

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 25, 1908.
SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joshua L. Chamberlain, of Maine, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Isaiah J. McCottrie, of South Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Georgetown, in the State of South Carolina. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1908.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander James G. Doyle to be a commander in the Navy from the 7th day of January, 1908.

Lieut. John McC. Luby to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 13th day of October, 1907.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

William E. Cummings to be postmaster at Highwood, Lake County, Ill.

Albert D. Housley to be postmaster at Stonington, Christian County, Ill.

Thomas S. Levis to be postmaster at Grant Works, Cook County, Ill.

IOWA.

Alma G. Ott to be postmaster at Riverside, Washington County, Iowa.

Henry T. Swope to be postmaster at Clearfield, Taylor County, Iowa.

S. L. Thompson to be postmaster at Corwith, Hancock County, Iowa.

MAINE.

Walter H. Downs to be postmaster at South Berwick, York County, Me.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Henry E. Clough to be postmaster at South Acton, Middlesex County, Mass.

MICHIGAN.

Leonard E. Morse to be postmaster at Lyons, Ionia County, Mich.

Byron S. Watson to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Gratiot County, Mich.

NEW JERSEY.

Maurice B. Comfort to be postmaster at Moorestown, Burlington County, N. J.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 25, 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT. And pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent that there be five hours more of general debate, the time to be divided equally between the respective sides of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] to control the time of the minority and myself to control the time of the majority.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that general debate on the agricultural appropriation bill close in five hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB]. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. I object.

Mr. SCOTT. I move, Mr. Speaker, that general debate on the agricultural bill close in four hours, the time to be equally divided as suggested in my former request, and on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion will be in order to close debate in four hours.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SULZER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SULZER. What is the regular order of the day?

The SPEAKER. The regular order is this motion.

Mr. SULZER. I want to call the Chair's attention—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to hear any discussion upon the point of order. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question on his motion.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to close debate in four hours.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I move to reconsider the motion and lay that motion on the table.

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

Mr. SULZER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SULZER. I rise for the purpose of propounding to the Speaker a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House to inquire about. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. The Chair can not determine that until the interrogatory is propounded.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas suspend? The Chair was mistaken. There was pending a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman from New York will propound his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SULZER. Accepting the apology of the Chair, my parliamentary inquiry is—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York may put it that way, but the Chair will apologize to the gentleman when in error as quick as to any gentleman in the House.

Mr. SULZER. And so would the gentleman from New York. Mr. Speaker, under Rule XXIV, clause 6, it says, "the morning hour for the consideration of bills called up by committees." I would like to know whether we are not entitled under that provision in the rules to have committees call up bills during the morning hour?

The SPEAKER. But a privileged motion has intervened.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion that I made to go into Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas withdraws his motion.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following report from the Appropriation Committee on the legislative appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a report on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

The bill H. R. 16882, an act making appropriations for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to all the Senate amendments as recommended by the committee and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the House discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and consider the bill in the House, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. I object.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], exercising his undoubted privilege, but exercising it in a very unusual way, objects to having this appropriation bill immediately go to conference. The Senate has placed upon this bill 365 amendments. A great many of these amendments are of very slight importance. Some of them are of large importance. Members will recognize that it is desirable in a contest between the House and the Senate that the House should not in the very first instance say what Senate

amendments they are willing to accept, and therefore take away our whole stock for trading. Therefore it has always been the custom—and I hope the custom will be observed now—to reject all the Senate amendments regardless of our opinion of their merits and send them all to conference. Then, in conference the conferees will decide, and if there is anything that the House or any of the Members of the House wish especially to consider, it will be brought to the House for consideration; but that course leaves the conferees of the House with the Senate amendments which the House approves still disagreed to, so that the House, by yielding to those, can compel the Senate to yield on amendments which the House does not approve. Therefore, it is obviously the policy of the House to disagree to all the amendments. I think there will be no objection on the part of the House to doing this, and so have no remarks to make on any amendments, but call for their reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee disagree to all the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, and had instructed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the Senate amendments be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union that the Senate amendments be disagreed to.

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

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House ask for a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. GILLETT, Mr. BRICK, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. LATTA, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 24, 1908:

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

H. R. 17277. An act for the relief of George S. Patten, of Williams, Coconino County, Ariz.

LEGISLATION RECOMMENDED BY THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read.

[For message see Senate proceedings of this day.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, under the usages of the House it has been customary only to refer the annual messages of the President to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. This is the second time this session that another message has been referred in that way.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I will explain to the gentleman the reason for that. The annual message deals with a great many topics with which different committees of the House have jurisdiction. The second message sent in by the President and this message deal with several topics of which several committees have jurisdiction. It is therefore necessary to refer it to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in order that hereafter it may be distributed. I would also say to the gentleman that I have reported from the Committee on Ways and Means a resolution distributing the second message of the President, to which he refers. That resolution is now on the Calendar. I have not called up that resolution because gentlemen on that side desired me to wait until they were ready to debate it before it was called up.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, at the time the last supplement to the annual message was presented to the House I made a hasty examination of the precedents and could find no instance where any message except the annual message had been referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union. Now, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has pointed out, the last message from the President is now on the Calendar of the House, with the resolution distributing it. If the same action is taken regarding this message and the same delay occurs, I wish to emphasize the fact that it will not be possible to take action upon these recommendations at this session of Congress, as the President is urging this House to do. Perhaps if the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] would suggest to the President that if he would confine his messages to one topic, they could be more readily sent to the appropriate committees and the committees take them under consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I want to say that the President is able to get up his messages without the recommendation of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My information, which is obtained from the public press, is that before this message was gotten up the President did confer with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as well as with several others.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the gentleman must be careful how he believes all he sees in the newspapers. [Laughter.] The gentleman from New York, however, is on visiting terms with the President of the United States.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, just a question. Can the gentleman from New York give us any information as to how long this message from the President will slumber in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that when the second message came in I introduced a resolution, I think the next day, distributing it, and I called it up before the Committee on Ways and Means at the very next meeting, and they promptly authorized it to be reported. When I brought it in here I was requested by the minority leader to allow a chance for debate. I do not know whether he is ready for debate on the resolution now or not. I have not called it up because the House has been busy with appropriation bills since. If I can have unanimous consent, I will call up the resolution at this moment and submit it to the House, moving to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from its further consideration.

Mr. SULZER. You have my consent to do it now. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I congratulate my colleague on stopping in his wild career.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to refer this message to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and that it be printed.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the resolution—I do not remember the number—distributing the second message of the President, and consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution No. 233 and the same be considered in the House at this time as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are you going to have any debate on it?

Mr. PAYNE. No.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I shall be constrained to object. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution 233.

Resolved, That so much of the special message of the President of the United States communicated to the two Houses of Congress on January 31, 1908, as relates to the revenue and the bonded debt of the United States be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

That so much as relates to the judiciary of the United States, to the administration of justice, to the punishment and prevention of crime, to judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, and to the organization of courts be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That so much as relates to commerce and the Isthmian Canal be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That so much as relates to the post-office and post-roads be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

That so much as relates to the public domain be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

That so much as relates to labor be referred to the Committee on Labor.

That so much as relates to private and domestic claims and demands, other than war claims, against the United States be referred to the Committee on Claims.

That so much as relates to reform in the civil service be referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

That so much as relates to the election of the President, Vice-President, or Representatives in Congress be referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, understanding there is a desire to debate this resolution, I shall object at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.
Mr. PAYNE. I am surprised.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I now renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19158, the agricultural 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 bill H. R. 19158, the agricultural appropriation bill, Mr. FOSTER of Vermont in the chair.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to request before I begin my remarks that I be not interrupted until the close of what I have to say. It occurred to me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that it might be a good idea at this time to review somewhat the work of the Department of Agriculture. The appropriations for this Department for the last ten or twelve years have increased very rapidly, and it seems to me that the House has a right to know what is being done with the money. It seems to me that the House is entitled to knowledge of the details of at least some of the important projects the Department is undertaking to carry out.

The first appropriation was made by Congress in the interests of agriculture in 1839. At this time an appropriation of \$1,000 was made for the purpose of "collecting and distributing seeds, prosecuting agricultural investigation, and procuring agricultural statistics." At this time the agricultural division was located in the Patent Office.

The Commissioner of Patents was also the Commissioner of Agriculture. A great many valuable seeds, plants, and shrubs were sent to the Commissioner of Patents by our foreign consuls, and this work was continued in a small way for a number of years. In 1853 the appropriation reached \$5,000; in 1855, \$50,000, and in 1862, \$64,000. During these twenty-three years, from the time the first appropriation was made, a considerable interest began to be manifested in different parts of the country in agriculture. The farmers' grange and other agricultural associations began advocating the establishment of a separate bureau for the purpose of carrying on agricultural investigations and the dissemination of information of interest to farmers. In 1862 Congress responded to this general demand for the recognition of the agricultural interests and passed an act establishing such a bureau. This was the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture. It is interesting to note that during the dark and gloomy days of the civil war, when the patriotic people of the country were buckling on their armor and rallying to the defense of Old Glory, Congress found time to lay the foundation for a Department that has since grown to be one of the most important in the Government service. It is also interesting to note that this legislation came from the hands of the new Republican party during the first Administration of the first man they elevated to the Presidency.

The foundation laid by those who upheld the hands of our martyred Lincoln in that mighty conflict has resulted in the growth of a great department which employs 9,000 people, most of whom are scientists and experts of the very highest order. The result of this legislation is more far-reaching, affects more people, and contributes more to the wealth and happiness of the Republic than possibly any other single act passed by Congress since the beginning of the Government under the Constitution, in 1789. Congress is continually appropriating money for the maintenance of the different Departments of the Government service. All of these expenditures of the public funds do not add one dollar to the wealth of the nation. It is true that they help to make our country great. They contribute to the defense and add to the glory and greatness of the nation, yet there is no direct financial gain to the people or the Government. They simply constitute an expenditure of the public funds without any hope of a return from the investment. This is not true of the expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. The introduction of one single crop has added more wealth to the nation in the last five years than the entire expenditures of the whole Department since the first appropriation was made in 1839.

When the organic act of 1862 was passed creating the Bureau of Agriculture, Mr. Isaac Newton was appointed as the first Commissioner of Agriculture. The expenditures of the Bureau under Mr. Newton's administration from 1862 to 1867 increased from \$64,000 to \$99,100. During this administration of Mr. Isaac Newton several important introductions were made, the most important of which was sorghum which was introduced from France and China. The growth of this industry has continued during all the years following. Last year the crop grown in the United States, as a result of this early introduction, was worth \$40,000,000.

Mr. Horace Capron succeeded Mr. Newton as Commissioner of Agriculture in 1867 and served until 1871. Mr. Capron succeeded in introducing the excelsior white schonen oats, the cavalier barley, and certain wheats from the Mediterranean which have become among the standard varieties of grain for the whole country.

Mr. Frederick Watts succeeded Mr. Capron in 1871 and served until 1877. His administration was made noteworthy on account of its introduction of the study of plant diseases.

Mr. Le Duc succeeded Mr. Watts and served from 1877 to 1881. It was during his administration that the first work was introduced affecting farm animals. In 1878 an appropriation of \$10,000 was made for the purpose of making a study of hog cholera and pleuro-pneumonia among cattle.

Commissioner Loring was appointed by President Hayes in 1881 and served until 1885. During the administration of Mr. Loring the study of animal diseases was continued and the Bureau of Animal Industry was established. He first introduced the navel orange and distributed a great many seeds in California and Florida. This orange was introduced from Bahia, Brazil. The crop of navel oranges in California alone last year was worth \$8,000,000.

Mr. Norman J. Colman was appointed by President Cleveland in 1885 and served until the end of his Administration. During the close of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration the Bureau of Agriculture was raised to the first rank and made one of the coordinate Departments of the Executive office, the Secretary of Agriculture becoming a member of the President's Cabinet. This act was passed February 9, 1889.

The only legislation of importance enacted during Mr. Colman's administration of the office, aside from making the Secretary a member of the Cabinet, was the enactment of what is known as the "Hatch law," which provided for the establishment of experiment stations in the different States of the Union, appropriating a maximum of \$25,000, which was to be expended in making scientific research in agriculture. During Mr. Colman's administration the study of public highways began. The appropriations for the Bureau of Animal Industry were increased very materially, and the scope of the work of this Bureau was greatly enlarged and put on a more effective footing.

When Benjamin Harrison became President in 1889 he appointed Jeremiah Rusk Secretary of Agriculture, who served until the close of his Administration. Mr. Rusk took up the duties of his office with a great deal of enthusiasm and reorganized the various Bureaus of the Department. He began the publication of farmers' bulletins, which proved a very valuable medium through which to disseminate the information accumulated in the Department relating to agriculture. Pleuro-pneumonia among cattle was stamped out by the Bureau of Animal Industry. The Department took up the question of the development of foreign markets for our farm products. During his administration the Weather Bureau was transferred from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.

He began the study of irrigation with a view of reclaiming the arid land of the West. Mr. Rusk also made considerable headway in the development of methods of spraying fruit trees in order to protect them from insect pests. He also introduced parasitical enemies of the scale insect that were infesting the citrus groves of California.

In 1893, at the beginning of Mr. Cleveland's second term, Hon. J. Sterling Morton, of Nebraska, became Secretary of Agriculture and served until the close of Mr. Cleveland's Administration. Secretary Morton systematized the work of the Department in a very effective way. He pointed out the necessity of a closer supervision of the expenditures of the Hatch fund through the State experiment stations. As a result of his recommendations Congress passed a law providing for a more rigid supervision of these stations, requiring an annual report to be made of the expenditures of the Government funds to the Secretary of Agriculture. The agricultural library was established in the Department, which proved of great benefit and convenience to the scientists and experts engaged in agricultural investigations. The Division of Soils was made a part of the Weather Bureau. The Division of Public Roads was greatly enlarged and the study of road construction was begun. During Mr. Morton's administration the Yearbook of Agriculture first made its appearance. At the close of his administration the appropriation for the Department was \$2,448,763.

When President McKinley was inaugurated in 1897 he appointed Hon. James Wilson, of Iowa, Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Wilson has continued in this capacity until the present time. While a great deal of credit is due to all of his predecessors, each one having a particular part to perform in the evolution of this great Department, yet it remained for Secretary Wilson to breathe new life into the work, bringing all the various bureaus to the highest state of efficiency, introduc-

ing in each a practical system for carrying on their labors and effective methods of carrying to the people the beneficial results of the experiments his experts and scientists were prosecuting in the various lines of agriculture. When Secretary Wilson took up the duties of his office there were employed in the Department 2,043 people. At the close of the last fiscal year, ending July 1, 1907, this number had increased to 9,107. There was appropriated for the first year of his administration of the office \$2,448,332. The appropriation for this Department in the pending bill is \$11,431,000. The number of employees has increased a little over 300 per cent, while the appropriations have increased 350 per cent. At this point I desire to pause to ask unanimous consent that I may insert in my remarks certain tables that I have, bearing on the agricultural development of the country.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. OLMSTED in the chair). The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. POLLARD] asks unanimous consent to insert certain data in his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLARD. When Secretary Wilson assumed the duties of his office he found that the various State experiment stations of the country were carrying on experiments entirely independent of the Department of Agriculture here in Washington. There was no sympathetic relation, no cooperation. In fact, each seemed to be traveling along separate lines and entirely independent of the other. Secretary Wilson has succeeded in bringing about a complete change in this respect. To-day the United States Department of Agriculture is in close touch and works in perfect harmony with every State agricultural experiment station in the country. A close and rigid inspection is made of all money appropriated by Congress to be expended in these different State stations. The Department in Washington has become the great head of one of the most magnificent systems of scientific agricultural education there is in the world. The Agricultural Department here in Washington bears the same relation to the State experiment stations that a man's heart does to his body.

It is the great central organ from which flows a vast fund of scientific and technical information from experts and scientists who contribute very materially to the success of the agricultural experiment stations throughout the several States of the Union. While it is true that the different State stations carry on original research work that is of a local nature, yet this great Department here in Washington is in close touch with them and offers a helping hand in the study of all questions that are of more than local interest. Instead of discord, instead of jealousy existing between the State stations and the Agricultural Department, to-day there is perfect harmony and hearty cooperation.

If time would permit, I should like to enter into a detailed discussion of each of the various divisions and bureaus of this great Department, tracing the development and growth of each and showing the particular relations existing between each of these divisions and the farmer on the farm. Time forbids my entering into a discussion of the question in such great detail; consequently I will confine myself to a brief review of two or three of the great bureaus which have done so much toward advancing the science of agriculture, which has resulted in its elevation and giving to it the true dignity to which it is justly entitled.

I will first take up the Bureau of Animal Industry. The first work done along the lines of studying diseases of farm animals was in 1878, when an appropriation of \$10,000 was made for this purpose. The Bureau of Animal Industry was organized under an act passed in 1884. From that time until the present there has been a rapid growth in this Bureau. From time to time Congress has enacted laws enlarging its scope and its duties. Beginning with an appropriation of \$10,000 in 1878, it reached \$144,440 in 1897. The appropriation for this Bureau for the present fiscal year is \$1,032,480, in addition to the permanent appropriation of three millions for the enforcement of the meat-inspection act.

