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the other day when I offered the amendment in reference to cocaine I stated, after a conversation with my distinguished colleague from Illinois in reference to the matter, that I was quite satisfied the amendment as offered would not go into the law. While it was an item in the bill which left the House, it would not be in the law in that shape. I introduced in the House to-day a bill on the subject of the transportation of cocaine, at the request of parties who are giving considerable attention to it, the retail druggists. I take it that when this bill becomes a law if anything in reference to cocaine is in the bill (and possibly also the same might apply as to intoxicating liquors, although I express no opinion about that), it ought to make an exception in favor of licensed physicians, dentists, retail druggists, and probably the shipping from one manufacturer or wholesale druggist to another; and the provision ought to be a positive inhibition on the transportation of this article and similar articles by mail, with a penalty clause attached. It is perfectly evident that the Post-Office Department itself will not be able to tell whether the package contains cocaine unless it be marked "cocaine." I think the only effect of putting the provision in the bill is to indicate the attitude of the House that there ought to be, in a proper way, legislation upon this subject along proper lines, and whether this amendment now offered by the gentleman prevails or not—and I trust it will not—I hope that he will not insist upon it, so that the matter can be perfected and be in one place in the law, instead of in four or five different places.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman says that there should be some amendment by which the prohibition should be so limited that in case of drugs furnished to dentists and doctors they should be transported. How is it possible for the Post-Office Department to ascertain the source from which its mail packages come?

Mr. MANN. That is exactly what I said before the gentleman asked the question—that I did not think the provision in the bill, the way it is in, if it became a law, would practically amount to a great deal.

Mr. PERKINS. Then why should we put it in?

Mr. MANN. It will amount to a great deal if it remains in the bill as passing the House, because, if it becomes a law, it will contain an inhibition upon the subject of transporting these articles by mail with a penalty to enforce it, except to licensed physicians and people of that class who ought to be supplied. You could put a thousand provisions in here that no part of the money can be used for the purpose of transporting cocaine by mail, but, if there is no penalty in it, it amounts to nothing. It is only a direction to the Post-Office Department, which has no means of ascertaining whether cocaine is transported or whether intoxicating liquor is transported. It puts the provision into the bill as it passes the House in such a way that the committee in charge must either recede or strike out the provision as

we put it in and put it in proper shape. I hope the gentleman will let this go with the rest, because the result will be satisfactory to the gentleman.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment, because it is not far-reaching enough. If we take it upon ourselves to say what shall be kept from the people, let us go a little further and keep patent medicines containing alcohol away from them. If I take a small glass of beer I do not get as much alcohol into me as I do when I take a teaspoonful of Peruna. [Laughter.]

Let me show you the amount of alcohol in these medicines taken from a letter that I received from the Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture.

Here is Peruna, which contains 18 per cent of alcohol; Warner's Safe Cure, 15.12 per cent alcohol; Hostetter's Stomach Bitters, 39 per cent alcohol. There is something good for you people to use who oppose the drinking of alcohol in its original state. [Laughter.] Wine of Cardui contains 20 per cent alcohol. Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound contains 18 per cent alcohol.

Now, while I am on the floor I wish to refer to the remarks made by my dear friend from Tennessee yesterday. He alluded to that beautiful part of the Lord's prayer, "Do not lead us into temptation." Now, if my friend's ideas are carried out, that part of the Lord's prayer may well be stricken out, because there will be nothing left with which to tempt people.

I fully agree with my friend from Tennessee that we ought to try to make people temperate. We only disagree as to the method.

I want to build up people strong in character, able to resist temptation. He wants to build up a nation of weaklings and sissies, from whom we must keep everything that is not good for them or that might be harmful to them. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendment thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from North Carolina if his amendment is to this paragraph?

Mr. SMALL. It is to the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. This is an amendment to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HUSTON].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] now offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding thereto:

"Providing the same may be carried when it is to be used for medicinal purposes, and upon the prescription of a physician."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, has debate closed?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

That the appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the postal service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons permanently incapacitated for performing such service. The establishment of a civil-pension roll or an honorable-service roll, or the exemption of any of the officers, clerks, and persons in the postal service from the existing laws respecting employment in such service is hereby prohibited.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order. Is that a provision of the existing statute?

Mr. TAWNEY. The current appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is the same as has been carried in several appropriation laws for postal service. There is no change of language in that paragraph.

Mr. MANN. That has been construed, then. There is carried in one provision of the bill something for taking care of people who are incapacitated.

Mr. HOLLIDAY. Not permanently.

Mr. MANN. Then you provide in another place they shall not be taken care of. That has received a construction, I take it, and that this provision does not conflict with the other provision.

Mr. OVERSTREET. To which provision does the gentleman refer?

Mr. MANN. You take care of the railway mail clerks who are incapacitated?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Then you say here that the appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the postal service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons permanently incapacitated for performing such service. That is apparently in direct conflict with the theory of the other provision.

Mr. OVERSTREET. This refers to the permanent incapacity of the clerk, while the provision in the Railway Mail Service carries the salary of the clerk for one year, and in case of death pays his widow or heirs \$1,000.

Mr. MANN. Suppose a railway mail clerk becomes permanently incapacitated?

Mr. OVERSTREET. He gets his salary for one year, and then he goes out of the service.

Mr. MANN. And this says that no portion of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the compensation of a person permanently incapacitated.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The construction is that it has never been decided that the clerk is permanently incapacitated until after the expiration of a year.

Mr. MANN. It has received that construction?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do not say it has received it specifically, but that is my interpretation of it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will forgive me for calling attention to it, but our Committee on Reform in the Civil Service is listening now to many reasons why a civil-pension list should be established, and it had appeared to me that the arguments made before that committee were receiving great weight with most of the members of the committee. Of course it is not called a civil-pension list; it is called a retirement fund at the expense of the employees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what it is.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter the Postmaster-General shall each year prepare and submit in his annual report to Congress estimates of the revenue and expenditures in the postal service for the fiscal year current, and also for the fiscal year next ensuing at the time said report is submitted, together with a statement of the receipts and expenditures for the preceding completed fiscal year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is one of the concluding paragraphs of the post-office appropriation bill, which carries two hundred and twenty millions of dollars. Not since I have served in Congress have I seen a like bill go through the Committee of the Whole with like facility. No one has been denied the right to debate, no amendment has been shut off; but this bill, with the exception of a few minor paragraphs, goes through in its entirety. It will go from this committee to the House, and will go through the House probably without any contest at all. And after this bill leaves this committee it will be found that there will not exist the necessity of asking the help of the plenary power of the Committee on Rules; it will not be necessary to have a drastic special provision put upon it to force it through on special order without amendment or debate. And why? Because it was properly prepared as an appropriation bill—not carrying a great mass of new legislation subject to the point of order, new legislation that obscures and confuses the minds of Members as to values and purposes in the real appropriations.

It was prepared as an appropriation bill should be prepared. It came to this committee; it has gone through the committee with facility, with every Member who has watched its progress understanding it; and I think its history and even course here ought to demonstrate to every committee on appropriations of the House of Representatives the proper way in which to prepare a bill, and to change the custom in this House as regards appropriation bills so that the practice in the future would be that every piece of new legislation of great moment should come into this House and into this Committee of the Whole separately and on its own merits, and be considered here without confusing and without obscuring regular appropriations. I want to congratulate the men who are on the committee with me. I do not agree with them all the time. I do not always follow the chairman of the committee or the committee, but I do know how diligent, industrious, and hard working the chairman of this committee is and how hard worked that committee is, as hard worked a body of men as I have ever seen in or out of a legislature. I congratulate them on the near perfection of this bill, on its approval by this committee, its coming approval by the House, and I commend the course

that has been taken here in the last three days to every chairman of every other appropriation committee of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter for the purpose of facilitating the handling of mail on United States naval vessels, competent enlisted men may, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, be designated by the Post-Office Department as "Navy mail clerks" and "assistant Navy mail clerks," and authorized to receive and open all pouches and sacks of mail addressed to the vessels, to make proper delivery of such mail, to receive matter for transmission in the mails, and to receipt for registered matter (keeping an accurate record thereof), to keep and have for sale an adequate supply of postage stamps, and to make up and dispatch mails in accordance with instructions.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. On that section and the two following sections, being kindred sections, I make the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the ground of his point of order is that this is new legislation?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Yes, sir.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, the remainder of the bill, with the exception of the last paragraph, is new legislation; but I think upon explanation the committee will appreciate that it is wise legislation, and I believe the gentleman from Tennessee will not then insist upon his point of order. There is no appropriation carried; no expense incurred. It undertakes to authorize, however, the proper officers of our war vessels—

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield to a question? Will there not be expense incurred, but to be paid by the Navy Department instead of the Post-Office Department?

Mr. OVERSTREET. If the gentlemen will permit me to explain, I think I can make the matter clear.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee whether he had advised the gentleman from Kansas that these paragraphs in the bill were late items of legislation?

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman, if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] will permit me, they are new legislation, and so far as I know they are meritorious legislation, but the purposes would be served a great deal better if they were brought in separately.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to explain this paragraph, I would be glad to do so. There is now no provision at all for facilitating either the collection or distribution of mail addressed to the sailors and officers upon our war vessels. Registered mail and special delivery mail are often misplaced, and sometimes entirely lost, because of the lack of some system under which the sailors, officers, and other men upon these vessels may receive the mail. Many of these war vessels have many hundreds of men. These vessels touch only at a few ports. Mail addressed to the men must take its risk of reaching the vessels. Many times it is unknown where the vessels will put in, and the parties addressing the letters to the men and sailors and officers of the Navy are not advised as to how to get their mail to those men.

Now, these several provisions, the three or four paragraphs, merely install a system whereby a proper officer in command of the war vessel may delegate some man or men whose duty it will be to take charge of the mail, deliver it at the post for distribution to the points addressed, and to collect the mail addressed to the men on the vessels and see that it is delivered to them individually, and to receipt for registered mail and special-delivery matter. Provision is made under which these men must give bonds and be compelled to follow the rules and regulations of the postal service. It is recommended, indeed it is prepared, by the Navy Department, and sent through proper official channels to the Postmaster-General, and by the Postmaster-General transmitted to the committee with a recommendation for its passage. The expense, if any, answering my friend from New York [Mr. PERKINS], would be to the Navy Department in the event it should be found necessary to pay anything extra beyond what the men themselves would receive. I fancy, however, that it would only result in the men being detailed for this character of work for certain periods of time, and relieved from other duty, and not entail any additional expense.

Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Does the gentleman yield the floor?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the provision in this bill for post-offices in the Navy is a rather crude and incomplete affair. It seems to me if that service is needed it would be better for us to pass a separate act, following out the rules of the House by not having any new legislation on appropriation bills in the way of amendment or otherwise. My

friend from Indiana for two or three days has prevented this House from having new legislation on this bill, and it has not been more than half an hour since he prevented me from securing a vote on an amendment that affects the rights and interests of twenty-five or thirty millions of people in the United States living in the country. I suggest to him that if he wants new legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House, there ought to be some reciprocity in his movement.

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

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Certainly; for a question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Does the gentleman regard it as fair and proper reciprocity to compare legislation which contains a provision for the distribution of mail to the officers and men on the battle ships to granting authority to build roads by the Government, at the expense of the Government, throughout the country?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Why, of course I do. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am not much surprised. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's opposition to the legislation proposed by me a while ago has forced the friends of that measure, which I prepared, in order to have it placed in the bill, to go to the other end of the Capitol for relief. Now, it is possible that over there, where this rule is not maintained that I seek to invoke against him now, he may obtain the relief that he is asking. I have no objection to that. But when we go to the Senate, I would rather that we both go, and that he have one proposition and I have the other, and we will have better means of agreeing. I want him to feel the force of the rule as it affected us personally.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has had long experience in this House. Does not the gentleman recognize the difference in the position of the chairman of a committee in charge of an appropriation bill making the point of order upon an amendment offered from the floor of the House in violation of the rules and inserting in a bill a provision which the committee has ordered inserted in the bill?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I take it that a member of the committee has as much right on this floor as the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly the gentleman has the same right to make the point of order.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I think when a bill comes from the committee a member has the right, when all points of order are reserved, to make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Of course he has a perfect right to make the point of order, but the gentleman was talking about reciprocity. I simply wanted to ask, would any chairman of a committee on appropriations last fifteen minutes in this House unless Members understood that the chairman of the committee would protect the House from legislation offered as amendments on the floor of the House, by making points of order against them.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. And when the chairman of the committee offers amendments in violation of the rule the Members of the House can protect the House.

Mr. MANN. That is perfectly proper.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Do I understand the gentleman to insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Each Navy mail clerk and assistant Navy mail clerk shall take the oath of office prescribed for employees of the postal service and shall give bond to the United States in the sum of \$1,000 for the faithful performance of his duties as such clerk, and when necessity arises therefor any assistant Navy mail clerk may be required by the commanding officer of the vessel upon which he is stationed to perform the duties of Navy mail clerk.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. The same point of order is made to that as to the other section.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks shall receive no compensation for their services from the Post-Office Department or postal service, but may be allowed additional compensation for such services by the Navy Department. Such clerks and assistant clerks shall be employees of the Navy Department and amenable in all respects to naval discipline, except that, as to their duties as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, the commanding officers of the vessels upon which they are stationed shall require them to be governed by the postal laws and regulations of the United States.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I want to reserve the point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the point of order.

Mr. KELIHER. I move to strike out the last word. It is understood—

Mr. MANN. I respectfully submit to the Chair, How can a gentleman move an amendment when a point of order is pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. An amendment can not be offered while a point of order is reserved.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I will make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that, while that may be technically correct, the practice has uniformly been to permit gentlemen to speak to a pro forma amendment while the point of order is reserved. The gentleman from Tennessee now makes the point of order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

That if the revenues of the Post-Office Department shall be insufficient to meet the appropriations made by this act, a sum equal to such deficiency of the revenue of said Department is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply said deficiencies in the revenues for the Post-Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1909, and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post-Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. KELIHER. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I understand it is the intention of the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, when this committee rises, to ask a separate vote upon the amendment voted into the bill upon the day before yesterday, whereby the committee increased or made provision for vitalizing the act which was passed last year that made provision for the \$1,200 clerks in the city carrier service.

I want it understood that certain facts should be borne in mind. I believe it to be my duty to disabuse the minds of the members of the committee of the wrong impression that may have been left by a few statements made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], chairman of the Post-Office Committee, on the day before yesterday, in the course of his argument. In answering my charge that deception had been practiced, both upon the House and the carriers, the distinguished chairman stated that the committee had kept faith, and that they had but carried out the wishes of the father of the law, the First Assistant Postmaster-General. He said in that debate, quoting Mr. Hitchcock's statement before the Post-Office Committee last year:

All I ask as to the \$1,200 grade is that it be authorized, and leave to Congress the determination of when and how many carriers shall be advanced into that grade.

Continuing, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] stated:

Instead of there being the practice of deceit or subterfuge, the provision was made with eyes open, not only of the committee of conference, but the First Assistant Postmaster-General himself.

Later on he said:

By withholding the appropriation from the \$1,200 grade we have violated neither the provisions of the law nor the intent of its framers.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the chairman of the committee when he makes that statement, and I want to impress upon this House with all the emphasis I can command that when this committee failed to appropriate a sufficient amount to provide \$1,200 carriers, they did not carry out the recommendation of the First Assistant Postmaster-General. I respectfully call attention to the hearings of the Post-Office Committee on page 178. I now refer to the hearings before that committee this year, where the chairman asks Mr. Hitchcock, First Assistant Postmaster-General, if in an estimate he had submitted he, the First Assistant Postmaster-General, was not providing for an increase of 50 per cent of the carriers now in the \$1,100 grade to the \$1,200 grade. At one hearing Chairman OVERSTREET said:

It also includes, I observe, the promotion of 50 per cent of the carriers from the \$1,100 to the \$1,200 grade.

Mr. Hitchcock, in answer to that specific inquiry, said:

Yes; it was our plan to provide for the promotion of 50 per cent of the carriers in that grade.

Now, I reiterate that if the chairman of the Post-Office and Post-Roads Committee had not broken faith, if he were carrying out the wish of the man whom he says originally presented this proposition, the House would not have adopted this amendment against the protest of the gentleman from Indiana, but would have sustained the committee.

I understand that the supporters of the rural free-delivery service feel that the city carriers are being promoted far in advance of what they are worth when we give them what the law entitles them to; but I say this to those gentlemen, that when their proposition came up last year we provided \$900 a year for the rural carriers, and they are getting that \$900. We also provided \$1,200 for our carriers, but our carriers are

not getting that \$1,200. All this committee did when it voted the other day was to vitalize an act that you put upon the statute book last year. And, Mr. Chairman, if we, the friends of the city carriers, and you, the friends of the rural carriers, pull one against the other, your men will never get the increase which, I believe, they deserve, and our men will not get what the Congress contemplated giving and which the law now clearly provides. If you vote against us, we must, in order not to stultify ourselves, later vote against you. Consequently neither will get the increase that both deserve. I sincerely trust, in view of the fact that this statute providing \$1,200 is the law of the land, that the House will not reject the amendment voted in by the committee, but will sustain us and give these men that to which they are entitled—\$1,200 a year. [Applause.]

Mr. BURKE. Most of the arguments directed against this measure during the debate have been based upon the statement that raises have not been made in other branches of the public service to the extent contemplated by this amendment.

Objection to legislation should be based upon a healthier reason than that. Even if it were true that inequities exist in other Departments, that should not be used to justify a continued injustice to a body of men whose efficiency and whose worth are known to every business establishment and every home in the great cities of this country.

Last year we authorized the creation of this class; and while we left to a future Congress the duty of providing the cost to make the increase effective, we are now confronted with the duty to appropriate it and grant the increase or repudiate what every letter carrier in the great cities of this country had a right to regard as a promise.

In winter snows or under summer's burning suns, in the pelting rains or biting winds, the letter carrier, with the regularity of the seasons, is found bearing his burdens and performing his duties.

The Government tolerates no excuse, but demands always the presence of these men at their post of duty, and it is but fair that we should reward them in accordance with our promise and in keeping with justice.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose, when the committee rises and reports this bill to the House to ask for a separate vote upon the amendment by which the letter carriers of the \$1,100 grade would be promoted to the \$1,200 grade. The committee when it recommended this bill to the House concluded to make no recommendations for increase of salaries. When I presented the bill in the first instance to the committee, I stated that, without foreclosing against any future acts and without passing upon the merits or demerits of the several propositions, in opposing the increases of the city letter carriers we were merely keeping faith with the policy to make no increases of salaries. There are meritorious claims on the part of the fourth-class postmasters, in my judgment, of much merit; and yet the committee decided not to take up that question this year. I believe I have stated, and I repeat it, that, in my judgment, the clerks in the post-office of the eleven-hundred-dollar grade are more deserving of promotion than are the letter carriers of the eleven-hundred-dollar grade; and yet the committee, Mr. Chairman, has made no provision for a general increase of salaries of that class of employees. The slight increase of 15 per cent was in order that they might appoint from the eleven-hundred-dollar grade to the superintendents of the small stations at the rate of \$1,200 per year. Therefore we have been consistent upon our part in calling the attention of Members to the policy of not promoting anybody, whether he is a letter carrier, post-office clerk, railway mail clerk, rural carrier, or fourth-class postmaster; each one of these several divisions of employees has his particular advocate and champion.

As to whether or not we have violated the classification act, whether or not we have failed to keep faith, whether or not it is necessary to vitalize some legislation, is not before this committee. The classification act halted arbitrarily the promotion of letter carriers at the eleven-hundred-dollar grade, and I reassert, and challenge contradiction, that the First Assistant Postmaster, who went before the committee urging that legislation, specifically stated that he did not ask annual promotion of the letter carriers to the twelve-hundred-dollar grade, but he recommended the establishment of the grade, leaving Congress to decide when they should be promoted by making that promotion from the increased appropriation.