The act of 1884 creating the Bureau of Animal Industry as later amended in 1890 and in 1895 prevents the shipment into interstate commerce of live stock that is infected with contagious diseases. Under the act of 1884 and its amendments the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish quarantine boundaries, thus isolating diseased stock. Under the operations of this law the Bureau of Animal Industry has been able to stamp out pleuro-pneumonia, the foot-and-mouth disease, and other diseases that are a menace to the live stock of the country. The contagious disease known as "black leg" has almost been exterminated. Its prevalence has been reduced to such an extent that it is no longer feared by the cattle-men of the country. The extermination of these three diseases has saved millions of dollars to the farmers of the country.

Under these laws also the Secretary of Agriculture has waged relentless warfare against sheep and cattle scabies and cattle tick that is prevalent in the Southern States. The work of combating contagious diseases of live stock is carried on in cooperation with the State experiment stations and individual farmers, in each instance the State and the farmer bearing a portion of the expense. The method of the Department in waging warfare against these diseases is to send experts into the infected districts to simply give expert and scientific information for the eradication of these diseases, the local or State authorities furnishing whatever funds are necessary in the way of labor and materials necessary for prosecuting the work. This work is being carried on in an extensive manner, and the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry informed the Agricultural Committee during its hearings that the warfare against scabies in sheep and in cattle is being carried on relentlessly, and that he hopes in a year or two to stamp out these diseases entirely.

The work that has been carried on in the South against Texas fever has not made as great progress.

Investigations of this subject have been carried on for a long period of years, and the veterinarians of the Agricultural Department have finally discovered a remedy under which splendid results are reached. The extent of the territory affected by this disease and its universal prevalence in this infected area make the progress of the work very slow. Last year Congress appropriated \$150,000 for this work. The pending bill carries \$250,000. Even with this tremendous expenditure of money Doctor Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, says this work can not be completed for fifteen or twenty years. By legislative enactment Congress has directed the Bureau of Animal Industry to inspect all live stock imported into and exported from the United States. This Bureau is given supervision over stock carried in interstate commerce.

Mr. TIRRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this "Texas fever," as they call it, and I would like to inquire of the gentleman if any part of this appropriation is directed toward the medical aspect of the case, because I know of my own observation, having had a case in which the matter was involved, that for two or three years the Department was really ignorant of the nature and extent, medically, of the disease, and were working upon it then. I would like to ask the gentleman if they have arrived at any conclusion as to the remedy, and so forth, that can be used to stop the disease?

Mr. POLLARD. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman. I do not care to be interrupted, but I will reply to his question. I can say, I think, with accuracy, that the Department has now reached the point where the veterinarians of the Department are thoroughly familiar with the disease, and the remedies that will result in its destruction. They are now employing these remedies throughout this area. The cattle-tick region is being gradually narrowed; the area infected by this disease is being gradually pushed southward, and, under the method employed by the Department, Doctor Melvin tells us that there is no question whatever that in the time specified he will be able to destroy this pest. I hope I have answered the gentleman's question to his satisfaction.

Strict regulations have been drawn providing for Federal inspection of cars in which stock is shipped, which guarantees safety and humane treatment to the animals while in transit. The beginning of the inspection of meat destined for interstate or foreign commerce began in 1890. Under an act that became effective August 30 of that year this Bureau was directed to inspect cured meats that were intended for export. The first law passed on this question was confined to cured meat intended for export. March 3, 1891, the scope of this law was enlarged. It directed the inspection of live animals, carcasses, and all meat products destined for interstate or foreign commerce. While this law provided for inspection of live animals and meat destined for interstate or foreign commerce, yet its terms were never enforced, excepting as it affected foreign commerce. A very rigid inspection, however, was made of all meat intended for export. This legislation proved of great value to the live-stock interests of the country. It was not until the act of June 30, 1906, became effective that strict and regular inspection was made of all our meat destined for both interstate and foreign commerce.

This law not only guaranteed the purity and wholesomeness of our meat intended for export, but it guaranteed the same to every American home that is a consumer of meat. Under the terms of this act the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to not only inspect meat as indicated, but it provides that he shall place his stamp upon it, thus guaranteeing to the consumers, whether at home or abroad, the purity and wholesomeness of American meat products. While the passage of this act produced a temporary depressing effect upon the live-stock interests of the

country, yet I have no hesitancy in stating that it will prove of inestimable value as time goes on. The result of this legislation is that it practically puts the Government behind every package of meat that goes into the foreign markets. This will have a very decided effect in removing any prejudice or skepticism that may be entertained in the Old World as to the quality of our meat products. I think that in the next five years we will witness a very decided increase in the export of our meat products as a result of the operation of this law. While it is impossible to estimate in dollars and cents the direct benefits this Bureau has carried to the farmers of the country, yet there is no question but what the expenditures of the public money by this Bureau are worth a great many times more to the people than it costs.

Millions of dollars have been saved to the people by the extermination of contagious diseases that wrought great devastation wherever they got a foothold. You can not estimate in dollars and cents the value to the people of our own country to know that the meat that is eaten at every fireside throughout this great Republic is pure and wholesome, yet these are services this Department is furnishing.

The work of the Bureau of Plant Industry touches another side of the farmers' interests. This Bureau was established in 1900, and was formed by the consolidation of ten separate divisions, including vegetable physiology, pathology, botany, experimental gardens and grounds, pomology, Congressional seed distribution, grass and forage-plant investigations, sugar investigations, tea-culture investigations, and the Arlington experimental farm. I will not attempt to discuss in detail the divisions of this Bureau. Neither do I desire to limit the term "plant industry" to these divisions. I shall discuss it in its broadest sense, including the Bureau of Soils, the Bureau of Entomology, and the Bureau of Experiment Stations, as they all relate to plant life.

During the early administrations of the Department of Agriculture the introduction of new plants was confined to such plants as were brought here from abroad by our diplomatic and consular representatives in foreign countries.

When Secretary Wilson took charge of the office he introduced a new plan. Secretary Wilson had the advantage over his predecessors in being a practical farmer, having himself operated successfully for a number of years a farm in Iowa, one of the great States of the Middle West. His familiarity with farm problems enabled him to know the particular needs and demands of the farmer; consequently he introduced the idea of sending agricultural experts abroad for particular purposes. One of the problems that confronted Secretary Wilson was the question of introducing a new plant that would be adapted to the semiarid regions of the great West where the rainfall is very light. Coming from the great agricultural section of the West, he realized that there was great need of a variety of wheat that would be especially adapted to this section of the country. The problem that presented itself to him was threefold: One, the introduction of a variety of wheat that would extend northward from Kansas the area for growing winter wheat; another was the introduction of a variety of spring wheat that would be better adapted to the States of the great Northwest, as the yield of wheat in that great area was rapidly declining; third, the introduction of a variety of wheat that would be adapted to the semiarid regions of the West.

The Secretary sent one of the best trained agriculturists in the country to Russia. He spent months in traversing the arid desert regions of that great Empire in hopes that he might find some species of wheat that could be introduced in the semiarid parts of western Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. When this expert came back to the States he brought with him two varieties of wheat, one known as the Durum and the other the Kharkov wheat. This was in the winter of 1899. The first seed, I believe, was planted either that year or in 1900. The Durum wheat was introduced first in western Kansas and Nebraska. This has proven to be a very valuable variety of wheat to the great semiarid regions covering the western parts of these two States. Eight years of experience has proven that this wheat will thrive and produce abundant crops in the semiarid sections. The yield of this crop last year amounted to 45,000,000 bushels, worth \$30,000,000. Since its introduction there has been grown in the United States in the past eight years 131,000,000 bushels, worth over \$90,000,000. This one crop has brought more money to the farmers of the Middle West than the entire cost of the Agricultural Department since the first appropriation was made in 1839. [Applause.] This variety of wheat is especially adapted to the semiarid regions of the Middle West. Only a few years ago—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the gentleman tell us which of the two varieties proved to be the most successful?

Mr. POLLARD. I will come to that. I will take up the

other in its order. I desire to finish the discussion of this variety first.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. POLLARD. I might say that within the past fifteen years practically all of that area lying west of the one hundredth meridian was not supposed to be adapted to the raising of farm crops. During the early settlements of western Nebraska and western Kansas the farmers went in and planted corn and nothing but corn. Corn was the great staple crop, and the farmers that came there from portions of the country where corn was a good crop undertook to raise corn in this new country. Very little attention was paid to wheat or any other crop. As a result, a few dry years followed and they were compelled to leave that country. Since the introduction of Durum wheat, alfalfa, and other drought-resisting grains western Nebraska and western Kansas, western Oklahoma, and the western part of the two Dakotas have become among the richest agricultural portions of the United States. [Applause.] And that has all come about since Secretary Wilson assumed charge of this office.

Last fall I was campaigning in western Nebraska in the district of my colleague, Judge NORRIS. I made a speech one evening at a little town that had a population of about 700, and the next morning I visited different business establishments. I went into two banks located in that little town. One was a national bank and the other was a State bank. I found in the national bank—remember, in a purely farming community—no manufacturing and no industry aside from agriculture—I found that bank had on deposit of farmers' money, \$225,000. I went across the street and visited the State bank and found that there they had a deposit from the farmers of that region amounting to \$85,000. There were in these two banks in that small town, located away out on the plains, within a hundred miles of the Colorado line, deposits from farmers of that region amounting to \$310,000, showing the thrift and prosperity of that section of the country that a few years ago was considered worthless excepting for grazing purposes.

The other variety of wheat the Secretary introduced was the variety known as "karkov," which is a species of winter wheat and very similar to what is known as "turkey-red wheat." It is extensively grown in my section of the country. Turkey red was a Russian variety first introduced in Kansas by the Russian immigrants, who brought the seed with them from their native land. Little attention was paid to it until the Department discovered its importance. Kharkov wheat is closely related to the Turkey red wheat; in fact, you can scarcely tell the two apart.

Their introduction has, perhaps, brought a hundred times as much wealth to the farmers of the Middle West as the cost of this whole Department from the beginning. Ten years ago there was practically no winter wheat grown in Nebraska. We could not get a variety that would withstand our severe winters. Farmers practically gave up trying to raise winter wheat in that section, thinking that we were too far north to be able to grow it. In the past ten years a complete change has come about. Last year for every 1 bushel of spring wheat grown in Nebraska I think I could safely say 100 bushels of winter wheat were grown. I simply mention this to illustrate the value in dollars and cents this great Department has brought to the farmers of the country. When Secretary Wilson took up the study of the conditions existing in the spring-wheat States of the Northwest, he went at it from a different point of view. He sent expert plant pathologists and soil chemists into these States, and by careful study of the soil and the methods of wheat culture he has reached a solution of the problem that in the next ten years will produce as marked results in the spring-wheat States of the Northwest as he has wrought in the semiarid regions and the winter-wheat areas to which I have just referred.

The soil physicists and the plant pathologists have discovered that the soil of these Northwestern States has not become exhausted, and that by the introduction of improved cultural methods just as good wheat can be grown in this area as was produced twenty or twenty-five years ago. The continual growing of wheat year after year on these soils has produced a peculiar condition. The soil physicists seem to have demonstrated beyond possibility of contradiction that the continual growing of one crop on any particular soil does not exhaust the plant food of the soil. They seem to be able to prove that the roots of the plant as it draws its food from the soil gives off an excrement that is poisonous to the plant itself. Unless this poisonous matter is destroyed the soil becomes infected so badly that it becomes impossible to grow the same plant in this particular soil at all. The soil physicists have discovered that as the roots of the plant draw their food from the soil they give off a poisonous excrement that is similar to the poisonous or filthy excrement that passes from the human being as a result of the

process of digestion. It bears the same relation to plant life that the kidneys bear to man. You clog a man's kidneys for forty-eight hours, thus preventing him from excreting the poisonous matter from the food he takes into his body, and it is sure to produce death.

The soil physicists have discovered also that the plant food is always present in the soil, only the plant is unable to make use of it when the soil becomes surcharged with this poisonous matter. Just as in the animal, its power to digest food is present so long as food is taken into the stomach, but unless it can excrete the poisonous matter from the body death is certain. Likewise, unless the poisonous substance can be removed from the soil, it will in time produce death to the plant, just as the stoppage of a man's kidneys will, in a briefer time, produce death. The soil physicists and the plant pathologists, working hand in hand, have discovered a solution of this question. By experiments they have demonstrated that by the application of fertilizers or by the rotation of crops or seeding the land to alfalfa, clover, timothy, or some other grass, thus giving it a rest for three or four years, this poisonous matter will soon die for lack of nourishment. These same scientists have discovered that the poisonous matter excreted by the roots of the growing wheat plant is different from the excrement discharged by the growing corn plant, and that the poisonous matter given off by one has no effect upon the other.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. POLLARD. Just a question.

Mr. GOULDEN. Have they tried both the rotation of crops and the fertilizer at the same time?

Mr. POLLARD. Yes; they have done that, and they find that particularly in this area of country the rotation of crops produces even better results than the application of fertilizer. Not only that, but the farmer saves the price of his fertilizer, and by continuous growth of other crops he gets the same return for his investment and his soil is refertilized and it is brought back to its virgin state.

Mr. GOULDEN. I do not think the gentleman understood the question. I meant if both had been tried, both the rotation of crops and fertilizing, at the same time, and what was the effect, and was it found that it was really necessary in order to bring about the best results in the way of crops? I ask this because, being a practical farmer myself, I want to know something about it. I say frankly that on the farms I have the honor of cultivating we do both.

Mr. POLLARD. If the gentleman will please pardon me, I do not care to have him make any statements. I am limited in my time and I have a great deal of ground to cover.

Mr. GOULDEN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I asked the question in good faith.

Mr. POLLARD. If I had time, I would be glad to let the gentleman proceed, but he knows that over on his side of the House there is one gentleman who will object to an extension of time.

They have experimented with both methods, and while I say both are effective, yet the rotation of crops seems to produce the best results. It is certainly better for the farmer, because it costs him nothing excepting the cost of the seed that he plants.

As a result of these investigations and these discoveries the Agricultural Department is in a position now to give the farmers of this great area scientific and practical advice as to how to increase the production of their farms. When the results of these discoveries were laid before the Secretary he at once saw the necessity of the introduction of a new crop into this region in order to rotate with wheat; consequently he sent one of his best-trained experts to northern Russia, and he has brought back and introduced a very hardy species of alfalfa which is able to withstand the extreme cold of this area. In this bill we have made provision for the purchase of a great quantity of this seed to distribute among the farmers of this region. If this new hardy variety of alfalfa will do for the Northwest what alfalfa has done for my section of the country, it will revolutionize agriculture in that region. While this work is too new for us to make any estimate of its value yet, I believe that in the next ten years it will produce as beneficial and profitable results as followed the introduction of Durum, Turkey red, and Karkhov wheat.

The Government to-day is maintaining experimental farms in the semiarid regions of the West. Investigations are being made of cultural methods that are best adapted for conservation of what little moisture is given to the soil. New crops are sure to be introduced that are adapted to that region—drought-resistant sorghum, Kafir corn, Durum wheat—and a cold and drought resistant alfalfa has been secured from Siberia which gives promise of great value. Millions of acres of land will be cultivated in that region that would have been a physical impossibility ten years ago. This condition has been brought about entirely by the introduction of these new crops and im-

proved cultural methods that have been introduced by the Agricultural Department. While these investigations have not been completed, yet they have reached a point where it is clearly demonstrated that within the next few years this great section of the country that was characterized by John C. Fremont as the great American desert and only ten years ago was thought to be worthless except for grazing purposes is sure to be brought under the plow and will make homes for millions of people.

Another line of work in which investigations are being carried on with promise of great value is the development by breeding of a new variety of wheat that will be rust resistant. Experts of the Department have been engaged in investigations of this character for several years, and they are encouraged to believe that their efforts will be crowned with success. Rust is a species of fungus that affects the wheat at about the time it begins to fill. It draws all the nutrition from the stalk, thus preventing the development and filling out of the kernel. I have seen wheat fields at the time they were in blossom that gave promise of a yield of from 25 to 35 bushels per acre. A week of hot, rainy weather setting in would practically destroy the whole field, cutting down the yield from 5 to 10 bushels per acre. By selection and breeding the Department has endeavored to produce a variety of wheat that will be rust resistant. If this can be done, it will add millions of dollars to the wealth of the farmers of the wheat regions of the country every year. Investigations have also been carried on looking to the improvement of the standard of quality and the yield of corn by plant breeding and proper cultural methods.

It has been demonstrated that the yield of corn can in this way be increased from 15 to 30 per cent. The live-stock interests of the country have made great progress in the development of the various strains of cattle, hogs, and sheep. By recognized methods of selection they have produced a type of Durham and Hereford cattle that have raised the standards of these breeds very materially. The work of breeding and improving strains of live stock has been carried on for years, with the result that there are found on American farms to-day some of the finest herds of pure-bred stock that there is in the world. Until recently very little attention has been given to the question of improving the yield or quality of our grains. It appears that all kinds of plant life respond much more readily to improvement by breeding and selection than is found in animal life. The Washington Department of Agriculture, the various State experiment stations, and a few leading corn growers of the country have discovered that by applying simple methods of breeding and selection that it is possible to develop an ear of corn that will be true to type and of a very high standard of quality.