Mr. KELIHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I prefer that the gentleman would not interrupt me now. The First Assistant Postmaster-General was very solicitous about this classification, and I do him the

credit to say that it was very largely due to his championship of the legislation that it finally became a law. And yet he, in the original recommendation, halted arbitrarily the promotion of the carriers at the thousand-dollar grade and not the eleven-hundred-dollar grade, and Congress in passing the legislation advanced one grade the arbitrary automatic promotion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope our friends from the large cities will not undertake in their zeal to gratify the desires of their constituencies and leave the impression that any of us is failing to keep faith with anybody. I claim just as much affection for and attention to the letter carriers of the Seventh Congressional District in Indiana as does the gentleman from Massachusetts; man for man they are the equal of the carriers in the Boston office, and I lament, Mr. Chairman, being obliged to oppose the urgent request of a number of my constituents in failing to make these promotions, but I must defend on behalf of the Government, whose services we are engaged in discharging. In view of the legislation last winter, one session ago, we went as far as was consistent when we increased the salary of these postal employees to the extent of \$12,000,000.

I hope at no distant day in the future to see additional increase provided for them, but at this session of Congress, in my judgment, it is unwise to make the increase in salaries.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is a hundredfold more unwise to make a selection of one particular class of employees and increase their salaries and fail to increase the salaries of the others. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we can keep faith with ourselves and the Government, and be sustained in our recommendation for the increase of salaries, either to all or let all wait until we can consider whether or not the conditions of business and the revenues of the country will justify the additional increase. [Applause.]

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

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will.

Mr. POLLARD. I would like to inquire how much of the appropriation bill of last year increased the salary of letter carriers in cities of the first class?

Mr. TAWNEY. Two million four hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. POLLARD. That applies to letter carriers in cities of the first class?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes. This amendment proposes an increase of salary of the eleven-hundred-dollar class, and they are all in cities of the first class and none of them are in cities of the second class.

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

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is now pending.

Mr. SULZER. I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. I do this for the purpose of saying a few words for the letter carriers. For years, Mr. Chairman, I have been in favor of the demands of the letter carriers of the country for just wages, and in several Congresses in the past I had the honor to introduce their bill for an increase of pay, because, in my judgment, I believed that their salaries were then, and are now, inadequate for the services they perform. Last year, after a long and bitter fight, the matter culminated in an amendment to the law fixing the grades and the salaries for the same, and it was understood when that amendment was adopted that the letter carriers' pay in the highest grade, beginning last July, should be \$100 a month or \$1,200 a year. When the time came around, however, the Post-Office authorities said Congress had made no provision for the payment of the salaries of the men in the highest grade in accordance with the law. In other words, Congress failed last year to appropriate the money to pay the letter carriers in accordance with the law. The law is on the statute books, and all we are asking Congress to do to-day is to pay these men in accordance with that law. There is no increase of pay. That is no increase of salary. The Government, through Congress, has put this law on the statute books, and that law says that the letter carriers in the highest grade shall receive \$1,200 a year. Now, the friends of the letter carriers say to the committee, and we say to Congress, let us appropriate the necessary money in accordance with law to pay these men's salaries, just the same as we appropriate the necessary money to pay the salaries of every other employee of the Government. The adoption of that law last year was in reality a contract between the Government and the letter carriers, and we can not violate it now without disregarding the law, doing injustice to the letter carriers, and breaking the promises we then made to them.

Mr. Chairman, I plead to-day, as I have pleaded in the past, for justice for the deserving letter carriers. Their request for living wages is the demand of humanity. My heart goes out to them. I can not refrain from making this appeal in their behalf for simple justice.

There is not a man in this House who does not know that I am telling the truth when I say that these letter carriers are the hardest worked, the most patient, the most honest, the most zealous, the most untiring, and the most efficient men to-day in the employ of the Government; and yet they get the poorest pay. They are paid to-day just about the same wages they were paid twenty-five years ago, and everybody knows that the price of the necessities of life under the Dingley tariff law has gone up over 30 per cent during the last ten years, and the letter carriers' wages remain just about the same as they were twenty-five years ago. [Applause.]

The letter carriers and the post-office clerks, and every other person whose salary is fixed, do not get any benefit from the Dingley high-tariff law, for nearly all the necessities of life they have to buy now they have to pay about 30 per cent more by reason of this Republican tariff law than they did ten years ago.

Now, I say \$1,200 a year for a letter carrier who has worked for the Government for years honestly and faithfully, in all kinds of weather, carrying the mail in sunshine and rain, in storm and distress, in the cold of winter and the heat of summer, is little enough. No man can decently bring up his family and educate his children on any less. How poorly, how miserably the letter carriers are paid! And yet, take them all in all, they are courteous, long suffering, uncomplaining, honest, assiduous, and industrious. How few of our citizens ever think of their trials, their wants, their health, their families and the little ones at home. At present they do not earn enough, no matter how long they have been in the service of the Government or how many hours a day they labor, to keep body and soul together. And what do they get? A mere pittance a month that is not enough to economically support one man. Let us be honest. Let us be just. Let us be true to the dictates of our nobler impulses, and if we are, this amendment—so honest and so just and so earnestly desired—will be adopted. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I trust that when this question comes up to-day in the House, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] moves, as he says he will, to disagree with the amendment the Committee of the Whole House put in the bill to pay these men their salaries at \$1,200 a year, that every man who is in favor of the law, every man who believes in justice, and every man who wants in good faith to keep the contract, will vote against the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] and vote with the friends of the letter carriers in favor of the amendment put in the bill by the Committee of the Whole House to pay the letter carriers \$1,200 a year, in accordance with the law we passed last year. [Applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I think it is not necessary to prolong debate on this subject, but it is fair to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GOEBEL], who offered the amendment, that he should have a chance to speak upon it, and it is also fair that the opponents of the amendment should have the close, those offering it having the opening. I now ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto, which closes everything, be closed in ten minutes, and that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GOEBEL] have five minutes of that time and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] the remaining five minutes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman make it fifteen minutes, so that I may have a few minutes, and in that event I shall make no objection to his request?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the gentleman from Indiana will agree to that so that my colleague will have five minutes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] be permitted to speak for five minutes, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GOEBEL] for five minutes, and that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] for five minutes, and that then all debate close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph to the bill close in fifteen minutes, of which time the gentleman he has named shall, in the order he has named them, occupy five minutes each. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, the last Congress created a \$1,200 grade in the letter-carrier service. It failed, however, to provide sufficient appropriation to pay that maximum salary. The amendment we adopted the other day in this Committee of

the Whole simply makes last year's legislation effective and gives life to the statute. It will give to the highest grade of carriers a salary of \$1,200, which, in my judgment, they certainly earn, and which in common justice they ought to have.

Again and again, in years past, we have appealed in the name of fairness for this increase. For over a quarter of a century the salaries remained unchanged. Bills to increase the pay so as to make it commensurate with the work done and to meet the increased cost of living were laid aside and smothered to death in the committee. I joined others in earnest protest, but in vain. Amendments in various Congresses, some of which I offered, were ruled out or rejected. At last, compelled by public sentiment to increase the pay, Congress last year created the grade but withheld the money required to meet that increase, and now notice is served on us that the question will be tested in the House as to whether we shall provide the funds that shall vitalize the law.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express the hope that every gentleman who believes in fair play will vote to retain the amendment in the bill. I am glad to say that I have been an earnest and consistent friend of the letter carriers. When two days ago we adopted the amendment I was gratified, for I felt that, though long delayed, justice was being done. The result of long and continued effort was at last at hand. The ineffective law of last year was to be given life. Yet to-day the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the Post-Office Committee [Mr. OVERSTREET], tells us it is unwise to make the appropriation. Why unwise? We created the grade. Surely every eleven-hundred-dollar man had a right to expect Congress would appropriate sufficient to cover the required increase. To withhold it now is not alone unfair and unwarranted, but seems to me to be a breach of faith.

These men are faithful in the performance of their work. They live in cities where the cost of living is high, where rents are on the increase, where the meager salaries they receive barely meet the cost of the actual necessities of life. This country is too large and too great to deal mean or niggardly with its employees, especially when they labor as hard and untiringly as do the postal men. They are in no pensioned class. When age comes on after years of service and earning capacity has ceased, the men are left, too oft, I regret to say, to their own sad plight. So then, let us deal fairly and uprightly with them. Do not let Congress tell them in one breath that they can be promoted to a \$1,200 grade and in the same breath tell them it will not supply the necessary funds to make it good.

It will be unnecessary to discuss the matter further. I have so often argued the justice of the increase that I refrain from repetition. My time to discuss the matter is limited, but in the few moments allotted to me I do earnestly and urgently appeal to the membership of this House to retain the amendment. Pay these men what is just. Do not resort to subterfuge in withholding the money that the law contemplates shall be appropriated. And so I hope that if a vote is to be had on this matter again when we go back in the House the appropriation will be sustained, so that this deserving class of men may receive the salary that they so richly earn. [Applause.]

Mr. GOEBEL. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], I desire to say I have no criticisms to make upon him nor upon the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. That committee honestly and conscientiously discharged its duties and agreed by a majority vote to report this bill. The committee was not unanimous so far as certain provisions contained in the bill are concerned, and one difference arose upon the proposition that we are considering to-day. I submit that when the Post-Office Committee had concluded to make no increase, that that committee can not rise higher than the Committee of the Whole House, that their recommendation can rise no higher than the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House to be made to the House. I offered the amendments to increase the pay of the clerks in the Post-Office Department. The committee of the Whole House saw fit to disagree with me upon that proposition. I offered the amendment to allow expenses to the railway mail clerks, and the Committee of the Whole disagreed with me upon that proposition. I submit to the will of the Committee of the Whole upon those propositions. That committee, however, agreed with me upon the amendment to increase the pay of letter carriers. It would seem that if the gentleman wanted to carry out the wishes of the Committee of the Whole, he ought not to insist upon the House rescinding the action of the Committee of the Whole.