The Department of Agriculture here in Washington and the State experiment stations have made great progress in the last few years in introducing these methods of improving our cereal crops. The Washington Department has perhaps done more toward introducing these improved methods than all of the State stations combined by the distribution of farmers' bulletins and the carrying on of cooperative demonstration work through the agricultural experiment stations and with individual farmers.

Another line of investigation carried on by the Bureau of Plant Industry is the study of all kinds of diseases of plants and fruits. Insect and fungus pests that attack our cereal and plant crop cause the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of fruit and grain annually. A very careful study has been made of the causes and methods of controlling apple scab, apple bitter rot, black rot, and leaf spot. It is estimated that these diseases cause a loss of \$10,000,000 annually. Effective remedies have been discovered for combating these diseases. Information concerning the methods of controlling these diseases has been scattered broadcast over the country through bulletins and demonstration experiments.

I see my time is going very rapidly. I did desire to continue this discussion somewhat longer. I had planned to refer to the experiments which have been made in the development of a species of wheat that will be rust resistant. That is of inestimable value to the whole wheat-growing region of the United States. I desired also to discuss at some length the investigations that have been made along the line of producing cotton that will be wilt resistant, the cotton boll weevil investigations, their studies in tobacco, and various other lines of endeavor, but I find I will have to pass over that, and I will ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks that portion of my speech.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POLLARD. A study of the organism causing pear blight has resulted in a discovery of a method to control this disease.

Pear blight has almost destroyed the pear-growing industry of the United States, all our choice varieties being very susceptible to pear blight. This industry is valued at \$15,000,000 annually in California alone. Statistics show that almost one-third of the orchards of that State have been destroyed by this disease. It is believed, however, that the new methods introduced by the Department of Agriculture will result in saving the remainder of the orchards.

The investigation of the causes of wilt in sea island and upland cotton has resulted in the discovery of a method of controlling this disease. The plant pathologists have introduced a new variety that resists the ravages of this pest. I might mention other investigations that have been conducted along similar lines, but I have said enough to indicate the importance and character of this work and its value to the country.

In 1867 the Commissioner of Agriculture began investigating the sugar-beet question. During that year eight varieties of sugar beets were grown on the Department grounds in Washington, and nine varieties were sent to Illinois for trial. The sugar content of these first varieties that were tested varied from 7 to 8 per cent. During the same year a study was made to outline the area of the country that was best adapted to sugar-beet culture. In 1869 two publications were issued by the Commissioner of Agriculture discussing the methods of sugar-beet culture in Europe, which resulted in an early introduction of sugar-beet seed into this country. During that year and 1870, three sugar-beet factories were built in the United States—one each in Illinois, California, and Wisconsin. The growth of the sugar-beet industry has been gradual until the present time. The Department of Agriculture has been rendering assistance in developing this industry, except during the administration of Secretary Morton. Secretary Morton suspended sugar-beet investigations in 1893. Immediately upon assuming the duties of his office in 1897 Secretary Wilson resumed the study of this question. Cooperative work has been carried on by the State experiment stations, which has aided very materially the success of this industry.

To-day there are sixty-four sugar-beet factories in the United States with a combined annual output of approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds of sugar, the raw product bringing to the farmers of the country an annual revenue of over \$20,000,000. As a result of the study of this question in the last ten years by the Department of Agriculture we are now able to produce a very considerable amount of sugar-beet seed. Until the last few years all the sugar-beet seed for planting the fields has been imported. It is thought that within a short time enough sugar-beet seed will be grown in the United States to supply the entire demand of American sugar-beet growers. As a result of the study of this question by the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations the sugar content of the beet has been very materially increased. In some sections of the country best adapted to sugar-beet culture the sugar content of the beet has reached as high as 20 per cent. Under new cultural methods introduced by the Department of Agriculture the yield and the sugar content of the beet is being gradually increased. This is an industry that was first introduced by the Department of Agriculture in 1867 and has now become one of the staple farm crops of the country.

The results of the investigations of the cotton and rice industries of the South, the tobacco industry of the North and South Atlantic States, has produced results equally as startling as is shown in other lines of research in this Department. The United States Department of Agriculture went into Texas a few years ago when the cotton boll weevil threatened the whole cotton industry of that State. By propagating new varieties of cotton and introducing improved cultural methods the cotton crop has been saved to that State. Quarantine lines have been established, preventing the spread of this disease that held the whole cotton industry of the South in jeopardy. Doctor Knapp, who has been in direct charge of this work in the South, told the Agricultural Committee that thousands of farms were abandoned in Texas on account of the ravages of this pest. Since the Department took charge of this work, however, farmers have returned to their farms, and under the guiding hand of Mr. Knapp they are now able to raise a better strain of cotton in spite of the boll weevil than they were before this pest was first visited upon that State.

The results that have followed the cooperative demonstration work in the cotton fields of the South is indeed marvelous. These new resistant strains of cotton and improved cultural methods have been introduced upon hundreds of thousands of farms in the South. The Department has succeeded in introducing new crops to serve in rotating with cotton. The cotton planter of the South has been taught the importance of diversified agriculture. The beneficial results that have followed the Department's entrance into this section of the

country is worth millions of dollars to the cotton-growing industry of the South.

The Department's experts have introduced from Japan new varieties of rice along with new cultural methods that have simply revolutionized the rice industry of the South. When the Agricultural Department took up this work they actually found farmers working in the rice fields of the Carolinas with boots on their horses to enlarge their feet so as to prevent them from sinking too far in the mud as they tilled their crops. After a careful study of the methods of rice culture at home and abroad, the Department has introduced methods of rice culture that is similar to the methods employed in raising wheat in the Western States.

Under the old method the sowing was done with a drill, the rice was hoed by hand and cut with a reap hook. One man was capable of taking care of but 1 or 2 acres. Under the improved methods introduced by the Department of Agriculture the gang plow and the disk harrow and the broadcast seeder have been brought into use. The rice is cut with a twine binder and thrashed with a steam thrasher. One man can cultivate about as much rice under these new improved methods as one man can cultivate in wheat in the North.

Tobacco investigations were begun by the Department in 1898. As a result of these investigations by the Department their experts have taught the tobacco growers how to ferment the tobacco leaf properly. The introduction of these improved methods of fermenting the tobacco leaf has resulted in saving at least \$1,000,000 a year to the tobacco growers. The plant pathologists have introduced new methods of seed selection which has resulted in a very material improvement in the quality of the tobacco. The Department has produced two improved strains of wrapper tobacco for planting in Florida and Connecticut, known as the "Uncle Sam Sumatra" and the "Hazelwood Cuban." These new strains are worth from 15 to 20 per cent more than any other tobacco on the market.

I might continue a discussion of the new plants that have been introduced by the Department and improved cultural methods they have inaugurated which have resulted in enriching the farmers of the country by hundreds of millions of dollars. I think, however, I have continued this review far enough to indicate to this committee clearly that the expenditures in the Department of Agriculture have brought results. This great Department, in cooperation with the State experiment stations all over the country, has been able to make two blades of grass grow where only one was grown when they took up this work.

I can not leave this subject without saying a word about the man at the head of this great Department, who has done so much toward the advancement of the science of agriculture. Secretary Wilson is a specimen of the hardy, thrifty, determined frontiersman. When he came into this Department he brought with him the same industry, the same foresight, the same business sagacity, and the same skill that he carried with him when he went out on the frontier in Iowa and helped to make that State one of the greatest States in the Union. During the eleven years he has been Secretary of Agriculture he has done more toward elevating the American farmer, giving to him the poise and dignity that is his due, than all of his predecessors combined.

His keen, watchful eye has followed every expert, whether he was exploring the steppes of Russia, the fertile valleys of Japan, the cold, barren regions of Siberia, or whether he was conducting investigations in the cotton fields of the South, in the wheat fields of the Northwest, in the tobacco fields of Connecticut, or on the stock ranches in the great West. His great heart has been the motive power that has given force and energy and success to all these various lines of investigations and research. In Secretary Wilson the farmers of the country, yea the whole people of the country, owe a debt of gratitude that they can never repay. By the reduction to practical application the science of agriculture he has built for himself a monument that will be as enduring as time itself.

I wish to divert your attention for a moment to a comparison of the part the two great political parties have taken in this great work. As I said at the opening of my remarks the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture was passed during the Administration of Abraham Lincoln, the first President the Republican party gave to the country. In all, thirty laws have been passed bearing on the question of agriculture since 1862. Of these laws just three came from the hands of the Democratic party.

Every one of the other twenty-seven laws were enacted by the Republican party; consequently this marvelous development and growth of the Department of Agriculture and the beneficial results that have gone out to the people are the result of Republican ingenuity, Republican forethought, and Republican statesmanship. It was the Republican party that gave to the

country the organic act creating the Department. It was under Republican legislation that the investigation of animal and plant diseases was begun. It was the result of Republican legislation that the beet-sugar industry, the durum and Turkey red wheat, alfalfa, and improved strains of rice, cotton, and tobacco were given to the country. It was Republican legislation that opened the great semiarid regions of the West to settlement. It was by Republican legislation that the irrigation of the arid lands has been introduced. In this magnificent work the great Republican party has known no North, no South, no East, no West. All parts of the country have felt the beneficial results of its statesmanship.

The Republican party entered into that section of the country that since the rebellion has done everything in its power to obstruct and block the progress of not only our party, but of the nation. We went into the cotton fields of the South and taught the poor cotton planter how to grow cotton and rice. We showed him how to combat the cotton boll weevil. We have carried on a system almost akin to wet nursing in our efforts to teach him how to grow cotton and rice at a profit. This very bill carries an appropriation of \$250,000 for combating Texas fever, which is wholly confined to the South. We have produced results equally beneficial in the tobacco fields of Connecticut, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky; in fact, all sections of the country have been beneficiaries of the growth of this great Department as a result of Republican statesmanship.

I wish to call your attention for a few moments to a comparison of the growth of agriculture on the farms during Democratic and Republican Administrations. I will only elaborate upon a few of the leading crops.

I find that during the Administration of President Harrison the average annual acreage of corn was 74,280,396 acres. The average annual yield of corn during his Administration was 1,822,870,000 bushels. The average annual price per bushel on the 1st day of December was 39.7 cents. During the Cleveland Administration the average acreage and yield was practically the same as during the Harrison Administration, but the value of the crop was \$162,000,000 less in round numbers. The average annual price per bushel was 7½ cents less per bushel. During the McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations the average annual acreage increased to almost 88,000,000 acres. The average annual production amounted to 2,240,634,463 bushels. The average annual value was \$869,575,309. The average annual price per bushel was 38.9 cents. I find that the value of the corn crop during the last year of the Harrison Administration was 6.8 per cent greater than it was during the first year of his Administration. I find that during the last year of the Cleveland Administration the value of the corn crop actually decreased 16 per cent from what it was during the first year of his Administration.

I find that the total value of the corn crop for the year 1907 was 75 per cent greater than it was during the first year of the McKinley Administration. These figures represent the average annual price on the farm on the 1st day of December during these Administrations. A close examination of these figures discloses the fact that during the year 1894, which was the year and the drought prevailed over a large portion of the corn-growing section of the country, the total production of corn was 1,212,770,000 bushels, being the smallest crop grown since 1881. The average price of corn for that year for the United States on the 1st day of December was 45.7 cents per bushel. The next year there was grown the largest corn crop ever produced up until that time. There was an increase over the year 1894 of almost 1,000,000,000 bushels, and the price dropped to 25 cents per bushel. One big crop following a very light crop in a Democratic Administration brought the average price of corn down for the whole country from 45.7 cents to 25.3 cents per bushel. The next year, 1896, another tremendous crop of corn was grown, being in excess of the great crop grown in 1895 by about 130,000,000 bushels.

The price that year dropped to 21.5 cents per bushel as an average throughout the United States on the 1st day of December. With over a billion more bushels of corn grown in 1896 than in 1894, the value of the crop was \$60,000,000 less. Now, let us see what took place during the Republican administrations that followed. In the next year, 1897, which was the first year of the McKinley Administration, the total production of corn was 1,902,000,000 bushels, in round numbers, which was about 380,000,000 bushels less than was grown the year before; the price increased from 21.5 to 26.3 cents per bushel. From the first year of the McKinley Administration on down to the year 1900 there has been almost a continuous increase in the production of corn, reaching for the year 1906, 3,000,000,000 bushels, being by far the largest crop ever grown in the United States. During all this period the price of corn increased in almost the same proportion as the yield. During the Democratic Adminis-

tration of Grover Cleveland one short crop of corn brought the price up to 25 cents per bushel. Two large crops reduced the price to 21 cents per bushel. The beginning of the McKinley Administration followed two large crops of corn.

Thereafter the production of corn not only increased for one year, but for ten, and instead of the price going down with one big crop, as it did with the Cleveland Administration, the price soared higher and higher until it reached the maximum in 1901, when the average price of corn on the 1st day of December throughout the United States was 60 cents per bushel. The lowest average price of corn throughout the United States on the 1st day of December since 1900, just three years after the Republican party came into power, was 39.9 per bushel, which was the 3,000,000,000-bushel crop in 1906.

I have a number of tables here bearing on this same question which I desire to insert at this point, which the House has kindly permitted. I wish to read briefly from them. I find that of the great staple crops grown on the farm during the Cleveland Administration, such as corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, tobacco, and cotton, during the first year of the Cleveland Administration the total value of all these crops was \$2,034,000,000 in round numbers, and in the year 1894 the value was \$1,917,000,000; in 1895, \$1,757,000,000; and in 1896, \$1,748,000,000, showing that for the four years of the Cleveland Administration there was a gradual decline each year in the value of these great staple crops of the farms. I also find that in the live-stock interests of the country, including horses, cattle, mules, sheep, swine, in fact all of the other animals that compose our live-stock interests.

In the year 1893 they were worth \$2,443,000,000. There was a gradual reduction each year until the close of the Cleveland Administration, when the value was \$1,727,000,000, a falling off of \$700,000,000 in value during that period.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. POLLARD. For a question.

Mr. RUCKER. I will ask you if the figures do not show that the average price of all the great crops was considerably less during the last ten years than the prior ten years?

Mr. POLLARD. On the contrary, the facts show the opposite to be the case.

Mr. RUCKER. Well—

Mr. POLLARD. I can not yield for the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. RUCKER. I beg your pardon. I wanted to see whether there were two classes of statistics which this Department was furnishing.

Mr. POLLARD. I did not understand your statement.

Mr. RUCKER. Under your assumption and your statement as to the facts, I say that the Government must be furnishing two sets of statistics, because I can produce their statistics that are different from those you quote.

Mr. POLLARD. I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. LAMB. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a question?

Mr. POLLARD. Only a question.

Mr. LAMB. Do you wish to leave the impression on the country that that falling off was due to the fact that Cleveland was President?

Mr. POLLARD. I will discuss that later on when I reach it. I will go into that matter very fully if I have the time.

These figures prove conclusively to my mind that so far as the great agricultural interests of the country are concerned the people are infinitely better off during a Republican than during a Democratic administration. During the last few days we have heard a great deal said about the condition of the farmer. Our Democratic friends have been bemoaning his plight since this little stock gamblers' panic struck the country. The agricultural products of the United States for the last year under panic prices, as you choose to call them, were worth almost as much as they were during the whole Administration of Grover Cleveland. Our Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle need not become exercised about the condition of the farmer. With the exception of two or three weeks when this gamblers' panic first made its appearance, at which time there was no market at all for any farm products simply because the banks would not give out any money to pay for the crops, the farmers have not felt the effect of the panic. You take it out in the great agricultural sections of the country, and if the farmers of that region did not read the daily papers they would never know there had been a panic.

At the close of eleven years of Republican administration we find that the country has produced the third largest crop of corn in our history, being exceeded only in the years 1905 and 1906. The total production of corn for the year 1907 was 2,592,326,000 bushels, and the average price throughout the

country on the 1st day of December was 51.6 cents per bushel. Here we find ourselves in the midst of a Republican panic, as the Democrats choose to call it. In the face of this awful panic, that has brought devastation and ruin to the homes of the people, according to Democratic authority, the total value of the production of all the farms in the United States is the greatest in our history—10 per cent greater than the record-breaking crop of 1906, 17 per cent in excess of the crop of 1905, 20 per cent greater than the crop of 1904, 57 per cent greater than the crop of 1899, and 100 per cent greater than for the last year of Cleveland's Administration. The total production of all the farms of the United States for the last calendar year was \$7,412,000,000. This is \$657,000,000 more than the value of the crop of 1906, and this, gentlemen of the committee, in the midst of a Republican panic.

If such conditions as these are what follow Republican panics, so far as the farmer is concerned we had better let the panic continue than take any chances of having a change of administration and a return to the times of soup houses under the Cleveland Administration.

For the first time in our history the exports of farm products exceeded a billion dollars in value. I fully realize that Providence has been kind to the country under our administration. We are willing to admit that Providence has been on our side. I have never heard anyone suggest that Providence ever worked with the Democratic party. Yes; Providence has given us the warm sunshine and the bounteous rain that has helped to swell the production of our farms, yet, if we were to follow the precedent established in the Cleveland Administration, a bounteous production of our farms would mean low prices and low values for everything the farmer has to sell. How is it that this is not the case under a Republican administration? How is it that a large acreage and an abundant harvest during a Democratic administration brings cheap prices for farm crops and under a Republican administration the same conditions are followed by higher prices and exorbitant values for farm products?