Now, then, let us see. Every opportunity was afforded the gentleman, and the Committee of the Whole has spoken upon these propositions. We are going now into the House, where the gentleman intends to ask the previous question and avoid

the further discussion upon the merits of this proposition, and intends to defeat this amendment. I said to you that we were not keeping faith with these employees in the Post-Office Department; that last year we said to them, "We are going to increase your salary," and we created the grades of \$1,100 and \$1,200, and we said, "We will make the appropriation in order that you may be raised into the \$1,200 grade." In vain have I tried to get from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] his reasons why this appropriation should not be made. All that he has said was that the receipts of the Department did not justify this raise.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. GOEBEL. That was the only reason that was urged, except that the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads had turned its face against every increase, whether right or wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposition we are now discussing is whether or not when a separate vote is demanded in the House on the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole, increasing the salary of the letter carriers for the first-class offices of the United States, we should vote for or against the proposed increase.

The principal ground upon which this increase is demanded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KELIHER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GOEBEL], and other gentlemen who favor this proposition, is that the existing law divides the postal service outside the city of Washington into six grades, and that the sixth grade in the letter-carrier service has never been appropriated for, and therefore the maximum amount that anyone in that service can receive is \$1,100 a year.

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KELIHER] says he proposes to vitalize that law. Why did not Congress at the last session vitalize that law when it was enacted?

Mr. SULZER. The friends of that act thought Congress did do it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the provision referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts does not bear the construction that he and the gentleman from Ohio contend for. It reads as follows:

That after June 30, 1907, clerks in offices of the first and second class, and carriers in the city delivery service, shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$600; second grade, salary \$800; third grade, salary \$900; fourth grade, salary \$1,000; fifth grade, salary \$1,100; sixth grade, salary \$1,200.

Now, note this language:

Clerks and carriers at first-class offices shall be promoted successively to the fifth grade and clerks and carriers at second-class offices successively to the fourth grade.

That means, Mr. Chairman, that the question of when these carriers should be promoted to the sixth grade was left to the discretion of Congress. And any time that Congress should provide the necessary appropriation they could be advanced to the sixth grade, and not until then. All of the inferior grades, however, were advanced successively until they reached the fifth grade, and the compensation fixed by Congress for that grade is \$1,100.

If you propose to increase or to vitalize this law in respect to the carriers in the first-class cities or in the offices of the first class, why do you not apply your provision for an increase of salaries to the clerks in these several post-offices—clerks who work from twelve to fifteen hours a day; clerks whose duties require a much higher degree of intelligence and education than is required of letter carriers? Why do you not extend your proposed increase to the railway postal clerks, or why did you vote down the amendment to increase the salaries of these, the poorest paid and hardest worked employees in the Government service? It is not consistency you demand or want, it is not the vitalization of existing law the gentleman wants; it is the vitalization of votes that gentlemen seek in urging this increase of salary to the carriers in the large cities of the country. No man can justify such discrimination against the large body of post-office employees, who are infinitely more worthy of consideration than are the carriers in our large cities.

If there is an aristocracy in the post-office service, so far as compensation is concerned, it consists of the letter carriers of the United States. They are receiving more compensation now and are working shorter hours than any other class of Government employees, either in the post-office service or outside of the post-office service outside of the District of Columbia. Mr. Chairman, we are about to make a favorable report to the House on this bill and recommend the passage of the largest appropriation bill that the Congress of the United States has

ever passed. This bill exceeds the current law in the amount of \$8,674,199. It carries, without this proposed increase of \$1,185,000, an aggregate appropriation of \$221,765,392. This fact alone, in view of diminished and diminishing revenues, should arrest the attention of this House, as it will the attention of the country. It should prompt Members to consider their duty to the Government before adding to the enormous aggregate of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it can not be claimed that because we are unwilling to increase the salary of the class 6 carriers at this time we are doing any injustice to them at all. This Congress began the consideration of appropriations with the determination that under the existing revenue it would be impossible to provide any increases of salary for the employees in the civil establishment of the Government; and thus far we have adhered to this purpose. There has been no increases of salary in any of the appropriation bills that Congress has passed except in isolated cases where there were exceptional circumstances. To those who are disposed to criticize this House, let me call to their attention what we have done within the last twelve months for the letter carriers and post-office clerks in the postal service outside of Washington in respect to the increase of their salaries. At the last session we increased the salaries of the railway mail clerks \$1,500,000. We increased the salaries of the rural free-delivery carriers \$5,600,000; we increased the salaries of the clerks in post-offices \$2,500,000; we increased the salaries of the letter carriers \$2,400,000, making an aggregate increase for these several branches of the postal service of \$12,000,000 at one session of Congress. And this bill carries an increase in salaries for letter carriers beyond the amount of this amendment of \$1,300,000.

In conclusion, therefore, I submit that this House is not justified in increasing the deficit for the next fiscal year by adding to this bill \$1,185,000 in order to increase the salaries of a now favored class of post-office employees.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had directed him to report the bill H. R. 18347, the post-office appropriation bill, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any of the amendments?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I demand a separate vote on the amendment in lines 22 and 23, on page 14 of the bill.

Mr. GOEBEL. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. KELIHER. On that I ask for a call of the roll.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the vote will be taken on the remaining amendments in gross.

No other separate vote was demanded.

The other amendments were agreed to in gross.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, in lines 22 and 23, strike out "26,650,000" and insert "27,825,000."

Mr. KELIHER. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken, and the yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken, and there were—yeas 135, nays 126, answered "present" 11, not voting 116, as follows:

YEAS—135.

Adair	Burton, Del.	Douglas	Goulden
Alexander, N. Y.	Burton, Ohio	Draper	Graft
Allen	Butler	Edwards, Ga.	Granger
Ames	Calder	Ellis, Mo.	Greene
Ansberry	Calderhead	Ellis, Oreg.	Hackney
Anthony	Carlin	Englebright	Hammond
Ashbrook	Caulfield	Favrot	Harding
Barclay	Cockran	Fitzgerald	Hardwick
Bartlett, Ga.	Cocks, N. Y.	Focht	Harrison
Bates	Cole	Fornes	Hay
Bennet, N. Y.	Cook, Colo.	Foss	Hayes
Bocher	Cook, Pa.	Foulkrod	Henry, Conn.
Brick	Cooper, Wis.	Gaines, Tenn.	Higgins
Brodhead	Dalzell	Garrett	Hill, Conn.
Broussard	Denby	Gill	Hitchcock
Burke	Denver	Goebel	Hobson
Burleigh	Diekema	Goldfogle	Howland

Hubbard, W. Va.	Livingston	Ofcott	Sherley
Hughes, N. J.	Longworth	Olmsstead	Sherman
Humphrey, Wash.	McLernout	Parsons	Sherwood
Johnson, Ky.	McGavin	Pearre	Slayden
Johnson, S. C.	McHenry	Perkins	Southwick
Jones, Wash.	McKinlay, Cal.	Peters	Sperry
Kahn	McKinley, Ill.	Porter	Sterling
Kellher	McKinney	Pray	Stevens, Minn.
Kennedy, Ohio	McLachlan, Cal.	Prince	Sulloway
Kipp	Madden	Pujo	Sulzer
Knowland	Mann	Ransdell, La.	Taylor, Ohio
Kuftermann	Maynard	Reynolds	Tou Velle
Law	Monser	Richardson	Willett
Lawrence	Mudd	Roberts	Williams
Leake	Murphy	Rothermel	Wilson, Ill.
Lenahan	Nye	Ryan	Wood
Lever	O'Connell	Sheppard	

NAYS—126.

Adamson	De Armond	Hill, Miss.	Rainey
Aiken	Dixon	Hinsaw	Randell, Tex.
Alexander, Mo.	Driscoll	Holliday	Rauch
Bannon	Edwards, Ky.	Houston	Reeder
Bartlett, Nev.	Ellerbe	Howard	Rucker
Beale, Pa.	Esch	Howell, Utah	Russell, Mo.
Beall, Tex.	Ferris	Hull, Tenn.	Russell, Tex.
Bell, Ga.	Floyd	Jones, Va.	Sims
Birdsall	Foster, Ill.	Kelifer	Slomp
Bonyng	Foster, Ind.	Kinkaid	Small
Boyd	Fuller	Landis	Smith, Cal.
Bradley	Fulton	Lewis	Smith, Mich.
Brantley	Gaines, W. Va.	Lindbergh	Smith, Mo.
Brundidge	Gardner, Mich.	Littlefield	Snapp
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Sparkman
Burleson	Garner	McCreary	Spight
Byrd	Gilham	McMorran	Stafford
Campbell	Godwin	Madison	Steenerson
Capron	Gordon	Marshall	Sturgiss
Carter	Gregg	Miller	Tawney
Chaney	Gronna	Moon, Tenn.	Taylor, Ala.
Chapman	Hackett	Moore, Tex.	Thistlewood
Clark, Mo.	Haggott	Morse	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton	Hall	Murdock	Tirrell
Cooper, Tex.	Hamilton, Iowa	Needham	Volstead
Cox, Ind.	Hamilton, Mich.	Nelson	Vreeland
Craig	Hardy	Overstreet	Wanger
Crawford	Haskins	Padgett	Wheeler
Crumpacker	Haugen	Page	Wiley
Darragh	Heflin	Patterson	Young
Davenport	Henry, Tex.	Payne	
Davis, Minn.	Heppburn	Pollard	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.

Bowers	French	Jenkins	Watkins
Finley	Griggs	Langley	Weisse
Foster, Vt.	Humphreys, Miss.	Townsend	

NOT VOTING—116.

Acheson	Fairchild	Lafcan	Pou
Andrus	Fassett	Lamar, Fla.	Powers
Barchfeld	Flood	Lamar, Mo.	Pratt
Bartholdt	Fordney	Lamb	Reid
Bede	Fowler	Laning	Rhinock
Bennett, Ky.	Gardner, Mass.	Lassiter	Riordan
Bingham	Gillespie	Lee	Robinson
Boutell	Gillett	Legare	Rodenberg
Browlow	Glass	Lilley	Sabath
Brumm	Graham	Lindsay	Saunders
Burnett	Hale	Lloyd	Scott
Caldwell	Hamill	Lorimer	Shackelford
Candler	Hamlin	Loud	Smith, Iowa
Cary	Hawley	Lovering	Smith, Tex.
Clark, Fla.	Helm	Lowden	Stanley
Conner	Howell, N. J.	McCall	Stephens, Tex.
Cooper, Pa.	Hubbard, Iowa	McGuire	Talbott
Coudrey	Huff	McLain	Thomas, Ohio
Cousins	Hughes, W. Va.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Underwood
Cravens	Hull, Iowa	McMillan	Waldo
Currier	Jackson	Macon	Wallace
Cushman	James, Addison D.	Malby	Washburn
Davey, La.	James, Ollie M.	Mondell	Watson
Davidson	Kennedy, Iowa	Moon, Pa.	Webb
Dawes	Kimball	Moore, Pa.	Weeks
Dawson	Kitchin, Claude	Nicholls	Weems
Dunwell	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Norris	Wilson, Pa.
Durey	Knapp	Parker, N. J.	Wolf
Dwight	Knopf	Parker, S. Dak.	Woodyard

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the remainder of this session:

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.