To my mind the explanation is simple. When the people awoke on the morning following the election in November, 1892, and realized that the country had gone Democratic, that very morning retrenchment set in all over the country, factories were either closed or began running on short hours. Yes; the panic of 1893 began during the closing hours of Harrison's Administration, but it did not come until it was known a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress had been elected, pledged to give the people free trade. Laboring men were thrown out of employment. Mr. Gompers has said that in the year 1893 there were 3,000,000 able-bodied men in the United States, most of whom had families to support, who were seeking employment in vain. This condition not only continued throughout the year 1893, but the same conditions prevailed during the whole of the Cleveland Administration. How different was the situation when the Republican party was returned to power. When the people awoke on that bright morning in November, 1896, and the news was flashed from one end of the country to the other that McKinley had been elected President the country was full of sunshine. The little birds even were singing sweeter songs than they had ever sung before. The fires were rekindled in the furnaces. The factories once more became hives of industry. The spindles began to turn, and the laboring men went back to work on full time.

The Republican party had been in power for hardly a year when all of these 3,000,000 men who had been seeking employment found more than they could do. The factories all over the country began to expand and new ones sprang up here and there like magic. The demand for labor grew year after year, and we found the condition where there were two jobs awaiting every man that wanted work. The day laborers were all at work at good wages; they were eating three good square meals a day. They were eating the choicest cuts of beef, veal, mutton, and pork. They were buying pianos and other comforts for the home. They were consuming farm products of every description, building up a great home market for the products of the farm. Under the stimulus of the Dingley tariff that we have heard so much about our country has reached the highest degree of prosperity in all lines of industry ever known. It is this great home market that has been built up since the Republican party came back into power, under the Dingley Act, that has made the farmer prosper as he has never prospered before and to even revel in luxury.

The total production last year of all our farms, of all our factories, of all our mines, and of all our forests reached \$27,000,000,000 in value. Our total exports were worth \$1,750,000,000. Our total imports were worth \$1,250,000,000, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of \$500,000,000. Gentlemen, this means that the total value of the American market was worth \$26,500,000,000. The total value of the international

commerce of all the nations of the world last year was \$20,000,000,000. This great American market of ours, that has grown up under the Dingley tariff act, was worth six and a half billion dollars in excess of the entire international commerce of the world. Is it any wonder that the farmer is prosperous when he has such a market as this in which to sell his goods? And I want to say to my friends on the other side of the House that the farmers of the West are interested in a revision of the tariff. Yes; we are in favor of a revision of the tariff, but when that tariff is revised, I want to say to you that the farmers of the country are going to see to it that the party is in power that will revise it along protective lines. The farmer will insist that this great home market is not interfered with.

In the platform adopted by the Democratic party in Omaha a few days ago, which, it is said, was written by the Hon. William J. Bryan, my distinguished constituent, there is a plank committing the Democratic party to tariff for revenue only. What is a tariff for revenue only? A tariff for revenue only is a tariff that is placed on noncompeting articles. Mr. Bryan has said time and time again that a protective tariff is highway robbery. A protective tariff, he tell us, takes the money out of one man's pocket and places it in another's. If this is true and the Democrats are put in power one year hence, it means that they will enact a tariff law, if they are true to their pledges, without any element of protection in it, for their great leader has said that a protective tariff is robbery. What does this mean, gentlemen? It simply means that over 50 per cent of the articles that are now on the free list will be transferred to the dutiable list. Under the present tariff law over 50 per cent of our imports come in free of duty. Practically all the commodities, with the exception of sugar, that are classed among the necessities of life are on the free list. A large per cent of the duties collected on our imports come from the luxuries of life.

If we are to take the Democratic party at their word, and they come to enact a tariff law, 80 per cent of the duties will be on the necessities of life. Not only that, but by tearing down the protective tariff they will permit the goods produced by the cheap foreign labor to come into competition with the goods produced by our high-priced American labor. This means that the wages of the American laborer must be reduced to a corresponding level with those of his brother laborers across the sea. The laboring men of the country will either have to submit to a reduction in their wages of from 50 to 100 per cent or there will be thousands thrown out of employment. In either event it means that this great home market of ours will be destroyed. This great home market that is worth \$27,000,000,000 and furnishes a market for the products of the American farm will be opened to the products of the cheap foreign labor. I want to say to you that the farmers of the country will never tolerate such conditions as that. [Applause.] The American farmer is deeply interested in the factories and in the mines and in the forests of the country.

The farmer knows that he furnishes the food for the men who work in the factories, in the mines, and in the forests.

He knows that unless the factory hands, the miners, and the foresters work at good wages all the time they can not consume the maximum of food products. The farmer knows that if a tariff law is enacted stripped of protection, it will close 75 per cent of the factories of the country; that hundreds of thousands of men will be thrown out of employment. He knows that the moment these factories close and these men are out of employment his market is interfered with. The farmers of the country know that it is this great home market that is responsible for high prices for farm products. I want to say to you that the farmers of the country will never permit this great home market to be interfered with by the Democratic party.

Gentlemen, I have too much faith in the good sense and the good judgment of the American laboring man, the American farmer, and the American business man to think that they will consider for a moment the advisability of electing a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. The laboring people, the farmers, and the business men of the country have great confidence in the grand old Republican party, and I want to say to you that the future of our party was never more propitious or gave promise of greater success in all our history than it does to-day. When the Ides of next November arrive and the result of the Presidential election is flashed over the country we will have a guaranty of four more years of Republican rule and prosperous times. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLLARD. I should like to ask leave to continue my remarks fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. OLMSTED). The Chair will state that the time for general debate has been limited by order of the

House. The committee can by unanimous consent extend the time of the gentleman from Nebraska. It can not extend the four hours fixed by the House. The Chair will put the request. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to have his time extended for fifteen minutes.

Mr. LAMB. If it does not come out of the time on our side, I shall not object; but if it does, I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The order of the House made no distinction as to side, but only as to four hours for general debate.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are several others who desire to participate in debate on this side, and as I have already been given the right to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I will withdraw my request for an extension of time. [Applause.]

TABLE No. 1.—Statistics of farm products during the Administrations of Harrison, Cleveland, McKinley, and Roosevelt.

Administration and product.	Average acreage per year.	Average number bushels per year.	Average total value per year.	Average price per bushel.	Per cent of increase from first year of Administration to last in value.	Per cent of increase of last year of Administration over average of same Administration in value.
CORN.						
Harrison	74,280,396	1,822,870,000	\$707,734,534	\$0.397	6.8 per cent increase	9.2 per cent decrease.
Cleveland	74,430,430	1,816,816,682	545,584,322	.322	16 + per cent decrease	10 + per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt	87,971,235	2,240,634,463	869,575,309	.389	57 + per cent increase	34.1 per cent increase.
WHEAT.						
Harrison	38,170,585	504,387,750	378,212,494	.749	5.9 per cent decrease	14.8 per cent decrease.
Cleveland	34,544,458	437,796,608	246,903,735	.566	45.7 per cent increase	22.1 per cent increase.
McKinley and Roosevelt	45,540,593	631,181,162	451,617,233	.688	14.4 per cent increase	13.6 per cent increase.
OATS.						
Harrison	26,634,845	668,641,250	208,848,843	.374	21 per cent increase	0.1 per cent increase.
Cleveland	27,435,244	708,170,429	174,633,278	.242	41 per cent decrease	24 per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt	27,699,358	835,644,006	246,936,311	.294	102 per cent increase	21 per cent increase.
POTATOES.						
Harrison	2,640,575	191,062,390	94,883,281	.532	42 per cent increase	9 per cent increase.
Cleveland	2,766,465	225,823,362	88,588,959	.420	33 per cent decrease	18 per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt	2,805,707	241,700,416	124,812,869	.521	75 per cent increase	26 per cent increase.
HAY.						
Harrison	51,389,325	61,917,176	482,121,583	\$7.81	4 per cent increase	1 per cent increase.
Cleveland	46,350,237	56,750,316	455,198,105	8.03	32 per cent decrease	14 per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt	40,665,522	58,393,644	489,912,829	8.45	47 per cent increase	28 per cent increase.
COTTON.^a						
Harrison		Total weight of lint.	3,780,236	306,940,476	Per ton.	
Cleveland			3,990,605	251,532,677	\$0.081	9 per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt			5,242,555	478,817,438	.064	10 per cent increase.
					.0883	79 per cent increase.
HORSES.^a						
Harrison		Number.	14,383,005	977,532,061	Per head.	
Cleveland			15,576,329	709,580,187	\$68.18	2 per cent increase.
McKinley and Roosevelt			16,469,387	1,041,095,508	44.60	49 per cent decrease.
					60.62	312 per cent increase.
MULES.^a						
Harrison			2,290,958	178,892,005	77.79	2 per cent decrease.
Cleveland			2,323,852	131,282,213	56.42	37 per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt			2,809,368	217,712,128	72.70	356 per cent increase.
CATTLE.^a						
Harrison			52,523,944	922,473,388	18.90	4 per cent decrease.
Cleveland			51,141,422	877,363,804	17.22	3 per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt			58,159,886	1,253,114,700	23.44	41 per cent increase.
SWINE.						
Harrison			51,231,874	246,487,716	4.81	17 per cent decrease.
Cleveland			44,577,445	242,960,532	5.42	38 per cent decrease.
McKinley and Roosevelt			46,333,539	283,959,612	5.90	50 per cent decrease.

^a This carries the figures up to 1908, those above only to 1906.

TABLE No. 2.—Total value of following crops based on prices December 1, each year.

	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
Corn	\$591,026,000	\$554,719,000	\$544,986,000	\$491,007,000
Wheat	213,171,000	225,902,000	237,939,000	310,603,000
Oats	187,576,000	214,817,000	163,655,000	132,485,000
Barley	28,729,000	27,134,000	29,312,000	22,491,000
Rye	13,612,000	13,395,000	11,965,000	9,931,000
Buckwheat	7,074,000	7,040,000	6,936,000	5,622,000
Potatoes	108,662,000	91,527,000	73,985,000	72,182,000
Hay	570,883,000	468,578,000	308,186,000	388,146,000
Tobacco	39,155,000	27,761,000	35,574,000	24,258,000
Cotton	274,480,000	287,121,000	290,338,000	291,812,000
Total	2,034,968,000	1,917,994,000	1,757,876,000	1,748,467,000

Total value of all farm crops for year 1896, \$1,967,025,000.
The crops enumerated comprised 81.3 per cent of the total value of all crops (not including live stock) in the Census of 1899.

Values based upon farm price December 1.
Farm value of all live stock on farms January 1—

Year.	Value.
1893	\$2,483,506,000
1894	2,170,818,000
1895	1,819,447,000
1896	1,727,926,000

TABLE No. 3.—Average, production, value, and prices of corn for the United States.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per bushel December 1.	Farm value December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1896	34,308,538	25.3	867,946,295	47.4	411,450,830
1897	32,320,249	23.6	768,320,000	57.0	437,769,763
1898	34,887,246	26.0	906,527,000	46.8	424,056,649
1899	37,108,245	23.6	874,320,000	59.8	522,550,509
1870	38,646,977	28.3	1,094,255,000	49.4	540,320,456
1871	34,091,137	29.1	991,898,000	43.4	430,355,910
1872	35,526,836	30.8	1,092,719,000	35.3	385,736,210

TABLE No. 3.—Average, production, value, and prices of corn for the United States—Continued.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per bushel December 1.	Farm value December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1873	39,197,148	23.8	933,274,000	44.2	411,961,151
1874	41,036,918	20.7	850,148,500	58.4	493,271,255
1875	44,841,371	29.5	1,321,069,000	36.7	481,674,804
1876	49,033,364	26.2	1,283,827,500	34.0	436,108,521
1877	50,369,113	26.7	1,342,558,000	34.8	467,635,230
1878	51,585,000	26.9	1,388,218,750	31.7	440,289,517
1879	53,085,450	29.2	1,547,901,790	37.5	580,481,217
1880	62,317,842	27.6	1,717,434,543	39.6	679,714,409
1881	64,262,025	18.6	1,194,916,000	63.6	759,482,179
1882	65,659,545	24.6	1,617,025,100	48.5	783,837,175
1883	68,301,889	22.7	1,551,066,895	42.4	658,051,485
1884	69,683,780	25.8	1,795,528,432	35.7	640,735,859
1885	73,130,150	26.5	1,936,176,000	32.8	635,674,630
1886	75,694,208	22.0	1,665,441,000	36.6	610,311,000
1887	72,392,720	20.1	1,456,161,000	44.4	646,103,770
1888	75,672,763	26.3	1,987,790,000	34.1	677,561,580
1889	78,319,651	27.0	2,112,892,000	28.3	597,918,829
1890	71,970,763	20.7	1,489,970,000	50.6	754,438,451
1891	76,204,515	27.0	2,060,154,000	40.6	836,439,228
1892	70,626,658	23.1	1,628,464,000	39.4	642,146,630
1893	72,036,465	22.5	1,619,496,131	36.5	591,625,627
1894	62,582,289	19.4	1,212,770,052	45.7	554,719,162
1895	62,075,830	26.2	1,615,135,580	25.3	411,961,151
1896	61,027,156	23.2	1,415,835,165	21.5	301,008,967
1897	60,005,051	23.8	1,408,967,933	26.3	370,472,932
1898	77,721,781	24.8	1,924,184,660	28.7	552,923,428
1899	82,108,587	25.3	2,078,143,933	30.3	629,210,110
1900	83,320,872	25.3	2,105,102,516	35.7	751,220,034
1901	91,349,928	18.7	1,522,519,801	60.5	912,555,788
1902	94,043,613	26.8	2,523,638,312	40.3	1,017,017,349
1903	88,001,993	25.5	2,244,176,925	42.5	952,838,801
1904	92,231,581	29.8	2,467,480,934	44.1	1,087,461,440
1905	91,011,369	28.8	2,707,693,540	41.2	1,116,693,738
1906	93,737,581	30.3	2,927,416,061	30.9	1,160,623,479
1907	99,231,000	25.9	2,562,320,000	51.6	1,326,901,000

Acreage, production, value, and price of wheat for the United States.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per bushel December 1.	Farm value December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1866	15,424,496	9.9	151,999,906	152.7	232,109,630
1867	18,321,561	11.6	212,441,400	145.2	308,387,146
1868	18,460,132	12.1	224,036,600	108.5	243,032,746
1869	19,181,004	13.6	260,146,900	76.5	199,024,906
1870	18,902,591	12.4	235,881,700	94.4	222,766,969
1871	19,943,893	11.6	230,722,400	114.5	264,075,851
1872	20,858,359	11.9	249,097,100	111.4	278,522,068
1873	22,171,676	12.7	281,254,700	108.9	300,669,528
1874	24,067,027	12.3	308,102,700	83.3	265,881,167
1875	26,381,512	11.1	292,138,000	89.5	261,396,926
1876	27,627,021	10.5	290,358,500	96.3	278,697,238
1877	26,277,546	13.9	364,194,148	105.7	385,089,444
1878	32,108,580	13.1	420,122,400	77.6	325,814,119
1879	32,545,950	13.8	448,756,630	110.8	497,030,142
1880	37,983,717	13.1	498,549,898	56.1	474,201,850
1881	37,709,020	10.2	388,280,090	119.2	456,880,427
1882	37,067,194	13.6	504,185,470	88.4	445,602,125
1883	36,455,593	11.6	421,085,160	91.1	383,649,272
1884	39,475,885	13.0	512,765,000	64.5	330,802,260
1885	34,180,246	10.4	357,112,000	77.1	275,320,300
1886	36,893,181	12.4	457,218,000	68.7	314,226,020
1887	37,641,783	12.1	456,320,000	68.1	310,612,960
1888	37,336,138	11.1	415,898,000	92.6	385,248,080
1889	38,123,890	12.9	490,590,000	69.8	342,491,707
1890	36,087,154	11.1	399,262,000	83.8	334,773,678
1891	39,916,897	15.3	611,780,000	83.9	513,472,711
1892	38,554,480	13.4	515,949,000	62.4	322,111,881
1893	34,629,418	11.4	396,131,725	53.8	213,171,381
1894	34,882,436	13.2	460,267,416	49.1	225,902,025
1895	34,047,332	13.7	467,192,947	50.9	237,938,998
1896	34,618,646	12.4	427,684,346	72.6	310,602,530
1897	39,465,066	13.4	530,149,168	80.8	428,547,121
1898	44,055,278	15.3	675,148,705	58.2	392,770,320
1899	44,502,516	12.3	547,308,845	58.4	319,545,259
1900	42,495,385	12.3	522,220,505	61.9	323,515,177
1901	49,895,514	15.0	748,460,218	62.4	467,350,156
1902	46,302,424	14.5	670,063,008	63.0	422,224,117
1903	49,464,967	12.9	637,821,835	69.5	443,024,826
1904	44,074,875	12.5	552,399,517	92.4	510,489,874
1905	47,854,079	14.5	692,979,489	74.8	518,372,727
1906	47,306,829	15.5	735,290,970	66.7	490,332,760
1907	45,211,000	14.0	634,087,000	87.4	554,437,000

Acreage, production, value, and prices of hay for United States.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per ton, December 1.	Farm value, December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1866	17,668,904	1.23	21,778,627	10.14	220,835,771
1867	20,020,554	1.31	26,277,000	10.21	268,300,623
1868	21,541,573	1.21	26,141,900	10.08	263,589,253
1869	19,501,281	1.42	28,420,000	10.18	289,043,043
1870	19,831,895	1.23	24,525,000	12.47	305,743,224
1871	19,009,052	1.17	22,239,400	14.30	317,959,799
1872	20,318,938	1.17	23,812,800	12.61	308,024,517
1873	21,894,084	1.15	25,085,100	12.53	314,211,037
1874	21,769,772	1.15	25,133,900	11.94	300,222,454
1875	23,507,994	1.19	27,873,600	10.78	300,377,839
1876	25,282,797	1.22	30,857,100	8.97	276,901,422
1877	25,367,708	1.25	31,629,300	8.37	264,879,790
1878	26,931,300	1.47	39,608,296	7.20	285,015,625
1879	27,484,991	1.29	35,403,000	9.32	330,894,494
1880	25,893,955	1.23	31,925,233	11.65	371,811,084
1881	30,888,700	1.14	35,135,064	11.82	415,131,386
1882	32,339,585	1.18	38,138,019	9.70	371,170,323
1883	35,515,948	1.32	46,884,009	8.19	383,834,451
1884	38,571,593	1.26	48,470,460	8.17	393,139,309
1885	39,849,701	1.19	44,731,550	8.71	389,732,873
1886	36,501,688	1.15	41,706,499	8.46	353,437,690
1887	37,664,739	1.10	41,454,458	9.97	413,440,283
1888	38,591,903	1.21	46,643,004	8.76	408,490,555
1889	52,947,236	1.28	68,829,612	7.04	470,374,948
1890	50,712,513	1.19	60,197,580	7.87	473,569,972
1891	51,044,490	1.19	60,817,771	8.12	494,113,613
1892	50,833,063	1.18	59,823,735	8.20	490,427,708
1893	49,613,469	1.33	65,766,158	8.68	570,882,872
1894	48,321,272	1.14	54,874,408	8.54	465,578,321
1895	44,206,453	1.06	47,078,541	8.35	398,185,615
1896	43,259,756	1.37	58,932,158	6.55	388,145,614
1897	42,436,770	1.43	60,664,876	6.62	401,300,728
1898	42,780,827	1.55	66,376,920	6.00	398,060,647
1899	41,328,462	1.35	55,635,756	7.27	411,928,187
1900	39,132,800	1.28	50,110,906	8.39	445,538,870
1901	39,300,500	1.28	50,590,877	10.01	506,191,533
1902	39,825,227	1.50	59,857,578	9.03	542,036,364
1903	39,933,759	1.54	61,395,940	9.08	556,376,880
1904	39,998,602	1.52	60,666,028	8.72	529,107,625
1905	39,361,960	1.54	60,531,611	8.52	515,959,784
1906	42,476,224	1.35	57,145,950	10.37	592,539,671
1907	44,028,000	1.45	63,677,000	11.68	743,507,000

Acreage, production, and value of oat crop of United States on 1st day of December of each year.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per bushel December 1.	Farm value, December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1866	8,864,219	30.2	268,141,077	35.1	94,057,945
1867	10,746,416	25.9	278,698,000	44.5	123,902,556
1868	9,665,736	26.4	254,969,800	41.7	106,355,976
1869	9,461,441	30.5	288,384,000	38.0	109,521,734
1870	8,792,395	28.1	247,277,400	39.0	96,443,637
1871	8,385,809	30.6	255,743,000	36.2	92,591,359
1872	9,000,769	30.2	271,747,000	29.9	81,308,518
1873	9,751,700	27.7	270,340,000	34.6	93,474,161
1874	10,897,412	22.1	240,309,000	47.1	113,133,034
1875	11,915,075	29.7	354,317,500	32.0	113,441,491
1876	13,358,908	24.0	320,884,000	32.4	106,814,893
1877	12,826,148	31.7	406,394,000	28.4	115,546,194
1878	13,176,500	31.4	413,578,560	24.6	101,753,468
1879	12,683,500	28.7	363,761,320	33.1	120,533,294
1880	16,187,977	25.8	417,885,380	36.0	150,243,565
1881	18,831,600	24.7	466,481,000	46.4	198,198,970
1882	18,494,691	26.4	488,250,610	37.5	182,978,022
1883	20,324,962	28.1	571,302,400	32.7	187,040,264
1884	21,300,917	27.4	583,628,000	27.7	161,528,470
1885	22,783,680	27.6	629,409,000	28.5	179,631,830
1886	23,653,474	25.4	601,134,000	29.8	180,137,930
1887	25,020,906	25.4	636,618,000	30.4	200,699,790
1888	26,908,282	26.0	701,735,000	27.8	195,424,240
1889	27,462,316	27.4	751,615,000	22.9	171,781,008
1890	26,431,369	19.8	523,621,000	42.4	222,048,486
1891	25,581,861	28.9	738,394,000	31.5	232,312,267
1892	27,063,885	24.4	661,035,000	31.7	209,258,611
1893	27,273,033	23.4	638,854,859	29.4	187,576,092
1894	27,023,553	24.5	662,066,928	32.4	214,816,920
1895	27,878,406	29.6	824,443,537	19.9	163,655,068
1896	27,565,985	25.7	707,346,404	18.7	132,435,033
1897	25,730,375	27.2	698,767,809	21.2	147,974,719
1898	25,777,110	28.4	730,906,643	25.5	186,405,364
1899	26,341,380	30.2	796,177,712	24.9	198,167,975
1900	26,374,795	29.6	800,125,969	25.8	206,089,233
1901	28,541,476	25.8	736,808,724	29.9	220,653,777
1902	28,653,144	34.5	987,842,712	30.7	303,684,852
1903	27,638,196	28.4	784,094,109	34.1	267,601,665
1904	27,812,669	32.1	894,595,552	31.3	279,000,013
1905	28,046,746	34.0	953,216,197	29.1	277,047,637
1906	30,958,768	31.2	964,904,822	31.7	306,298,978
1907	31,837,000	23.7	754,443,000	44.3	334,568,000

Acreage, production, value, and prices of barley for the United States.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per bushel December 1.	Farm value December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1866	492,532	22.9	11,283,807	70.2	7,916,342
1867	1,131,217	22.7	25,727,000	70.1	18,027,748
1868	997,498	24.4	22,896,100	109.0	24,948,127
1869	1,025,795	27.9	28,622,200	70.8	20,286,164
1870	1,108,924	23.7	26,295,400	79.1	20,792,213
1871	1,113,735	24.0	26,718,500	75.8	20,264,015
1872	1,397,082	19.2	26,846,400	68.6	18,415,839
1873	1,387,106	23.1	32,044,491	86.7	27,794,229
1874	1,580,626	20.6	32,552,500	85.0	27,697,824
1875	1,780,902	20.6	36,908,600	74.1	27,367,522
1876	1,766,511	21.9	38,710,500	63.0	24,402,091
1877	1,614,654	21.3	34,441,400	62.8	21,629,130
1878	1,790,400	23.6	42,245,630	57.9	24,454,301
1879	1,680,700	24.0	40,283,100	58.9	23,714,444
1880	1,843,329	24.5	45,165,346	66.6	30,090,742
1881	1,967,510	20.9	41,161,330	82.3	33,862,513
1882	2,272,103	21.5	48,953,925	62.9	30,768,015
1883	2,379,009	21.1	50,136,097	58.7	29,420,423
1884	2,608,818	23.5	61,203,000	48.7	29,779,170
1885	2,729,359	21.4	58,360,000	56.3	32,867,696
1886	2,652,957	22.4	59,423,000	53.6	31,840,510
1887	2,901,953	19.6	56,812,000	51.9	29,464,390
1888	2,966,382	21.3	63,884,000	50.0	37,672,063
1889	3,220,834	21.3	78,332,976	41.6	32,614,271
1890	3,135,302	21.4	67,168,344	62.7	42,140,502
1891	3,352,579	25.9	86,839,153	52.4	45,470,342
1892	3,400,361	23.6	80,098,762	47.5	38,026,032
1893	3,220,371	21.7	69,869,495	41.1	28,729,386
1894	3,170,602	19.4	61,400,465	44.2	27,134,127
1895	3,299,973	26.4	87,072,744	33.7	29,312,413
1896	2,950,539	23.6	69,695,223	32.3	22,491,241
1897	2,719,116	24.5	66,685,127	37.7	25,142,130
1898	2,583,125	21.6	55,792,257	41.3	23,064,350
1899	2,878,229	25.5	73,381,563	40.3	29,594,252
1900	2,894,282	20.4	58,925,833	40.8	24,075,271
1901	4,295,744	25.6	109,932,924	45.2	49,705,153
1902	4,661,063	29.0	134,054,023	45.9	61,898,634
1903	4,993,137	26.4	131,881,391	45.6	60,169,313
1904	5,145,878	27.2	139,748,958	42.0	58,651,807
1905	5,095,628	26.8	136,651,020	40.3	55,047,168
1906	6,323,757	28.3	178,916,484	41.5	74,233,997
1907	6,448,000	23.8	153,597,000	66.6	102,310,016

TABLE No. 4.—Acreage, production, value, and prices of rye for United States.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per bushel, December 1.	Farm value, December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1866	1,548,033	13.5	20,894,944	82.2	17,149,716
1867	1,689,175	13.7	23,184,000	100.4	23,280,584
1868	1,651,321	13.6	22,504,800	94.9	21,349,190
1869	1,657,584	13.6	22,527,900	77.0	17,341,831
1870	1,176,137	13.2	15,473,000	73.2	11,326,967
1871	1,039,531	14.4	15,365,500	71.1	10,927,623
1872	1,048,654	14.2	14,888,000	67.6	10,071,061
1873	1,150,355	13.2	15,142,000	70.3	10,638,258
1874	1,116,716	13.4	14,990,900	77.4	11,610,339
1875	1,359,788	13.0	17,722,100	67.1	11,894,223
1876	1,408,374	13.9	20,374,800	61.4	12,504,970
1877	1,412,902	15.0	21,170,100	57.6	12,201,759
1878	1,622,700	15.9	25,842,700	52.5	13,566,002
1879	1,625,450	14.5	23,639,400	65.6	15,507,431
1880	1,707,619	13.9	24,540,829	75.6	18,564,560
1881	1,789,100	11.6	20,704,950	93.3	19,327,415
1882	2,227,894	13.4	29,960,087	61.5	18,439,194
1883	2,314,754	12.1	28,068,582	58.1	16,300,503
1884	2,343,933	12.2	28,640,000	51.9	14,857,040
1885	2,129,301	10.2	21,756,000	57.9	12,594,820
1886	2,129,918	11.5	24,480,000	53.8	13,181,330

TABLE No. 4.—Acreage, production, value, and prices of rye for United States—Continued.

Year.	Acreage.	Average yield per acre.	Production.	Average farm price per bushel, December 1.	Farm value, December 1.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1887	2,053,447	10.1	20,603,000	54.5	11,281,140
1888	2,394,805	12.0	28,415,000	58.8	16,721,839
1889	2,171,493	13.1	28,420,200	42.3	12,009,752
1890	2,141,853	12.0	25,807,472	62.9	16,229,992
1891	2,176,486	14.6	31,751,898	77.4	24,589,217
1892	2,163,657	12.9	27,894,037	54.2	15,103,901
1893	2,038,485	13.0	26,555,446	51.3	13,612,222
1894	1,914,780	13.7	26,727,615	50.1	13,395,476
1895	1,890,345	14.4	27,210,070	44.0	11,954,823
1896	1,831,201	13.3	24,369,047	40.9	9,930,769
1897	1,708,561	16.1	27,368,324	44.7	12,239,647
1898	1,643,207	15.6	25,667,522	46.3	11,875,350
1899	1,639,308	14.4	23,931,741	51.0	12,214,118
1900	1,591,302	15.1	23,995,927	51.2	12,235,417
1901	1,987,505	15.3	30,344,830	55.7	16,900,742
1902	1,978,548	17.0	33,630,592	50.8	17,080,703
1903	1,906,894	15.4	29,368,416	54.5	15,993,871
1904	1,792,673	15.2	27,241,515	68.8	18,748,323
1905	1,730,159	16.5	28,455,952	61.1	17,414,138
1906	2,001,904	16.7	33,374,833	58.9	19,671,243
1907	1,926,000	16.4	31,566,000	73.1	23,098,000

TABLE No. 5.—Balance of trade and relative magnitude of imports and domestic exports of farm products, 1890-1906.

Year ending June 30—	Exports.						
	Domestic.				Foreign.		
	Total.	Farm products.	Other than farm products.	Per cent of farm products of total.	Total.	Farm products.	Other than farm products.
1890	\$845,293,825	\$634,855,869	\$210,437,956	75.1	\$12,534,856	\$3,908,820	\$5,626,036
1891	872,270,283	652,407,931	219,862,352	74.8	12,210,527	6,109,781	6,100,746
1892	1,015,732,011	803,122,045	212,609,966	79.1	14,546,137	6,688,755	7,907,382
1893	831,039,785	621,201,671	209,838,114	74.8	16,634,409	7,155,979	9,478,430
1894	869,204,937	636,633,747	232,571,190	73.2	22,985,635	9,586,876	13,348,759
Annual average, 1890-1894	886,706,369	669,644,253	217,062,116	75.5	15,772,313	7,280,042	8,492,271
1895	793,392,509	558,385,861	235,006,738	70.4	14,145,566	7,964,115	6,211,451
1896	863,200,487	574,398,264	288,802,223	66.5	19,406,451	10,916,730	8,489,721
1897	1,032,007,603	689,755,196	342,252,410	66.8	18,985,953	9,707,782	9,278,171
1898	1,210,291,913	859,018,946	351,272,967	71.0	21,190,417	10,460,348	10,781,069
1899	1,203,931,222	792,811,733	411,119,489	65.9	23,022,080	12,134,208	10,957,872
Annual average, 1895-1899	1,020,564,765	694,873,999	325,690,766	68.1	19,384,003	10,220,448	9,143,645
1900	1,370,763,571	844,616,530	526,147,041	61.6	23,719,511	11,263,253	12,456,258
1901	1,460,462,806	951,628,331	508,834,475	65.2	27,302,185	11,293,045	16,009,140
1902	1,355,481,861	857,113,533	498,368,328	63.2	26,237,540	10,308,306	15,929,234
1903	1,392,231,302	878,480,557	513,750,745	63.1	27,910,377	13,505,343	14,405,034
1904	1,435,179,017	859,180,264	576,018,753	59.9	25,648,254	12,625,026	13,023,228
Annual average, 1900-1904	1,402,823,711	878,199,843	524,623,868	62.6	26,163,573	11,798,994	14,364,579
1905	1,491,744,641	826,904,777	664,839,864	55.4	25,817,025	12,316,525	14,500,500
1906	1,717,953,882	976,047,104	741,906,778	56.8	25,911,118	10,856,259	15,054,859
1907*	1,854,563,956	1,055,257,800	799,296,156	59.9	26,138,741	15,901,710	10,337,031
Year ending June 30—	Imports.				Balance of trade (+) for United States, (-) against United States.		
	Total.	Farm products.	Other than farm products.	Per cent of farm products of total.	Total.	Farm products.	Other than farm products.
1890	\$789,310,409	\$384,100,435	\$405,209,974	48.7	+\$68,518,275	+\$257,664,254	-\$189,145,979
1891	844,916,196	420,211,949	424,704,247	49.7	+ 39,564,614	+ 238,305,703	- 198,741,149
1892	827,402,462	436,697,057	390,705,405	52.9	+202,875,686	+ 373,063,743	- 170,188,057
1893	896,400,922	425,657,448	440,743,474	49.1	- 18,735,728	+ 202,700,202	- 221,435,930
1894	654,994,622	365,160,319	289,834,303	55.8	+237,145,950	+ 251,030,304	- 43,914,354
Annual average, 1890-1894	796,604,922	406,365,442	390,239,480	51.0	+105,873,750	+ 270,558,853	- 164,685,093
1895	731,969,965	373,115,985	358,853,980	51.0	+ 75,598,200	+ 193,203,991	- 117,635,791
1896	779,724,674	391,029,407	388,695,267	50.1	+102,882,204	+ 194,285,587	- 91,403,323
1897	764,730,412	400,871,468	363,858,944	52.4	+285,263,144	+ 298,591,507	- 12,328,363
1898	616,049,654	314,291,796	301,757,858	51.0	+615,432,676	+ 555,136,408	+ 60,296,178
1899	697,148,489	355,514,881	341,633,608	51.0	+529,874,813	+ 449,431,120	+ 80,443,693
Annual average, 1895-1899	717,924,639	366,964,707	350,959,932	51.1	+322,004,219	+ 338,129,740	- 16,125,521
1900	819,941,184	420,139,288	429,801,896	49.4	+544,541,898	+ 435,740,495	+ 108,801,403
1901	823,172,165	391,931,051	431,241,114	47.6	+664,592,826	+ 570,990,325	+ 93,602,501
1902	908,320,948	413,744,557	489,576,391	45.8	+478,398,453	+ 453,677,282	+ 24,721,171
1903	1,025,719,237	456,199,325	569,519,912	44.5	+394,422,442	+ 435,783,575	- 41,361,133
1904	991,087,371	461,434,831	529,652,520	46.6	+469,739,900	+ 410,350,439	+ 59,389,461
Annual average, 1900-1904	918,648,181	428,689,814	489,958,367	46.7	+510,339,103	+ 461,309,023	+ 49,030,080
1905	1,117,513,071	553,851,214	563,661,857	49.6	+401,048,595	+ 285,370,088	+ 115,678,507
1906	1,226,562,446	554,175,242	672,387,204	45.2	+517,302,054	+ 432,728,121	+ 84,573,933
1907*	1,434,421,425	627,272,528	807,148,897	43.7	+446,271,272	+ 443,786,982	+ 2,484,290

* Preliminary.