Mr. KNOPF with Mr. WEISSE (both for increase).

Until further notice:

Mr. FRENCH with Mr. BURNETT (on carriers' salary, Mr. FRENCH in favor of increase, Mr. BURNETT against increase).

Mr. LANING with Mr. HELM.

For this day:

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES.

Mr. BROWLOW with Mr. CRAVENS.

Mr. CARY with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. HAMLIN.
 Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. LAMAR of Florida.
 Mr. DAWES with Mr. LAMAR of Missouri.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. LASSITER.
 Mr. GILLET with Mr. LEE.
 Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey with Mr. REID.
 Mr. HUFF with Mr. RHINOCK.
 Mr. ADDISON D. JAMES with Mr. ROBINSON.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. LEGARE.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.
 Mr. KNAPP with Mr. McLAIN.
 Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. MACON.
 Mr. DURYEA with Mr. WALLACE.
 Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.
 Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 Mr. COUDREY with Mr. WOLF.
 Mr. CONNER with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. HALE with Mr. STANLEY.
 Mr. McMILLAN with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.
 Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. KIMBALL.
 Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.
 Mr. DWIGHT with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. LLOYD.
 Mr. BEDE with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. POWERS with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. LOVERING with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. LAMB.
 Mr. DAWSON with Mr. WEBB.
 Mr. LOUD with Mr. TALBOTT.
 Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. BOWERS.
 Mr. LOBIMER with Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi.
 Mr. JENKINS with Mr. LINDSAY.
 Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. LOWDEN with Mr. SAUNDERS.
 Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. WATKINS.

On this vote:

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. SCOTT (on carriers' salary, Mr. BARTHOLDT in favor of increase, Mr. SCOTT against increase).

Mr. WALDO with Mr. LANGLEY (on carriers' increase, Mr. WALDO in favor of increase, Mr. LANGLEY against increase).

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. McCALL (on carriers' salary, Mr. TOWNSEND against increase, Mr. McCALL in favor of increase).

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDO] has voted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SHERMAN]. He has not.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am paired with him, and if he were present he would vote "aye." I voted "no," and I will withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LANGLEY, and he voted "present," as above recorded.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I suggest a recapitulation of the vote before it is announced, and ask for order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is entitled to a recapitulation, but the Chair will say that the vote is not close.

Mr. SULZER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I was informed that there was only a difference of two.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas are 136 and the nays are 126. The yeas have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to and lay that motion on the table. The gentleman from Indiana is on the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York moves to reconsider the vote and that that motion lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

PENSION OF WIDOWS AND MINOR CHILDREN.

The Speaker laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15653) "An act to increase the pension of widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late civil war, the war with Mexico, the various Indian wars, and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late civil war," with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the amendments in the bill affects a matter over which the Committee on Pensions has jurisdiction, and I hope that a member from the Committee on Pensions will be appointed as one of the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the conferees later.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House nonconcurred in the Senate amendments to the widows' pension bill, and I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to reconsider the vote by which the House disagreed to the Senate amendments and asked for a conference.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman from New York moves to lay that motion on the table.

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

PENSION BILLS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that bills now in order on the Private Calendar may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. CAPRON, will take the chair.

HENRY M'CALL.

The first pension business was the bill (H. R. 3510) granting an increase of pension to Henry McCall.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry McCall, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 8 strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

FRANK Z. CURRY.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Frank Z. Curry.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Frank Z. Curry, late second lieutenant of Company B, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 8 strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

HARRY L. ORENDORFF.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 4226) granting a pension to Harry Orendorff.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harry Orendorff, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, after "late," strike out "of" and insert "seaman."

In line 6, before "United," insert "U. S. S. Newport."

In line 7 strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Harry L. Orendorff."

JAMES BARBOUR.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 4326) granting an increase of pension to James Barbour.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James Barbour, late of Company A, Third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 7, after "Infantry," insert "Texas and New Mexico Indian war."

In line 8 strike out "thirty" and insert "sixteen."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

MARGARET C. STORTS.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 6543) granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Storts.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Margaret C. Storts, widow of Charles H. Storts, late of Company I, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6 strike out the initial "H." and insert "Henry."

In line 7, after "Infantry," insert "war with Mexico."

In line 8 strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

LOUISA E. PRICE.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 7741) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Price.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Louisa E. Price, widow of Edmund Price, late of Company H, Palmetto Regiment South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 7 change "Volunteer" to "Volunteers."

In lines 7 and 8 strike out "Infantry."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

MAGGIE Z. TARTER.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 10837) granting a pension to Maggie Z. Tarter.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Maggie Z. Tarter, widow of William W. Tarter, Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, after "Tarter," insert "late of."

Add to the end of the bill "and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said William W. Tarter until they reach the age of 16 years."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

SAMUEL W. BURT.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 10938) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Burt.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel A. Burt, late of the Seminole Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of — dollars per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Change the initial "A" where it appears in claimant's name in the title and body of the bill to "W."

In line 6, after "late of," insert "Captain Henry's company South Carolina Volunteers."

In the same line strike out "the Seminole" and insert "Florida."

In line 7, after "rate of," insert "sixteen."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

NOBLE SAXTON.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 11457) granting a pension to Noble Saxton.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Noble Saxton, late of Company H, Second Oregon Mounted Volunteers, 1855 and 1856, and Company A, First Battalion Oregon Volunteers, 1856, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, after "late of," insert "Captain Sheffield's."
In the same line strike out the initial "H" and insert "A."
In the same line, after "Second," insert "Regiment."
In line 7, after "Volunteers," insert "Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war."

Strike out all in line 7 after "Volunteers."

Strike out line 8.

In line 9 strike out all before the word "and."

In line 10 strike out "fifty" and insert "sixteen" and add to the end of the bill the words "in lieu of that he is now receiving."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Noble Saxton."

ANNA BORKOWSKI.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 11464) granting a pension to Anna Borkowski.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Anna Borkowski, mother of Frank Borkowski, late of Company D, Second United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, before "mother," insert "dependent."

In line 7, after "Second," insert "Regiment."

In same line, after "Infantry," insert "war with Spain."

In line 8 strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

MARY HUTCHINSON.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 14341) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hutchinson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Hutchinson, widow of Burrell B. Hutchinson, late of Company H, Palmetto Regiment South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In lines 7 and 8 strike out "Volunteer Infantry" and insert in lieu thereof "Volunteers, war with Mexico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

ELIZABETH NORTON.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 14680) granting a pension to Elizabeth Norton.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth Norton, widow of Charles F. Norton, late hospital steward in the Third Regiment Texas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 7 strike out "in the."

In line 8, before "and," insert "war with Spain."

Also, in the same line, strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve." Add to the end of the bill "and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Charles F. Norton until she reaches the age of 16 years."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

WILLIAM H. JONES.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 15019) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Jones.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of W. H. Jones, late of Hembry's and Swan's companies, Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Change the initial "W." in the title and body of the bill to "William."

In line 6, after "late of," insert "Captain Hembree's," and in the same line strike out "Hembry's."

In line 7 change "Volunteer" to "Volunteers."

In the same line strike out "Infantry" and insert "Cherokee and Florida."

In line 8 strike out "twenty-four" and insert "sixteen."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

ALEXANDER IAUN.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 15547) granting a pension to Alexander Iaun.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Alexander Iaun, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

DINAH E. SPRAGUE.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 15605) granting an increase of pension to Dinah E. Sprague.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Dinah E. Sprague, widow of Ara Sprague, sergeant in Captain Peterson's company, war of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6 strike out "sergeant in" and insert "late of."

In line 7, after "company," insert "New York Militia."

In line 8, after "twenty" insert "twenty-four."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

ADDIE W. FARQUHAR.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 15958) granting an increase of pension to Addie W. Farquhar.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Addie W. Farquhar, widow of Rear-Admiral N. H. Farquhar, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$100 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6 strike out the initials "N. H." In line 7, before "Farquhar," insert "Norman V. H." In line 8 strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

AMERICA BRUCE.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 16028) granting an increase of pension to America Bruce.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of America Bruce, widow of Griffin Bruce, late of Captain Harvell's company, Tennessee Volunteers, Florida war of 1838, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 7 strike out "Harvell's and insert "Howell's."
In the same line, after "Volunteers," strike out "Florida war of" and insert "Cherokee Indian disturbances."
In line 8 strike out "eighteen hundred and thirty-eight."
In line 9 strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

JOHN MOGG, ALIAS JOHN MOOR.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 17331) granting an increase of pension to John Mogg.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Mogg, alias John Moor, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 7, after "Infantry," insert "Florida Indian war."
In line 8 strike out "thirty" and insert "sixteen."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to John Mogg, alias John Moor."

JAMES KILBY.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 18029) granting an increase of pension to James Kilby, sr.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James Kilby, sr., late of Peedee's company, North Carolina Volunteers, Cherokee Indian war and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

After claimant's name in the title and body of the bill strike out "senior."
In line 6, after "late of," strike out "Peedee's" and insert "Captain Peden's."