Farm land value per acre, including buildings and improvements, 1890 and 1905:

Census of 1890:	
Total acres	623,218,619
Total value	\$13,279,252,649.00
Average per acre	\$21.31
Census of 1905:	
Total acres, census 1900	838,591,774
Total value, Department of Agriculture, 1905	\$22,745,420,567.00
Average per acre	\$27.12

Mr. LAMB. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a petition to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States from the Headquarters Memorial and Executive Committee of the City of Buffalo, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in relation to the matter of abolishing the pension agencies in the United States. The petition is in opposition to the action of this House. I desire to add to that that it meets with my most cordial approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting the matter indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The petition is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS MEMORIAL AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
Buffalo, N. Y., March 7, 1908.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

The above-named committee, composed of delegates representing all the Grand Army posts of said city, Encampment No. 97, Union Veteran Legion, E. L. Hayward and Chaplain P. G. Cook Camp Sons of Veterans, General D. S. Stanley Garrison Army and Navy Union, and Budd Naval Veteran Association, earnestly protest against the passage of the bill to abolish all the pension agencies except the one at Washington, for the alleged purpose of economy or business reasons.

The pension agency system was established for the convenience of the pensioners, and in our judgment great inconvenience, annoyance, and delay will result to the pensioners if this proposition should become a law. We have no hesitation in saying that the pension agency system is entirely satisfactory to the pensioners. It is our firm conviction that such proposed legislation will inflict great hardship upon our comrades, their widows, and other dependents, because of delays in receiving their checks promptly and for other reasons. "Not a day passes that some inquiry is not made at the agencies, some lost paper asked for or to be replaced, some error sought to be corrected, or a request for a new voucher." These letters and requests receive prompt attention. It is safe to say that there are received at the eighteen agencies at least 25,000 defective vouchers each quarter to be returned for correction, making 100,000 for the year. There would certainly be a long delay in these cases and many of our comrades would be "camping on the other side before they could get their checks in hand." The present method of payment of pensions is the result of many years' experience and study, with a view of considering the convenience of the pensioners, at the same time conserving the interests of the Government; that familiarity with the present agency system results in the prompt payment of pensioners, to the mutual satisfaction of pensioners and the Government. The matter of economy, however, is of trifling importance compared with the inconveniences and annoyances our pensioners would be submitted to by the removal of all the agencies to Washington.

When the present agency system was established there were only 232,000 pensioners on the rolls; disbursements only \$30,000,000. Now there are nearly a million pensioners on the rolls and the disbursements the next fiscal year will be over \$160,000,000.

The welfare of these wards of the nation requires the present agency system more than ever before, and the fact that those interested in retaining the present force in the Pension Bureau at Washington on the false plea of economy are willing to sacrifice the convenience of the pensioners to gain their end, ought to be potent in defeating the scheme.

Even if business methods and economy are desired instead of patriotism and appreciation of the veterans, let them reduce their force in the Pension Bureau by abolishing their high-salaried clerkships, and keep their low-salaried clerkships in the pension agencies to do the work.

Very respectfully, yours,

HENRY J. MESSING, President.

JOHN J. GRAVES, Secretary.

We are in hearty accord with the above statement.

H. J. Swift, Department Commander, G. A. R., Buffalo, N. Y.; C. D. R. Stowits, Inspector-General, G. A. R., Buffalo, N. Y.; Daniel E. Sickles, Major-General, U. S. A., retired, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., New York City; John A. Reynolds, late Brigadier-General, U. S. A., Past Department Commander, Canandaigua, N. Y.; N. Martin Curtis, late Brigadier-General, U. S. A., Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Ogdensburg, N. Y.; Charles H. Freeman, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Corning, N. Y.; Joseph W. Kay, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Allan C. Bakewell, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., New York City; D. S. Alexander, Past Department Commander of the Potomac, G. A. R., Buffalo, N. Y.; J. S. Koster, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Port Leyden, N. Y.; James Owens, National Council of Administration, Senator Twenty-first District, New York City; W. S. Bull, A. A. G., G. A. R., Buffalo, N. Y.; Alfred Lyth, Past Senior Vice-Commander in Chief, G. A. R., Buffalo, N. Y.; James Tanner, Past Commander in Chief, G. A. R., and Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Washington, D. C.; James S. Fraser, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., New York City; Harrison Clark, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Albany, N. Y.; James S. Graham, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Rochester, N. Y.; N. P. Pond, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Rochester, N. Y.; John S. Maxwell, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Amsterdam, N. Y.; J. M. Snyder, Past Department Commander, G. A. R., Troy, N. Y.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, after the death of Washington two intellectual giants, hostile and implacable, towered above the cradle of the infant Republic. They have fixed the attention of succeeding generations, and after the lapse of a century loom before us mountainlike. Reposing on each lofty peak is a temple, the object of the admiration of its votaries and the anathema of its foes. They are the Ebal and Gerizim of all history. One was called Alexander Hamilton and the other Thomas Jefferson—each the antithesis of the other and each in himself a startling paradox. I shall endeavor to give an authentic account of the character of the one and the services of the other.

Jefferson, to the manor born, lapped in luxury, wealth, and ease; cultured, refined, sensitive, tracing his proud lineage back through centuries of heroic and heralded ancestry, became the great apostle of the people and the savior of the oppressed.

Hamilton, at the beginning of the Revolution, appears in New York, a stranger—an obscure West Indian, his past wrapped in mystery, yea in shadow—and he becomes the champion of caste, the defender of privilege; forgetting his humble origin, he disdains the ladder by which he rose, and lives and dies with a sovereign contempt for his kind. Strange man, strange paradox!

Hamilton was in a way the result of his early West Indian environment. No amount of genius or learning ever eradicates the indelible stamp of our age and nationality. No man can escape it. Aristotle was a Greek in the same sense that the humblest citizen of Athens was a Greek. Caesar was as essentially a Roman as the poorest legionary who followed him. Hamilton at the beginning of the hostilities was not a citizen of the United States. He was an alien; for that reason no character in the history of the world is as little understood. He was an enigma to his contemporaries; a thing apart, solitary and alone; he is as little understood now. It was a moral and mental impossibility that Hamilton should commend the form of government that was being framed or comprehend the character of the people who constituted it.

The Constitution is not the pure product either of Jefferson's or Madison's or Hamilton's thought. It is not framed as an architect designs a building. It is not the creature of some man's dreams; the genius of the great and constructive statesman is not employed in the invention of some new form of government, or the designing of an original fabric, which the people are induced to accept. He finds conditions, he adapts the best possible government to those conditions, which he can neither change nor alter.

The conditions that faced Jefferson and Hamilton and Madison were not of their making. They were of God's eternal ordination. Two motives, two purposes, filled the hearts of all the colonists alike. One was the formation of a more perfect Union which should protect them from all the world on the one hand and the eternal preservation of the autonomy of the States on the other. This double purpose filled the hearts of Adams and of Jefferson alike. Adams was a citizen of Massachusetts, with all the prejudices of his Puritan forebears. Jefferson was a citizen of Virginia, with all the prejudices of his cavalier ancestry. They met, each the citizen of a separate State. Massachusetts and Virginia and New York, each having been for a century a separate colony, were brought together, not by any affinity of laws, of customs, or of religion, but by the iron hand of necessity and by the menace of a common danger, and they carried into this confederation all their ancient prejudices. Hamilton alone never understood this, because he could not. He had never been a citizen of this country. To him it was a compact nation. It was impossible that he should enter into those things that were the results not of men's reason, but of men's experience. You to-day, expatriated from your country, may become a citizen of Germany, a loyal and patriotic citizen of Germany, but you can never enter into the prejudices which separate the Hapsburgs from the Hohenzollerns, because neither your interest, your prejudices, nor your pride run back into the period in which those royal houses had their origin. Hamilton had no preference among these various colonies, for the reason that he had never been a citizen of any of them. His dead were not buried here; he dreamed not of the States that were, but of the nation that was to be. He knew nothing of the traditions or the trials of the colonists who had inhabited this continent for a hundred years. Their local pride was to him a narrow provincialism; he could neither comprehend nor tolerate the stubborn contention of the colonies for the eternal preservation of an inviolate autonomy.

For that reason he was a puzzle to his contemporaries. Start with the strange, brilliant youth, the mysterious and commanding boy who appears suddenly and unheralded to thrill and dominate the amazed multitude assembled upon the commons.

The insignificance of that little volcanic knoll upon which Hamilton was born saved it from the notice or the oppression of Great Britain. The tiny island of Nevis, with its 20 square miles and its 10,000 inhabitants, never dreamed of rebellion to the mother country. Had it been oppressed, resistance was too impossible for serious consideration.

Hamilton admits that upon his arrival in this country he was every inch a loyalist, reared among a people ardently attached to the English Government; his highest ideals of human happiness and liberty were formed from the study of the common law and the history of the feudal system; for that reason he lived and died a monarchist pure and simple.

Mature and precocious far beyond his years, he arrived in New York, in a city wild with excitement, eagerly panting for freedom. Ten years of tyranny had killed every emotion of loyalty to the mother country or reverence for an imbecile king.

He became convinced not that the British Government was a bad government, but that it had treated the colonies badly, that it had denied to them the liberties and privileges it had conferred upon the citizens of England, and the inhabitants of Nevis, and that for that reason they had a perfect right to rebel, and to establish for themselves a government of their own. When the time came to determine the form of that government Hamilton would have established a limited monarchy disguised under the form of a republic. Jefferson would have none of it. The clash was sharp and decisive between them; hostility, endless, implacable, was inevitable, because their differences were inherent, organic; they went to the very foundation of the system and permeated every fiber of the fabric which was then in process of construction, by the framers of the Constitution.

As I have said, Hamilton's highest conception of human rights were derived from a study of the feudal system and the common law. From these premises monarchy was the inevitable and irresistible conclusion. Hamilton believed—

That all power and all property originally reposed in a feudal king and his mailed marauders. Like every cultured Englishman on earth, outside of the colonies, he believed that every privilege, the most sacred and inalienable rights, were conferred; that the inestimable blessings of liberty, all come trickling down from the filthy steps of a throne upon the people below, and that the measure of freedom increased as the government in its wisdom enlarged the sphere of the citizen's freedom, or as he in his strength or cunning could command it.

The story of the slow and painful passage from an absolute to a limited monarchy is the history of a thousand years of stubborn, patient, insidious encroachment upon royal prerogative. The most sacred and inalienable rights of the Englishman are not inherent. He traces them to a royal grant. He holds them secure, it is true, but, like his lands, they are secured by musty title papers or by a stubborn adverse possession, and are traced to the Crown.

The hardy English yeomanry watched with sleepless vigilance the weakness, the folly, and the necessities of their kings, and by slow and painful degrees they usurped first the prerogatives of the barons, and, rising above the ruins of decayed and shattered feudalism, they forced concession after concession from the cupidity or the cowardice of kings. The measure of the Englishman's liberties have been grandly and nobly extended till to-day Edward the Seventh has not a modicum of the real power possessed by Theodore Roosevelt. Hamilton had studied the source and watched the growth of liberty in the mother country, and he would have established a strong central national government in the western world, and have conferred upon the citizen a constantly increasing measure of freedom as he in turn displayed his capacity to use without abusing it. Men were to derive their liberties, as they became entitled to them, from the government.

Between this philosophy and this philosopher and Thomas Jefferson there was an infinite chasm, an impassable gulf. "All men are created free and equal and have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," thundered the father of Democracy in that immortal declaration. Life, liberty, happiness, were not conferred by the State, they were sacred from it, they were not ours by the grace of a king, but the gift of God, inherent, inalienable, no government could confer, since it never possessed them.

The Sage of Monticello, with the audacity of genius, turned his back upon all the precedents and finespun fallacies of four thousand years of civilization. He took a man, a simple citizen, endowed him with inherent and inalienable rights, clothed him with all power and authority, crowned him with a ballot, and the trembling monarchs of the world cowered before the towering creation of this mighty American.

Independence—

Declared Jefferson—

can be trusted nowhere but in the people in the mass. They are inherently independent of all but the moral law.

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but in the people themselves.

And again:

A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth.

An organized society was formed by having this citizen confer certain authority upon officers of the law, his servants, not his masters, commissioned for a fixed time, to discharge specific duties, necessary to protect and secure him in possession of property and the enjoyment of life and liberty. The total of the authority thus conferred became the Commonwealth, when these Commonwealths, for the sake of mutual protection, "formed a more perfect union," the aggregate of the powers expressly delegated by the States, formed the Federal Government. But the fountain, the source, of all authority was the citizen. This was the cardinal principle of Jefferson's philosophy; the sovereignty of the States was but a corollary; the largest measure of individual liberty, not State rights, was the "sumnum bonum" of his whole system of government. The individual was surrounded by the precinct, or township, the county, the State, the nation, like so many concentric circles, and each in proportion of its nearness to the citizen was invested with the greatest possible jurisdiction. Each served a double purpose. It prevented the encroachment of one citizen upon the rights of another, and presented between all and the ambition of a tyrant a series of stubborn barriers, each of which must be demolished before the liberties of a people could be engulfed in a compact Federal despotism.

This plan, original and sublime in its severe simplicity, crystallized into law, became the priceless legacy of succeeding generations, "the sheet anchor of our liberties," the Constitution of the United States.

Hamilton regarded the whole system with suspicion, and at last abandoned it in utter disgust. He tells us as much himself. On February 27, 1802, he writes his old friend, Gouverneur Morris:

Mine is an odd destiny. Perhaps no man in the United States has sacrificed or done more for the present Constitution than myself; and contrary to all my anticipations of its fate, as you know, from the very beginning. I am still laboring to prop this frail and worthless fabric. Yet I have the murmurs of my friends no less than the curses of my foes for my reward. What can I do better than withdraw from the scene? Every day proves to me more and more that this American world was not made for me.

Sad, soured, solitary man, still an alien to the hour of tragic death; still turning to the old objects of his early idolatry—royalty, caste, vested privilege—the putrid political "flesh pots of Egypt."

Says Thomas Jefferson:

I invited these gentlemen (Hamilton and John Adams) and the Attorney-General, as I remember, to dine with me. * * * Conversation began on other matters, and by some circumstance was led to the British constitution, on which Adams observed: "Purge that constitution of its corruption and give to its popular branch equality of representation and it would be the most perfect constitution ever devised by the wit of man." Hamilton paused and said: "Purge it of its corruption and give to its popular branch equality of representation and it would become an impracticable government. As it stands at present, with all its supposed defects, it is the most perfect government which ever existed." * * * The one (Adams) was for two hereditary branches and an honest election; the other (Hamilton) for an hereditary King with a House of Lords and Commons corrupted to his will and standing between him and the people.

Hamilton was indeed a singular character. Of acute understanding, disinterested, honest, and honorable in all private transactions, amiable in society, and duly valuing virtue in private life, yet so bewitched and perverted by British example.

Hamilton went into the constitutional convention with these ideas in his head, and with a rough draft of a constitution in his pocket, which would infallibly have carried them into fatal effect had they been accepted even in part by his colleagues. It provided for a governor or president to be elected by the people and to serve during good behavior. Trajan and Tiberius were elected in the same way and subject to the same conditions.

A senate and assembly, the assembly to be elected by the people, senators to be chosen by electors or by the State legislatures, and to hold office during good behavior.

The governor to have an absolute veto, and then, in order that he might completely and absolutely demolish the last vestige of local self-government, or the very existence of such a thing as State governments, this sinister instrument provided:

All laws of the particular States contrary to the Constitution or laws of the United States to be utterly void. And the better to prevent such laws being passed, the governor or president of each State

shall be appointed by the General Government, and shall have a negative upon the laws about to be passed by the State of which he is governor or president.

No State is to have any forces, land or naval, and the militia of all the States to be under the sole and exclusive direction of the United States, the officers of which are to be appointed and commissioned by them.

This was not a constitution, it was a snare.

"The Republican Government of France," says Jefferson, "was lost without a struggle because the party of *un et indivisible* had prevailed; no provincial organization existed to which the people might rally under authority of the laws, the seats of the directory were virtually vacant, and a small force sufficed to turn the legislatures out of their chambers, and to salute its leader as chief of the nation."

Such a constitution would have delighted the heart of the subtle, wily Octavianus.

"The system of Imperial government as instituted by Augustus," says Gibbon, "may be defined as an absolute monarchy disguised under the form of a Commonwealth."

Hamilton caught the trick from the crafty tyrants of antiquity.

"The masters of the Roman world surrounded their throne with darkness, concealed their irresistible strength, and humbly professed themselves the accountable ministers of the Senate, whose supreme decrees they dictated and obeyed."

There is a persistent effort to hold up the principal author of the "Federalist," as the father of the Constitution. No statement was ever more absolutely unwarranted or utterly untrue. The Federalist was not written until 1788, after the Constitution was framed and practically complete. I would not detract from the just fame of that, the greatest state paper of its kind. For terseness, lucidity and force, for transparent and invincible logic, for attractiveness of style, and for wealth of research, it has no peer or parallel. But the Federalist was never written, nor does it purport to prove that the Constitution is either the embodiment of a perfect or an ideal form of government. It performed its purpose, it met and completely answered the objections, then urged to various features and clauses of that instrument.

Hamilton believed that it was better to have the various colonies bound in a union under the Constitution than to be held as they then were under a loose confederation, or to remain separate, distinct, and dissevered sovereignties. He accepted the proposed form of government as the lesser of two evils. And he gave to this effort to bind them by what he regarded as "a frail and worthless fabric" all the force and energy of his splendid and forceful eloquence, and that lucid and inexorable logic so unrivaled in his day.

I am amazed at this renaissance of Hamilton, because Hamilton was no more a Republican than he was a Democrat. He was an autocrat, he was an aristocrat, but he had as little sympathy with Republicanism as with Democracy. He knew nothing of the vices of Republicanism—as God knows he would not be expected to—and less of its virtue.

Were he alive to-day the first man he would denounce would be his biographer and eulogist—Henry Cabot Lodge. In the sixtieth number of the Federalist Hamilton writes:

We have seen that an uncontrollable power over the elections for the Federal Government could not without hazard be committed to the State legislature. Let us now see what would be the danger on the other side—that is, from confiding the ultimate right of regulating its own elections to the Union itself. It is not pretended that this right would ever be used for the exclusion of any State from its share in the representation. * * *

Again—

Suppose an article had been introduced into the Constitution empowering the United States to regulate the elections of the particular States; would any man hesitate to condemn it, both as an unwarranted transposition of power and as a premeditated engine for the destruction of the State governments? The violation of principle in this case would have required no comment.

The man who wrote that had too much mental integrity to hold in aught save detestation and abhorrence the political dogmas of the author of the force bill.

It is true that in his famous "Report on Manufacturers" Hamilton advanced about all the arguments in favor of a protective tariff that have been heard since, but the poor man never dreamed that the general principles announced by him would be perverted into a cloak for privileged plunder. Hamilton's schedules would have been tiny things compared with the duties of to-day, no more like the schedules of Dingley, no more resemblance than there is between the living skeleton and the fat woman in a side show. Says Hamilton:

The continuance of bounties on manufactures long established must always be of questionable policy, because a presumption would arise in every such case that there were natural and inherent impediments to success.

Imagine the Secretary of the Treasury, in secret conclave with the heads of the steel trust, the leather trust, the paper trust, the pet and favored manufacturers of woolen and cotton goods. Fancy him, just before an election, about "fat-frying" and "touching" time, dropping an incongruous remark like this, anent:

Prohibitions of rival articles or duties equivalent to prohibitions. This—

Says Hamilton—

is another efficacious means of encouraging national manufactures; but, in general, it is only fit to be employed when the manufacturer has made such progress and is in so many hands as to insure a due competition and an adequate supply on reasonable terms.

Hamilton has many sins to answer for, it is true, but he was bold and progressive; he never sat still, never "stood pat." It was a moral and mental impossibility for that lucid and splendid intellect to have been clouded or deluded by the fallacies of this later day so-called "protection," or for the author of the Federalist to have been a "stand-patter."

I was amazed at the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in his eulogy on Hamilton. Why, there is nothing to me in all this world as absolutely ridiculous and absurd as this effort of the Republican party to claim that it is the posthumous child of a putative father who died fifty years before it was born. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The Republican party at the close of the war, and until the close of the war, was not a party; it was a propaganda, and when the purposes of that propaganda were accomplished you were absolutely without issues or ancestors. You only had office and an appetite. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And you proceeded to construct a platform and to hunt for respectable forefathers.

The "nouveau riche," after they obtain power and position, hunt for ancestors, and you went bogging about among the débris of dead Federalism and shattered Whiggery to find them, and you stumbled on the black side of Alexander Hamilton and accepted him as the patron saint of the Republican party. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Here my friend from Pennsylvania makes this statement:

He certainly is a bold man who, in the face of history, contends to-day that the permanent policies which have entered into the statutes and character of our nation are not the policies dictated by Hamilton and his followers.

Here my temerity may argue more than my judgment, but I deny it. There never was a deduction more absolutely unfounded hurled defiantly into the teeth of history.

What were the policies of Alexander Hamilton?

He would have had a President for life—he is elected every four years.

He would have Senators during good behavior—they serve a fixed and definite term of six years.

He would have the Executive armed with an absolute veto—you can by two-thirds majority annul that veto.

He would have muzzled free speech—Jefferson opened the deliberations of this House to the naked view and candid criticism of a free and untrammelled press.

He defended the alien and sedition laws—they are repealed.

He founded a national bank—it is demolished.

All his cherished and vaunted schemes are "gone glimmering in the dream of things that were," exploded fallacies they litter the débris of history.

I challenge the gentleman from Pennsylvania to give me one single solitary policy of Hamilton which was ever crystallized into law that lived. His policies are gone, his followers are dead. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] There are only left his apologists and his eulogists.

Says the gentleman from Pennsylvania, his interpretation of the Constitution made him immortal. "Yes," said Hamilton, "though it be not written in terms, if it be useful, proper, and necessary in the enjoyment of the powers expressly granted, it is impliedly written in the Constitution."

Hamilton was not the author of that theory. Roosevelt was the author of that theory, and I can prove it. Not Theodore Roosevelt but another Roosevelt. Said Thomas Jefferson, in a letter written in 1800 to Livingston:

We are here engaged in improving our Constitution by construction, so as to make it what the majority thinks it should have been. The Senate received yesterday a bill from the Representatives incorporating a company for Roosevelt's copper mines in Jersey. This is under the sweeping clause of the Constitution, and supported by the following pedigree of necessities. Congress are authorized to defend the country: ships are necessary for that defense; copper is necessary for ships; mines are necessary to produce copper; companies are necessary to work mines; and "this is the house that Jack built."

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

You do not need to trace this Roosevelt. The lineal descendant of that Roosevelt occupies a broader sphere and a loftier place, and still shows the same profound knowledge of the law and the same respect for the Constitution. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I am at a loss to understand this persistent and pernicious laudation not of those who established but those who construe the Constitution. Construction is but another name for interpretation. The best construction of an instrument is the most just and lucid statement of its meaning. It is a libel upon the immortal names affixed to this sacred ægis of our liberties to assert that it is so unintelligible that he who can decipher deserves greater glory than they who wrote it.

This vaunted capacity for a liberal interpretation of the Constitution was with Hamilton a means to an end. He felt for the form of government it embodied and should perpetuate a profound and ever increasing distrust and often expressed for it an undisguised contempt. He exhausted his morbid ingenuity in an unceasing effort to read into it those very policies which when presented in their naked hideousness the framers of the Constitution refused to accept or consider.

His measures in the concrete, his ideas of tenure of office, a central bank, a restricted and privileged electorate, of pomp and ceremonial, of a virtual censorship of the press, no man on either side of this Chamber would for a moment reestablish or indorse. Yet his untiring effort to stretch and distort and construe the organic law until on its dismembered form he might erect a throne that you would immortalize.

I exceedingly regret to see both in this Chamber and out of it a sort of literary conspiracy to further glorify Hamilton by a studied detraction of his great adversary and contemporary, Thomas Jefferson.

In discussing the Louisiana purchase, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] says:

Mr. Jefferson never dreamed of acquiring any of the territory west of the Mississippi save only the post of New Orleans. And he never dreamed even of that until the Western settlers, deprived of treaty rights of deposit at New Orleans, drove him to it. It was to acquire New Orleans only that he sent Monroe to France. Both he and his Secretary of State, Mr. Madison, saw nothing but danger in any acquisition of territory west of the Mississippi. To the French minister in Washington they explained that the United States had no interest in extending its population to the west bank, "since such extension would tend to weaken the State and to slacken the concentration of its forces." "In spite of affinities in manner and language," said his Secretary of State, "no colony beyond the river could exist under the same government, but would infallibly give birth to a separate State, having in its bosom germs of collision with the East, the easier to develop in proportion to the very affinity between the two empires."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from what he is quoting now?

Mr. DALZELL. I am quoting from the writings of Jefferson. But Robert Livingston, our minister to France, availed himself of his opportunity and of Napoleon's necessity and made the purchase of the great territory now constituting so many glorious States of the Union. The purchase took Jefferson by surprise. At first he thought he would cede a part of it to the Indians in exchange for their holdings on the east side of the Mississippi and "shut up all the rest from settlement for a long time to come." Then he raised the question of a constitutional amendment. "I suppose Congress must appeal to the nation for an additional article to the Constitution approving and confirming an act which the nation had not previously authorized," he wrote Senator Breckenridge, of Kentucky. "The Constitution has made no provision for our holding foreign territory, still less for incorporating foreign nations into our Union. The Executive in seizing the fugitive occurrence"—mark the term, the "fugitive occurrence"—"which so much advances the good of their country, have done an act beyond the Constitution."

When these views reached Livingston in France, he immediately gave Jefferson to understand that if the business were to be done over again, it never would be done. And thereupon Jefferson took alarm and immediately sent off another letter to Senator Breckenridge, in which he said:

"I wrote you on the 12th instant on the subject of Louisiana and the constitutional provision which might be necessary for it. A letter just received yesterday shows that nothing must be said on that subject which may give a pretext for retreating, but that we should do sub silentio what shall be found necessary. Be so good, therefore, as to consider that part of my letter confidential."

A greater number of erroneous conclusions were never condensed into similar space. Take the statement—

Mr. Jefferson never dreamed of acquiring any of the territory west of the Mississippi save only the post at New Orleans, and he never dreamed even of that until the western settlers deprived of treaty rights of deposit at New Orleans drove him to it.

Mr. Jefferson was not driven to negotiate for the post at New Orleans by the demand of Western settlers or by the denial of treaty rights of deposit at New Orleans, for the simple reason that he appointed Mr. Livingston minister to France and instructed him at length as to the nature of the remonstrance he should make against the holding of Louisiana by the French before any denial of treaty rights had occurred or was contemplated either by Jefferson or Livingston.

On March 29, 1801, Rufus King, then minister at London, wrote to Mr. Madison, Secretary of State:

The cession of Tuscany to the infant Duke of Parma, by the treaty between France and Austria forms a more compact and valuable compensation to this branch of the House of Spain than was formerly thought of, and adds very great credit to the opinion which at this time prevails both in Paris and London, that Spain has in return actually ceded Louisiana and Florida to France.

On September 28, 1801, Mr. Madison wrote to Robert R. Livingston:

From different sources information has been received that by some transaction concluded or contemplated between France and Spain the mouth of the Mississippi, with certain portions of adjacent territory, is to pass from the hands of the latter to the former nation. Such a change of our neighbors is of too momentous a concern not to have engaged the most serious attention of the Executive.

As early as 1797, one year before the three years' guaranty of the right of deposit at New Orleans, as fixed by the treaty of 1795, had expired, Jefferson wrote to James Monroe:

The exchange, which is to give us new neighbors in Louisiana—probably the present French armies when disbanded—has opened us to combinations of enemies on that side where we are most vulnerable.

In all this correspondence there is not one line or syllable about rights of deposit at New Orleans, for the simple reason that no such rights had at that time been denied. On February 18, 1803, two years after Livingston had been sent as minister to France, and nearly two years after he had repeatedly remonstrated in the strongest terms against the holding of New Orleans or Louisiana by the French, and after the most persistent effort to secure not only the post at New Orleans, "but Florida and territory north of the Arkansas River," he writes Mr. Madison as follows:

I have proposed to them the relinquishment of New Orleans and West Florida, as far as the river Perdido, together with all the territory lying north of the Arkansas.

Why he should make such a proposition, if the only purpose of Jefferson was to get the right of deposit at the port of New Orleans, is inexplicable.

In this same letter he writes:

I have accordingly put in his hands [Bonaparte's] some notes containing plain truth, etc.

One of these notes read as follows:

On the twentieth of October (1802)* the governor of New Orleans issued a proclamation, in which, speaking of the Americans, he says they will not in future be permitted to make a deposit of their cargo in New Orleans, in conformity to the twenty-second article of their treaty, which has expired.

On September 28, 1801, Mr. Livingston was advised by the Department of State to secure New Orleans and the Floridas. So far from being driven to it by a violation of treaty rights of deposit, he had never even heard of any such violation until January 10, 1803. On that date he writes to the French Minister of Exterior Relations:

I have just learned through a channel which, though not official, is such that it leaves one no doubt of its authenticity, that the governor of New Orleans has denied citizens of New Orleans a right of deposit there, etc.

On November 27, 1802, Mr. Madison wrote to Charles Pinckney, minister to Spain:

A letter from a confidential citizen at New Orleans has just informed us that the intendat at that place by a proclamation, from which an extract is also inclosed, had prohibited the deposit of American effects, stipulated by treaty of 1795.

On April 18, 1802, Thomas Jefferson wrote to Mr. Livingston:

If France considers Louisiana, however, as indispensable to her views, she might, however, be willing to look about for arrangements which might reconcile it to our interests: if anything should do this it would be the ceding to us the island of New Orleans and the Floridas.

How Jefferson could have been driven to make this demand by the violation of a treaty, six months before the treaty was violated and eleven months before he had any intimation of its violation is, to say the least, a most extraordinary occurrence.

Nor can I concur in the statement that—

Jefferson never dreamed of acquiring any of the territory west of the Mississippi save only the post at New Orleans.

In a letter to Mr. Livingston, of date April 18, 1802, Jefferson writes:

She [France] may say she needs Louisiana for the supply of her West Indies. She does not need it in time of peace. And in war she could not depend on them because they would be too easily intercepted. I should suppose that all these considerations could in some proper form be brought into the view of the Government of France.

Why bring all these things to the view of the Government of France if he only desired the continuance of a treaty right of

* The exact date of this proclamation was October 16, 1802.

deposit at the post of New Orleans, or if Jefferson never dreamed of acquiring any of the territory west of the Mississippi? Jefferson and everybody else at that time believed France would never cede the whole of Louisiana. It is plain that it was the fear that he might not be able to secure this valuable domain, and not that he neither dreamed of acquiring, nor that he did not desire it, that actuated him. This is manifest from the sentence which I have just quoted:

If France considers Louisiana, however, as indispensable for her views, she might, however, be willing to look about for arrangements which might reconcile it to our interests, etc.

As to the assertion that Mr. Madison saw nothing but danger in the acquisition of territory west of the Mississippi, and the argument that he opposed the acquisition of such territory, Mr. Madison fortunately has spoken for himself.

On July 29, 1803, Mr. Madison wrote Messrs. Livingston and Monroe:

The crisis relied upon has derived peculiar force from the rapidity with which the complaints and questions between France and Great Britain ripened toward a rupture; and it is just ground for mutual and general felicitation that it has issued under your zealous exertions in the extensive acquisition beyond the Mississippi.

Here we have the strange and startling spectacle of the Secretary of State's finding—

"just ground for mutual and general felicitation"

upon

the acquisition of territory beyond the Mississippi, although at the same time *"Mr. Madison saw nothing but danger in the acquisition of territory west of the Mississippi."*

Says the gentleman from Pennsylvania:

The purchase took Jefferson by surprise.

It did. It took Monroe and Livingston by surprise. It took Spain by surprise. It took France by surprise. It took Napoleon's own family by surprise. If there is any one thing—yes, there is only one thing—which above all else characterized the Great Conqueror, with whom Livingston and Monroe were dealing, it was that he always, in peace and war, in negotiation and in battle, took the other fellow by surprise. It was the secret of his success. "He was wrapped in the solitude of his own originality." He took the directory by surprise when he scattered the mob in the streets of Paris with grape and cannon. He took Italy by surprise when he "mingled the eagles of France with the eagles of the crags," and conquered the Alps before his approach was suspected in the plains below. He took Russia by surprise at Austerlitz; Austria at Wagram and at Marengo. He kept all Europe in a continual state of surprise for twenty years. He violated every tradition, every rule of statecraft and tactics, but he conquered half the world and wrote the Code Napoleon.

And why should he not have taken Jefferson by surprise, by the sudden and unheralded announcement that he had thrown an empire on the market with a ninety-day option and fifty million francs the purchase price? It was Napoleonic; that was all. Jefferson's greatness rests, not upon the fact that he was not surprised, but he is the only man born of woman whom the daring Corsican ever surprised and then let his astonished antagonist get the best of the bargain. Jefferson, notwithstanding his surprise, rose grandly to the occasion, and by his daring and superb diplomacy found in "the fugitive occurrence" a future empire. In a letter to Doctor Priestley, Jefferson frankly admits his surprise. He says:

I did not expect that he would yield until a war took place between France and England, and my hope was to palliate and endure, etc. I believed the event not very distant, but acknowledge it came sooner than I expected.