In line 7 strike out "war" and insert "disturbances."
In line 8 strike out "twenty-five" and insert "sixteen."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 18754) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Joseph H. Wagner, late major, Thirtieth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Douthitt, late of Company C, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Eighth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ewell Plummer, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment, and Companies E and F, Twentieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter K. James, late of Company L, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick B. Welty, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of J. George Spangenberg, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Permanent Party, General Mounted Service, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Larkins, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Fox, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia Churchill, widow of William H. Churchill, late of Company B, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Oliver D. Pearson, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alva C. May, late of Company E, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram K. Hazlett, late acting master, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eleazer Reynolds, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Bonfield, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Primley, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James G. McNett, late of Company C, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Justice, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Bachman, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi N. Gregory, late of Company I, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laurence Vanderbosch, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Jones, late of Company L, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Freadreck Dicke, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Gier, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Van Gorden, late of Company C, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert L. Lindsay, late captain, Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Harrington, widow of Walter S. Harrington, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Rosa A. Peters, former widow of Ackerson Archer, late of Companies K and G, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Andrew J. Moore, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Akins, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Yager, late of Company E, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Nelson, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel D. Vail, late of Company L, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Moon, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Fowler, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas G. Bratten, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and second lieutenant, Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. Knowlton, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel W. Moore, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Bemus, widow of Franklin Bemus, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Pinder, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dagworthy D. Joseph, late captain, Company C, Third Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William P. Crowell, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and second and first lieutenant, Company K, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mathew H. Clarke, late of Company H, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Parish, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theophilus C. Middlebrook, late first lieutenant, Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orator S. Holcomb, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon W. Yeagley, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Stokes, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilson D. Wright, late first lieutenant Company B, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Williams, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rhoda F. Thogmartin, helpless and dependent child of John H. Thogmartin, late first lieutenant Company I, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jonathan Harp, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Fowler, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Agnes B. Miller, widow of Josiah Miller, late additional paymaster, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Davis, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Langenfeld, late of Company F, Second Battalion, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph T. Prime, jr., late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christian A. Baldwin, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David S. Oliphant, late second lieutenant Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Fischer, late first lieutenant Company K, Sixty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Walton, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas W. Coe, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dallas W. Spencer, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob A. Hetrick, late unassigned, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company D, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Russey, late second lieutenant Company A, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Walker, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luke Shinness, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac H. Daggett, late of Company F, Fifty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac E. Johnson, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment, and Company B, Seventh Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Clark Burget, late of Company E, Sixty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dennis Hurley, late of Companies F and E, Twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James McMunn, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David U. Quick, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. Potter, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment, and Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Eager, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Williams, widow of John S. Williams, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Richard, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezra B. Spoor, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Domer, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Crites, late of Company A, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Moak, late of Company B, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Coffee, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ann Quackenbush, widow of Albert Quackenbush, late of Company I, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, First Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick Eckstine, late of Company D, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Button, late second lieutenant Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Back, late of Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Shevels, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas McCafferty, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Hopper, late of Company A, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Berl P. Penny, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grodine Drake, former widow of Loraine L. Severn, late of Company B, Ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Stephen Parker, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses L. Grace, late seaman, Portsmouth Navy-Yard, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Miller, late of Company B, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Consider H. Willett, late captain Company G, Second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Andrews, late of Company D, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Moore, late of Company C, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Argo, late of Company E, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi L. Crane, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Miller, late sergeant-major, Fifth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and first lieutenant Company H, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph M. Arnold, late of Companies H and A, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward S. Johns, late principal musician One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Kirkpatrick, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Dwyer, late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-third Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Myers, late of Company D, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cleophas Guerin, late of Company A, Third Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bertha C. Huntosh, widow of Charles G. Huntosh, late of Company B, Hatch's Independent battalion Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of the soldier until they shall arrive at the age of 16 years.

The name of James Hudson, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Reed, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Battery G, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Fields, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel D. Kingsbury, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sidney S. Smith, late of Company B, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Schenk, late first lieutenant and regimental quartermaster Seventeenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Slegfried, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Null, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment, and Company F, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Chick, late of Company I, Eighty-fifth Regiment, and Company I, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Deborah A. Sebastian, widow of James M. Sebastian, late sergeant-major, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harry C. Crary, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Ramsey, late of Company C, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Jackson, late of Company K, Eighty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Beverly D. Hunt, late of Company D, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theresia Neiss, widow of Jacob Neiss, late of Company I, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Wilbur F. Kellogg, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ann T. Holbrook, widow of Lyman C. Holbrook, late first lieutenant Company I, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elijah H. Forbes, late of Company I, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Hall, alias George Hogue, late of Company E, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Carr, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus C. Skaggs, late of Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Guy, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Williams, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Chancellor, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, the same to be paid to him under the rules of the Pension Bureau as to mode and times of payment without any deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Erastus Mack, late first lieutenant Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry M. Gibbs, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Marsee, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lawson D. Jernigan, late of Company C, and second lieutenant Company H, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Smith, helpless and dependent child of William W. Smith, late of Company G, Thirty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isaac H. Pinkerton, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Lally, late of United States ships North Carolina and Daylight, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mollie Smith, helpless and dependent child of George W. Smith, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alfred Picklesimer, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary T. Jennings, widow of John Jennings, late of Company I, First Regiment New York Volunteer Marine Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Freeman Burk, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Tharp, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Fuerschbach, late of Company I, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis C. Hodges, late of Company K, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abbie C. Fleharty, widow of Perry A. Fleharty, late of Company B, Sixty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Martha Louise Fleharty, helpless and dependent daughter of said Perry A. Fleharty, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Abbie C. Fleharty the name of said Martha Louise Fleharty shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Abbie C. Fleharty.

The name of Gilbert F. Gould, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company M, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Bell, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas D. Marshall, late of Company E, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel N. Clary, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Halestack, late of U. S. S. Rattler, Great Western, and Tyler, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James R. Dale, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David H. Mead, late of Company D, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the bill on page 25, line 23, by striking out "thirty" and inserting "forty." It is a misprint.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 23, strike out "thirty" and insert "forty."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

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

JOHN SHAUGHNESSY.

The next business upon the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5297) entitled "A bill to complete the naval record of John Shaughnessy."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point of order on the bill. However, possibly the bill had better be read, as the title does not disclose the nature of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to so amend the naval record of John Shaughnessy, late landsman, United States Navy, on U. S. S. Brooklyn, as to show him honorably discharged, to date from October 9, 1864.

The following amendment was read:

Line 6, after the word "him," strike out the word "honorably."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that under the rule this bill is properly up for consideration at this time.

Mr. MANN. If it is a bill to remove the charge of desertion it will be in order.

Mr. CALDER rose.

Mr. MANN. Is this the gentleman's bill?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I thought it was another bill. I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 18930) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Noah N. Greer, late of Company F, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Greenwood, late of Company G, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Cox, late of Company H, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Nash, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Sliger, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Eagleson, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel White, late of Company M, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry B. Wilson, late of Company K, Eighty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Woods, late of Companies H and A, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriett J. Cobbe, widow of Joseph E. Cobbe, late first Lieutenant Company D, Seventy-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John A. Phillips, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie L. Poole, widow of Theodore L. Poole, late first Lieutenant Company H, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of a minor child of the soldier until such child shall arrive at the age of 16 years.

The name of David H. Moredick, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Loucks, late of Company K, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. White, late second Lieutenant Company C, Seventy-first Regiment, and of Company G, Sixty-ninth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander N. Hart, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Dorbert, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph K. Bradfield, late of Company B, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry S. Hubbard, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Commodore P. Barker, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Reynolds, late of Company D, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Durling, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Mahood, late of Company A, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alva Griswold, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Haywood W. Weatherington, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Swigert, late of Company G, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Fordney, late unassigned, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johnson White, late of Company H, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The names of Edward B. Valerius and Louise M. Valerius, helpless and dependent children of Peter Valerius, late of Company G, One hundred and seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay each of them a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edwin E. Cleveland, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Martin, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel T. Askey, late of Company F, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Seifert, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Casper Pixley, late of Company I, Sixty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry B. Crawford, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Myron L. Fales, late of Company K, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard W. Courtney, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar A. Paddock, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Davis, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Orlando Cummings, alias Comans, late of Battery L, Second Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Owen Carroll, late of Company H, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Belt, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Ferrell, late of Company C, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David A. Davis, late quartermaster-sergeant, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and of Company K, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Hunter, late of Companies I and D, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hohenstein, late of Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Montgomery, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Bragaw, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Barnett, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Eberly, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Johnson Smith, helpless and dependent child of Henry Smith, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Josiah Lamb, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Wood, late first Lieutenant Company E, and captain Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Pangle, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah W. Adkins, late of Company E, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julius D. Austin, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Austin L. Nichols, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles O. Thomas, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Otto, late first Lieutenant Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Thompson, late of Company I, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Boyd, late of Company E, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Angel, late first Lieutenant Company D, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Burris, late of Company F, Seventy-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Kimball, late of Company B, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Armstrong, late of Company I, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac N. Sandwick, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Dee, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshal S. Phillips, late of Company M, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert A. Gentry, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Fargue, late of Company E, Fifty-seventh Regiment, and Company K, Sixty-first Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Hinkel, late of Ninth Independent Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram P. Neyman, late of Company I, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. Bergen, late second Lieutenant Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus Van Derveer, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cordice R. Sprague, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Armstrong, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy E. Conner, widow of Matthew B. Conner, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David H. Bishop, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Neil, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis A. Woodruff, late of Company A, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry K. Sikes, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and Company G, Fourth Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simeon Kysar, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles C. Brown, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Hammond, late of Company E, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Gill, late of Company H, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Breen, late of Company C, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ebenezer Watson, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Perry, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Standish C. Stiles, late of Company I, Third Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Duesler, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin C. Durham, late of Company K, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Gettiss, late of Company H, Seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilber S. Benjamin, late of Company D, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gustav Timble, late of Company L, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel W. Lapham, late captain Company K, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Swaney, late of Company B, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Pickett, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company L, Eighth Regiment, Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Underwood, late of Company A, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Guth, late of Captain Piquenard's independent company of Pioneers, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Smith, late of Companies K and A, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. McCoy, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Benjamin, late of Companies I and D, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Gaertner, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Elbridge, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and unassigned, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Spillane, widow of Michael Spillane, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment, and Company E, Fifth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Welker, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Lamon, late first lieutenant Company C, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of America H. Adams, widow of William G. Adams, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Allen L. Adams, helpless and dependent son of said William G. Adams, this pension shall be reduced to \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Allen L. Adams: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of America H. Adams the name of said Allen L. Adams shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said America H. Adams.