Napoleon sold Louisiana as he would have sold a horse or a cannon; he consulted nobody. Jefferson and Livingston soon realized that they had the First Consul to deal with and the First Consul alone. On September 1, 1802, Livingston wrote Mr. Madison:

There never was a government in which less could be done by negotiation than here. There is no people, no legislature, no counselors. One man is everything. He seldom asks advice, and never receives it unasked. His ministers are mere clerks, and his legislature and counselors parade officers.

Livingston was as much surprised as Jefferson, when, like a flash of lightning out of a clear sky, Bonaparte abruptly asked: "What will your country pay for an empire greater in extent than the whole area of the United States?"

Says Mr. Hosmer in his *History of the Louisiana Purchase*:

On the 11th of April, Talleyrand startled the envoy (Livingston) by the inquiry whether the United States would buy the whole of Louisiana and what price it would be willing to pay.

Mr. Livingston's reply betrays his surprise:

I told him (Talleyrand) I should receive with pleasure any communication from him, but that we were not disposed to trifle; that the times were critical.

Is it any wonder this declaration of Talleyrand "took Jefferson by surprise?"

The acquisition of Louisiana was one of the most cherished plans of the First Consul.

To his brother, Lucien, who concluded the treaty by which Louisiana was ceded to France, Napoleon said:

Above all don't let Louisiana go; hold fast to that.

Said Messrs. Livingston and Monroe in a letter to Mr. Madison:

Louisiana was acquired of Spain by France, in exchange for Tuscany, which latter is settled by treaty on the son-in-law of the King of Spain, with the title of King of Etruria, and was estimated in the exchange in consideration of its revenue at one hundred million francs. The First Consul thought he had made an advantageous bargain in that exchange, as appears by the high idea he entertained of its value, as shown on many occasions. Louisiana was the territory which he promised, in his proclamation at the peace, as an asylum to those who had become unfortunate by the Revolution, and which he spoke of as vast and fertile.

Again Livingston writes:

They are made to believe that this is one of the most fertile and important countries in the world. * * * It is a darling object with the First Consul, who sees in it a means to gratify his friends and to dispose of his enemies.

In addition to all this Napoleon repeatedly said he would never sell Louisiana.

On March 11, 1803, Livingston writes the Secretary of State:

I told you that Talleyrand assured me no sale would be heard of. You will find a passage in the note which was doubtless intended to convey that idea in very strong terms.

The next day he writes:

With respect to a negotiation for Louisiana, I think nothing will be effected here.

On April 11, Livingston again wrote Madison:

I had reason to believe that he (Bonaparte) began to waver; but we had nothing to offer but money and commercial advantages; of the latter, I did not think myself entitled to be liberal; and of the first, I found in them a certain degree of reluctance to treat, as derogatory to the dignity of the Government.

Again says Livingston:

Among the most fortunate projects of the First Consul was the colonization of Louisiana. He saw in it a new Egypt; he saw in it a colony that was to counterbalance the eastern establishment of Britain; he saw in it an asylum for his generals; and, what is more important in the then state of things, he saw in it a pretense for the ostracism of suspected enemies. To render the acquisition still more acceptable to the people, exaggerated accounts of its fertility, etc., were sold in every printshop. My first endeavor was to remove these impressions from the minds of the people most likely to be consulted, in which I was generally speaking very successful. But they all told me that it was a favorite project with the First Consul; nor would any of them hear of disposing of it by sale.

After reading this character of reports from his foreign minister for two years, Jefferson hears that Napoleon has suddenly thrown this vast empire on the world's bargain counter, proposes to sell the whole of Louisiana for one-half of its estimated cost, and we are to conclude that the great Executive was lacking in foresight and statesmanship, because "The purchase took Jefferson by surprise."

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] proceeds:

At first he thought he would cede a part of it to the Indians in exchange for their holdings on the east side of the Mississippi and shut up all the rest from settlement for a long time to come.

Then he raised the question of a constitutional amendment:

"I suppose Congress must appeal to the nation for an additional article to the Constitution approving and confirming an act which the nation had not previously authorized," he wrote Senator Breckenridge, of Kentucky.

What are we to infer from this language? If it means anything, it means that Jefferson was not only surprised, but disappointed, at this purchase, and that he raised objections both to the ceding and to the settlement of this country.

Let us take up this very letter written to Breckenridge of August 12, 1803, and see if any such idea was in the mind of the great Executive. He continues:

The legislature in casting behind them metaphysical subtleties, and risking themselves like faithful servants, must ratify and pay for it, and throw themselves on their country for doing for them unauthorized what we know they would have done for themselves had they been in a position to do it. It is the case of guardian investing the money of his ward in purchasing an important adjacent territory, and saying to him when of age, "I did this for your good; you may disown me, and I must get out of the scrape as I can. I thought it my duty to risk myself for you." But we shall not be disavowed by the nation, and their act of indemnity will confirm and not weaken the Constitution by more strongly working out its lines.

Was Jefferson indeed so determined to barter this domain to Indians,

and shut up all the rest from settlement for a long time to come?

Again I quote this same letter to Mr. Breckenridge, from which he [DALZELL] seems to reach so many conclusions:

Objections are raising to the eastward against the vast extent of our boundaries, and propositions are made to exchange Louisiana, or a part of it, for the Floridas. But, as I have said, we shall get the Floridas, and I would not give up one inch of the waters of the Mississippi to any nation, because I see in a light very important to our peace the exclusive right to its navigation, and the admission of no nation into it but, as into the Potomac and the Delaware, with our consent and under our police.

And now comes a part of this letter which throws a flood of light upon the whole question:

These Federalists see in this acquisition the formation of a new confederacy, embracing all the waters of the Mississippi, on both sides of it, and a separation of its eastern waters from us. These conditions depend on so many circumstances which we can not foresee that I place but little reliance on them. * * *

When I view the Atlantic States procuring for those on the eastern waters of the Mississippi friendly instead of hostile neighbors on the western waters, I do not view it as an Englishman would the procuring of future blessings for the French nation, with whom he has no relation of blood or affection. The future Atlantic and Mississippi States will be our sons. We have them in distinct but bordering establishments. We think we see their happiness in their union, and we wish it. * * *

God bless them both and keep them in union, if it be for their good, but separate them if it be better.

We fail to see anything in this letter which could in any way have disturbed the equanimity of Mr. Livingston. Yet we are told that—

When these views reached Livingston in France he immediately gave Jefferson to understand that if the business were to be done over again it never would be done. And thereupon Jefferson took alarm and immediately sent off another letter to Senator Breckenridge in which he said: "I wrote you on the 12th instant on the subject of Louisiana, and the constitutional provision which might be necessary for it. A letter just received yesterday shows that nothing must be said on that subject which may give a pretext for retreating, but that we should do *sub silentio* what shall be found necessary. Be so good, therefore, as to consider that part of my letter confidential." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

We note the laughter and applause on the Republican side as recorded in the Record, and a close examination of the exhibits in the case reveals a very amusing state of affairs.

Here is the letter in which Mr. Livingston uses the very identical words quoted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the only letter in which such language is used:

[Extract—Mr. Livingston to Mr. Madison.]

PARIS, July 30, 1803.

SIR: The House of Baring, etc. * * * Be assured that were the business to be done again it would never be done. They think we have attained an immense advantage over them, etc.

ROBERT R. LIVINGSTON.

Now there is not one line or syllable in this letter about "these views" reaching him. How could they? "These views" were published on August 12 and this letter was written July 30 *preceding*. Now, it is equally impossible that Jefferson at receiving this news "thereupon took alarm and immediately sent off another letter to Senator Breckenridge," for the simple reason that the second, this *sub silentio*, this letter which tickles the risibles of the Republican side of the House, was written on August 18, 1803. How could Jefferson in Washington take alarm at any letter written in Paris *nineteen days before*?

At this time the wizards of the nineteenth century had not yet performed miracles with electricity, steam, and steel. Locomotion by land was by the stage coach and on the sea by sail vessels. We know from this very correspondence just how long it took to cross the Atlantic Ocean. On April 11, 1803, Mr. Livingston wrote Mr. Madison, "Mr. Monroe arrived on the 1st at Havre. I expect him here in two days at furthest from this date." *His passage was twenty-nine days.* This was written on the 11th, so it took Mr. Monroe traveling post haste on this all-important mission forty-two days to cross the ocean and get from Havre to Paris. Yet at the same time Mr. Jefferson was alarmed by a letter which at the time he took this unaccountable "scare" was necessarily somewhere about the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. Was it "these views" reaching Livingston in France that made him write the letter of July 30, or the letter referred to in the letter of August 18, written to Breckenridge? Certainly not. There is no doubt about the letter Jefferson refers to—he identifies it himself, and it is of course not the letter mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

On the same day, August 18, Jefferson writes Mr. Madison:

I inclose you two letters from Robert R. Livingston; that of the 2d of June is just intelligible enough in the undeciphered parts to create anxieties which perhaps the cipher can remove. I infer that the less one says about the constitutional difficulties respecting Louisiana the better, and what is necessary for surmounting them must be done *sub silentio*.

Now let us see the "two letters," one of date June 2d, to which Jefferson refers, and we can instantly discover to what extent "these views reached Livingston in France."

On June 3d Livingston writes Madison:

My letter to the President and our joint letter will so fully explain this extraordinary business as to make any further observations unnecessary, etc.

What was this extraordinary business?

Here it is:

[Translation.]

M. Marbois, Minister of the Public Treasury, to Messrs. Livingston and Monroe.

Paris 20th Floreal 11th year (9th April, 1803.)

GENTLEMEN: The article of the convention relative to the payment which the United States have to make to France, in three months at most, after the satisfaction of the treaties and after the taking possession of Louisiana in the name of the United States, determines, in a precise manner, the largest terms agreed upon for the consummation of this affair. They are three months after satisfaction and the taking of possession. It is proper to foresee, also, the case in which this business should not be consummated within the interval above expressed, and as they are precise, it is well understood that every extraordinary delay beyond the date fixed places the contracting parties in the same situation as if they had never treated. These consequences of the stipulations agreed upon are just and necessary, etc.

BARBE MARBOIS.

To which the following reply was sent:

Messrs. Livingston and Monroe to M. Marbois, Minister of the Public Treasury.

PARIS, June 2, 1803.

SIR: We have received the letter with which you have honored us, dated 20th Floreal. Without entering into the principles it lays down, we are ready to admit, in order to remove, as far as depends on us, all difficulties, that it is the duty of the Government of the United States to carry into effect the provisions of the treaty and conventions, and that any neglect on their part to do so puts it in the power of the Government of France to declare how far it will or it will not be bound thereby, or entitle it to a compensation for the damage it may sustain. We will observe, sir, that, in making these concessions, we mean to confine ourselves to the letter of the treaty.

With the largest respect, etc.,

ROBERT R. LIVINGSTON.
JAMES MONROE.

Again Livingston writes Madison:

Be persuaded that France is sick of the bargain; that Spain is much dissatisfied, and that the slightest pretense will lose you the treaty. Nothing has raised the reputation of our country in Europe so high as the conduct of our Government on this occasion both at home and abroad.

So it was not—

these views reaching Livingston in France, but the effort of France to evade a bad bargain into which she had been drawn by the exquisite diplomacy—

the conduct of our Government on this occasion both at home and abroad.

In the face of this new complication, and as I shall show further on, on account of the blind implacable opposition of the Federalists to the "conduct of our Government both at home and abroad," which had "raised the reputation of our country in Europe so high."

This opposition and the necessity of ratifying the treaty, if at all, in ninety days, made it expedient to waive a constitutional question, and forced Jefferson and his friends to proceed *sub silentio*.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania then makes this remarkable statement:

The dominant statesmen of that day held, as was subsequently held by the courts, that the United States was a sovereign nation, having and entitled to exercise all the powers of any sovereign nation, the right to make war and peace, the right to acquire territory, and, as a necessary consequence of that right, the right to govern it without limitation save in the discretion of the Congress. That is the law of the land to-day as applied with respect to our new possessions, so that not only was Mr. Jefferson not the author of the Louisiana Purchase in the first instance, but the credit of having that great territory that we have to-day is due to the doctrines laid down by Alexander Hamilton in assertion of the nation's powers under the Constitution. [Applause on the Republican side.]

He is not explicit as to what he means by "the dominant statesmen of that day." If he means they who were responsible for the conduct of the Government, were dominant in the sense that they controlled, why, the Federalists having been routed "horse, foot, and dragoons," they were all Democrats. If he means those whose worth, capacity, patriotism, and disinterested devotion to the common weal rendered them worthy to rule, why the great majority of that class have always been Democrats. I presume he means those Federalists whose political prominence and official position made them dominant in their own party. And it is a fair inference from this statement that these "dominant statesmen" held that no amendment to the organic law was necessary—

that the United States was a sovereign nation, having the right to acquire territory, and, as a necessary consequence of that right, the right to govern it without limitation, save in the discretion of the Congress.

Fortunately these "dominant" Federalists have left an eternal memorial of their words and acts on this occasion. James K. Hosmer, in his history of the Louisiana purchase, is certainly no extravagant admirer of Jefferson. Yet he says:

In dealing with the danger which the approach of France brought to the United States, Jefferson and his party had shown a wiser and humaner spirit than did the opposition. Now in this later stage of the affair when the transfer of Louisiana by France to America had come about, it is the Jeffersonian policy which we from this distance must commend; for the Federalists became turbulent and factious. To this day in old New England families the tradition persists of the rancor with which Jefferson was regarded. There could be no good, so thought the friends of John Adams, in anything his rival had done, and the country would never be safe until they were again out of power. Incorporation of foreign territory was unconstitutional in the extreme and impossible in the extreme. The East might become depopulated through an emigration that might be expected to set out into the purchase. Secession of the trans-Mississippi country might certainly be looked for; there could never be anything in common between the men of the plains and the men of the coast.

Again—

Having stated his points, the Federalist leader (Griswold) dwelt on the impolicy of the treaty. What troubles were certain to arise in dealing with so vast an area, for the most part a wilderness, and, when peopled, having inhabitants so foreign in tongue, manners, and religion. Promptly as possible, on October 19, Gaylord Griswold again stood up in opposition, arguing that the Louisiana treaty was unconstitutional, first, because the treaty-making power does not extend to incorporating foreign soil and foreign people into the United States.

The words "new States may be admitted into the Union" he declared meant new States carved out of the territory belonging to the United States at the time the Union was founded.

But granting for the moment that such incorporations were right it belonged certainly not to Congress, to the President, and Senate.

When the matter came up in the Senate * * * Timothy Pickering of Massachusetts made the extremest statements possible of the rights of the States. He declared that to his mind the treaty was unconstitutional because it stipulated something no power existing could carry out.

The third article read, "The inhabitants of the ceded territory should be incorporated into the Union of the United States." Who was competent to carry that out? Not the President and Senate; not the President and Congress; not an amendment to the Constitution passed by two-thirds vote of both Houses and three-quarters of the States. He believed that the assent of every State was necessary before a foreign country could join the Union. * * * No acquisition of foreign territory was contemplated or provided for, and ought therefore to be regarded as impossible.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has not stated the name of any "dominant statesman," not a Democrat, in either the House or the Senate, at this time who urged that this territory could be annexed by virtue of the implied powers of the Constitution. After diligent search I have failed to find him.

The "dominant statesmen," among the Federalists, then in the House and Senate, were suffering from a chronic attack of Anglomaniac, were rendered hysterical by the excesses of the French Revolution, and were destined soon to write the ignominious epitaph of their party at the Hartford convention.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] would have us believe that Jefferson, in his letter to Senator Breckenridge August 18, raised the question of an amendment to the Constitution and thereafter abandoned it. He asks: "Was there any constitutional amendment ever offered to indorse the Louisiana purchase? Certainly not, no such amendment was sought."

It will be remembered that in the treaty, by which Louisiana was ceded, there was the additional provision that the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, privileges and advantages, and the immunities of citizens of the United States.

Jefferson never regarded an amendment to the Constitution as necessary to the acquiring of new territory; he thought it wise and expedient in order that he might fix more definitely the exact status of the new States, which were to be carved out of the newly acquired territory.

Nearly a year before the much-discussed Breckenridge correspondence, on January 1, he wrote Gallatin:

You are right in my opinion about Mr. Livingston's position, *there is no difficulty about the acquiring of new territory, and whether, when acquired, it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution, as it now stands, will be a question of expediency.* I think it will be safer not to permit the enlargement of the Union, but by an amendment of the Constitution.

Nothing Jefferson ever wrote displayed more fully that marvelous seerlike power which he, and he alone, seemed to possess. He was the oracle in the new temple, erected in so great a measure by his genius. With the admission of the trans-Mississippi States into the Union he had two groups of Commonwealths externally alike, yet occupying a different status and possessing certain powers and privileges emanating from diametrically opposite sources. The original colonies, absolutely separate and independent sovereignties, by the most solemn covenant, with jealous care, divested themselves of

certain powers, conferring them upon a central government, and at the same time providing that all powers not *expressly delegated* should be reserved to the States, respectively, and to the people thereof. But the new States never possessed any separate sovereignty, never delegated any powers, never possessed the power to reserve them in the full meaning in which that language was used by the colonies.

The thirteen colonies created the Federal Union and defined and limited its powers. This Government then purchased Louisiana and *conferred* the privileges and immunities of statehood upon the various Commonwealths into which