The name of Henry Allen, late of Fifth Independent Battery Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances Crain, widow of Seburn S. Crain, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment, and Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of William Crain, helpless and dependent son of said Seburn S. Crain, this pension shall be reduced to \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said William Crain: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Frances Crain, the name of said William Crain shall be placed on the pension roll,

subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Frances Crain.

The name of Oliver J. Williams, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McNevin, late captain Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Q. Barstow, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Myers, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Mead, late of Company I, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of N. Martin Curtis, late captain Company G, Sixteenth Regiment, and colonel One hundred and forty-second Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$100 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Murray, late of Company A, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisha Cooley, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Rencher, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi N. Woodside, late first lieutenant Company G, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Barry, late of Company B, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Allen, 1st, late of Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Roberts, late of Company K, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Deaver, late of Company B, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wesley I. Bond, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McIntosh, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Shadrach Stacy, late second lieutenant Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Cline, late of Company B, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York State Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Plush, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis Fricke, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment, and Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Falis H. Castone, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Merritt D. En Earl, late of Company K, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Quay, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Cavanagh, late of Company C, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert W. Hardin, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Boykin, widow of Jabez Boykin, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Samuel Scott, late of Company B, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seward Q. Payne, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hilan Hoskin, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Stasel, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Bassett, late of Company E, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Fisk, late of Company A, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Harper, late of Company A, One hundred and seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie Duncan, widow of Robert Duncan, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isaac N. Greer, late of U. S. S. Juliet, Hastings, and Fawn, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank E. Watrous, late captain Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Scott, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel R. Irwin, late first lieutenant Company C, Thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James P. Mallison, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Marshall, late of Company K, One hundredth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram P. Worthley, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. McClure, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$38 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Gruenewald, late of Company C, First Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Everhart, late of Company H, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Landis, late of Company E, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$38 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Blood, late of Company H, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alphonzo N. Nichols, late major and additional paymaster, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Blaisdell, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willis W. Wilkison, late of Company H, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hayes, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben V. G. Smith, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Battery E, Second United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Schoonmaker, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on page 4, by striking out lines 3, 4, 5, and 6. The beneficiary is dead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 3 to 6, both inclusive, being the pension of Joseph Loucks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what is the nature of the amendment?

Mr. SULLOWAY. The beneficiary is dead, and we drop the bill from the list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not want the harmony of the proceedings to be interrupted by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SULLOWAY. The harmony would not have been interrupted if the beneficiary had not died.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I also move to amend, on page 28, line 19, by striking out the word as it is spelled, namely, "Nichols," and insert the word "Nicholds."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19, page 28, make the spelling of the name "Nicholds."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

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

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR.

The next pension business was the bill (S. 5254) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows and dependent children of such soldiers and sailors.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Nathan H. Tyler, late of Second Battery, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Chase M. Swain, late second lieutenant Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Kraus, widow of Samuel Kraus, late captain Company B, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Joseph Logsdon, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Wharton, late of Company H, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gilbert A. Jordan, late of Company C, One hundred and second Regiment, and Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward C. Gearey, late lieutenant-colonel Thirty-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anthony Grisvol, late of Company G, One hundred and fortieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Bucklin, late of Company C, Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall H. Lewis, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David S. Oliphant, late second lieutenant Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Erastus Strickland, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin L. Felch, late of Company E, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Marshall, widow of Dustin Marshall, late of Company C, and first lieutenant Company A, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Mumford, widow of James R. Mumford, late of Company A, Fifty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jefferson Stanley, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan Dunkelberg, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luman N. Judd, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Favorite, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Shepard, late of Second Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marilla Harvey, widow of Elijah E. Harvey, late captain Company B, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bertha Zwicker, blind and dependent daughter of Charles Zwicker, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick D. Winton, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bridget Murphy, widow of Michael Murphy, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edmund J. Graves, late of Company C, Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Russell, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Thurston, late first lieutenant Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Postlewait, late of Company A, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hazen E. Soule, late of Eleventh Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Logan, widow of Robert Logan, late of Company A, First Regiment District of Columbia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Marcus J. Howland, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew G. Pringle, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johnston M. Watts, late of Company A, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elbridge Stevens, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Fln, late of Company D, Fifth and First Regiments California Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Irwin, late of Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Snook, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Clark, late of Companies H and K, First Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob M. Weekley, late of Company B, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Chitwood, widow of Richard G. Chitwood, late captain Company C, Osage Regiment, Missouri Home Guards, and Company G, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harrison Lovelace, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet E. Whiton, widow of Lester Whiton, late first Lieutenant Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George A. Whitney, late of Company E, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lydia M. Salisbury, widow of Jonathan B. Salisbury, late of Captain Ramsey's Company K, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and second Lieutenant Company D, Hatch's Battalion, Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John S. Lee, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Francis, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Gibson, late major, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Kellogg, widow of Edward Josiah Kellogg, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary J. Hammond, widow of Jehial P. Hammond, late of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Dolson B. Searle, late of Company I, Sixty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Conley, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gage S. Gritman, late first Lieutenant Company K, One hundred and sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry P. French, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Son, late of Company B, Thirteenth and Fifth Regiments Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eunice P. Athey, widow of Morrison C. Athey, late of Company E, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Orlando S. Goff, late of Company D, and second Lieutenant Company K, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Lounsbury, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Ostheimer, widow of Simon Ostheimer, late of Third Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannibal H. Whitney, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin W. French, late captain Company C, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome Crandall, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

On page 2 strike out lines 23 to 26, inclusive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

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

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

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE REGULAR ARMY AND NAVY.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 19101) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the civil war, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Cecil I. Smith, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of Miriam A. F. Jett, widow of Jesse T. Jett, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, war with

Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Jesse T. Jett until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Allen A. Wesley, late surgeon, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain.

The name of Richard M. Robinson, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Henry W. Schroder, late of the United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Berkheimer, late of Battery L, Third Regiment United States Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary R. Bryant, widow of James C. Bryant, late major, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Cornelius Meek, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month.

The name of Mattie B. Romsey, widow of Bradford T. Romsey, late of Company D, Second Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Bradford T. Romsey, until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Anna L. Gifford, widow of John H. Gifford, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Marlon C. Turrill, widow of Brig. Gen. Henry S. Turrill, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charles R. Barron, late musician, First Regiment United States Cavalry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Parkerson, late of Captain Laffery's company, Tennessee Mounted Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie Lynch, widow of Michael Lynch, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Michael Lynch, until she reaches the age of 16 years.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 19, after the word "volunteer," insert "Cherokee Indian disturbances."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read a third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SULLOWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the several bills were passed was laid upon the table.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The SPEAKER announced the following appointments: Directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women, Mr. BURTON of Delaware and Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. WATKINS to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. LOVERING, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Sallie D. Winslow, Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather late to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the pension appropriation bill, and I want to give notice that I will call it up the first thing in the morning.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

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

S. 5894. An act to provide for the completion of the enlargement of the Government building at Wichita, Kans., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 6028. An act to provide for the safety of life on navigable waters during regattas or marine parades—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5908. An act to amend an act authorizing the construction of a dam and bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5656. An act for the enlargement and extension of the post-office building at Pawtucket, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. R. 60. Joint resolution granting authority for the use of

certain balances of appropriations for the Light-House Establishment to be available for certain named purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, 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. 9205. An act to make the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 28, 1891 (26 Stats., p. 796), applicable to the Territory of New Mexico.

H. R. 16860. An act to establish a United States land district in the Territory of New Mexico to be known as the Tucumcari land district.

H. R. 16073. An act to authorize the town of Edgecomb, Lincoln County, Me., to maintain a free bridge across tide waters.

H. R. 16749. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Liberty Bridge Company," approved March 2, 1907.

H. R. 14043. An act to provide for the extension of time within which homestead entrymen may establish their residence upon certain lands within the limits of the Huntley irrigation project, in the county of Yellowstone, in the State of Montana.

H. R. 12803. An act allowing Chandler Bassett to perfect final proof in his homestead entry.

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of John P. Hunter.

H. R. 16746. An act to authorize T. H. Friel or assigns to construct a dam across Mulberry Fork of the Black Warrior River.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of R. H. M. Mills, president of the board of trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South of Pine Bluff, Ark., against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of papers, documents, etc., in the files of the Department and of no further use in the transaction of the public business—to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GOULDEN, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred to bill of the House (H. R. 225) to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the complement of crews of vessels, and for the better protection of life, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1226), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16620) authorizing the appointment of dental surgeons in the Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1227), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COUSINS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4112) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States," approved April 5, 1906, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1228), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HACKNEY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16743) for the removal of the restrictions on alienation of lands of allottees of the Quapaw Agency, Okla., and the sale of all tribal lands, school, agency, or other buildings on any of the reservations within the jurisdiction of such agency, and for other purposes,

reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1229), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FOSS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7620) to establish a naval militia and define its relations to the General Government, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1231), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BATES, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7843) for the relief of Jabez Burchard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1232), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8479) granting a pension to Malinda Jane Odell—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13803) granting a pension to Vance V. Pear-sall—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 18094) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Sullivan—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 19239) for a public building at the city of Eureka Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN (by request): A bill (H. R. 19240) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRODHEAD (by request): A bill (H. R. 19241) providing for the purchase of an oil painting entitled "The death of Brevet Lieut. Col. Alonzo H. Cushing"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 19242) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19243) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING: A bill (H. R. 19244) making an appropriation for completing and adorning a monument on the site of Fort Hamilton, in the State of Ohio, and for the purchase of adjoining grounds to be used as a public park—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 19245) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to prevent obstructive and injurious deposit within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City by dumping or otherwise, and to punish and prevent such offenses," approved June 29, 1888, as amended by the act of August 18, 1894—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 19246) authorizing the sale of certain public lands to the State of Idaho—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 19247) to provide for the labeling of cans, pots, tins, and other receptacles containing meat or meat food products when hermetically sealed and prepared for foreign or interstate commerce—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 19248) for the further protection of interstate trade—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 19249) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned brass or bronze

cannon and cannon balls to the Admiral Meade Post, No. 40, Grand Army of the Republic, at Oxford, N. Y.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 19250) to create in the War Department a roll to be known as the volunteer retired list, to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers of the United States Volunteer Army, Navy, and marines of the civil war, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 19251) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain lands to the city of Biloxi, Miss., for street purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 19252) for the relief of Alphonse Lacour, heir of Armand Lacour—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 19253) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Dunlap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 19254) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 19255) granting a pension to Jesse A. Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19256) granting an increase of pension to Elbert F. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19257) for the relief of Isaac A. Meyer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 19258) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Shoop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19259) granting an increase of pension to John W. Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19260) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19261) granting an increase of pension to David D. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19262) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Bowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19263) granting an increase of pension to William Groves, alias Thomas Jackman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19264) authorizing the Northern Idaho Insane Asylum to purchase not to exceed two sections of land from the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 19265) granting an increase of pension to Richard S. Hambridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULTON: A bill (H. R. 19266) granting an increase of pension to Day Wheeler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 19267) granting an increase of pension to John A. Soliday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILHAMS: A bill (H. R. 19268) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19269) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Batchelder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19270) granting an increase of pension to William Bronze—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 19271) for the relief of Edward H. D. Couch—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HACKETT: A bill (H. R. 19272) granting a pension to Julius C. Chappell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 19273) granting an increase of pension to William G. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 19274) granting a pension to Orrin Nason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 19275) for the relief of Rachel Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 19276) for the relief of the heirs of G. W. Upton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19277) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Manwell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 19278) granting an increase of pension to Louisa George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19279) for the relief of James Baxter, of Minatare, Nebr.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 19280) granting an increase of pension to George M. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 19281) granting an increase of pension to John B. Jeffery—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 19282) granting a pension to Fleming Litteral—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19283) granting a pension to Mary A. Muncy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19284) for the relief of H. Clay McKee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 19285) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of August Merkle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 19286) granting an increase of pension to John Sanford Mott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19287) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Shobe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 19288) to renew and extend certain letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MADISON: A bill (H. R. 19289) granting an increase of pension to James M. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19290) granting an increase of pension to George W. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 19291) for the relief of the estate of Alexander H. Keith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 19292) granting a pension to Alexander A. Garvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 19293) for the relief of the executors of the estate of Edward W. Southworth and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 19294) to correct the military record of Harding Weston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 19295) granting a pension to Ernest L. Tolson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 19296) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Dibert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19297) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Custer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19298) granting a pension to Elmer A. Rodkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 19299) granting a pension to Edward W. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 19300) to correct the military record of Daniel D. Mann—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19301) to correct the military record of Horace Clapp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19302) granting an increase of pension to John Ware—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 19303) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Newcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 19304) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 19305) granting an increase of pension to George B. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Petition of citizens of New York, for appropriation for relief of survivors of the *Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of New York Credit Men's Association, for the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alphonse Lacour—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Fairfield, Me., for legislation for creating a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Slack Cooperage Manufacturers' Association, for the bill providing for census of standing timber—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Lewis Frederick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of Washington Chapter, American Institute of Architects, against change of site of the Grant Memorial—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of J. C. Lott, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for forest reservation in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of memorial and executive committee of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, against consolidation of pension offices—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of city council of Newport, R. I., for appropriation for Naval Training Station at Newport—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of city council of Newport, R. I., for construction of next battle ship at a navy-yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of city council of Newport, R. I., for appropriation to fortify Narragansett district—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of Exeter Grange and Westerly Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAULFIELD: Petition of St. Louis Council, No. 26, United Commercial Travelers of America, against the Sims parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, for S. 28, for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, for legislation to rehabilitate the merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAWES: Petition of Presbyterian Church, 370 members, of Cumberland, Ohio, for Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of memorial and executive committee of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, against consolidation of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of Medal of Honor Legion of the United States, for H. R. 18698, relative to bestowal of medals of honor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of memorial and executive committee of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, against consolidation of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of citizens of New York and vicinity for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, of Buffalo, against consolidation of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Pacific Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association, for power of Interstate Commerce Commission to pass on proposed rates before they become effective—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of Herman Ridder, president of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, of New York City, relative to paper and pulp trust, for removal of tariff on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Executive Committee of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, against consolidation of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Petitions of Local Union No. 481, of Mount Carmel, Ill., and Local Union No. 1188, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Mount Carmel, Ill., against the Penrose amendment—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of Local Union No. 617, International Typographical Union, of Wallace, for removal of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of D. C. Address Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mendota, Ill., for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Association of American Directory Publishers, for the Kittredge copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Soliday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET: Petition of Hampshire County Pomona Grange, No. 8, assembled March 5, 1908, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of New York and vicinity for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of United Mine Workers of America, for McHenry bill for bureau of mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, for pension for widows and children of Doctor Lazear and Major Carroll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Joseph Hart, for copyright legislation to protect musical composers—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Herman Ridder, president of American Newspaper Publishers' Association, for removal of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Traders and Merchants' Association of Baltimore, against the Aldrich and for the Fowler currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of National Association of Clothiers, against the Aldrich and in favor of the Fowler currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of executive committee, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, against consolidation of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of J. B. Sweetland Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Edwardsburg, Mich., for the Sherwood pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of Sylvester Cole and others, for the Sims bill—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of R. H. Tarron, Andrew J. Young, W. K. Whittaker, John Smith, George Russell, and Jacob W. Truxel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of B. H. Wetzel and others of Monterey, Minn., against Penrose amendment—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Milton Lee, R. Milo Cooper, and John Valentine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Petition of citizens of Morgan County, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEIFER: Petitions of Pearl Bethard and 3 other Republicans, J. H. Jenkins and 4 other Democrats, T. J. Creager and 2 other Independents, and Frank W. Gras and 5 other Socialists, praying for the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of H. M. Todhunter and 12 other citizens; J. W. Johnson, of London, and 6 other citizens of Madison County, all of the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of a bill to create a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of Joint Conference Board of Allied Printing Trades, for abolition of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: Petition of residents of Green Bay, Wis., against Penrose amendment to postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Becker and vicinity, Sherburne County, Minn., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Polish citizens, against the Polish expropriation bill by the Prussian Diet—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of O. D. Smith and others, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of headquarters, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, against consolidation of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of William J. Cash, of New York City, for copyright legislation to protect musical composers—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of S. E. Layer and others, of New Jersey, for a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Elmer (N. J.) Grange, for creation of a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of citizens of Port Huron, Mich., against the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of citizens of New York and vicinity for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MADISON: Petition of citizens of Beeler, Ness County, Kans., for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MALBY: Petition of Bangor (N. Y.) Grange, for Federal construction of highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alexander H. Keith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, for S. 28, to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of Soquel Grange, No. 349, against the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Soquel Grange, No. 349, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Soquel Grange, No. 349, for investigation of conditions existing in the Santa Cruz Mountains, and especially in the vicinity of the Lomo Prieta Mountains, and, if practicable, establish a national forest reservation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Nolensville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Vance V. Pearsall (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Boston city council, for battleship building at navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Petition of Howard W. Body and other citizens of Berks County, Pa., in favor of S. 3152, for additional protection to the dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Taylor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of citizens of Florida, against the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Central Labor Union of Meriden, Conn., for battleship construction in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 287, of Waterbury, Conn., against Penrose amendment to post-office laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Haven, Conn., for a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mad River Grange, of Waterbury, Conn., for a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Danbury, Conn., for battleship construction in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Delhart, Tex., against the Penrose amendment to postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of James E. Macher, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Langdon Mitchell and R. R. Hanch, for protection in copyright bill for musical composers—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of William J. Cash, against the Currier copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of organization of *General Slocum* survivors, for an appropriation for relief of survivors of the victims of the disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TCU VELLE: Petition of Presbyterian Church of Gomer, Ohio, for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 14, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

RELIEF OF TOBACCO GROWERS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 17520, and that it be considered in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill and that it be considered in the House. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17520) for the relief of tobacco growers.

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

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17520) for the relief of tobacco growers.

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision 9 of section 3244 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 69 of the act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1894, is hereby further amended so as to read as follows:

"Every person whose business it is to manufacture tobacco or snuff for himself, or who employs others to manufacture tobacco or snuff, whether such manufacture be by cutting, pressing, grinding, crushing, or rubbing of any raw or leaf tobacco, or otherwise preparing raw or leaf tobacco, or manufactured or partially manufactured tobacco or snuff, or the putting up for use or consumption of scraps, waste, clippings, stems, or deposits of tobacco resulting from any process of handling tobacco, or by the working or preparation of leaf tobacco, tobacco stems, scraps, clippings, or waste, by sifting, twisting, screening, or any other process, shall be regarded as a manufacturer of tobacco: *Provided*, That unstemmed tobacco in the natural leaf and not manufactured or altered in any manner shall not be subject to any internal-revenue tax or charge of any kind whatsoever, and it shall be lawful for any person to buy and sell such unstemmed tobacco in the leaf without payment of tax of any kind: *Provided further*, That any person who sells natural leaf tobacco to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars shall be deemed and considered a dealer in leaf tobacco and become subject to all the provisions, rules, and regulations of subsection 6 of section 3244, United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 14, act of March 1, 1879, and also as amended by the act of March 3, 1883, and, further, shall be subject to all the provisions of section 3360, United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 14, act of March 1, 1879, and of sections 3359 and 3391, United States Revised Statutes: *And provided further*, That farmers and growers of tobacco may sell leaf tobacco of their own growth and raising to manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars without being considered leaf dealers or manufacturers of tobacco and shall not be subject to the sections of the law and amendments thereof above named."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, just one word. This bill was passed in the last Congress and is reported to this Congress unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. The bill was drawn originally by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Yerkes, and the purpose of the bill, in short, is to relieve the farmer who raises tobacco from a status under the law of a manufacturer or dealer, and to relieve him, therefore, to that extent of tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice is hereby authorized during the Sixtieth Congress to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

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

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

HEARINGS ON THE PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a print of a thousand copies of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on the pension appropriation bill for the year 1900.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for a print of a thousand copies of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the pension appropriation bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS MOBILE RIVER, MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill.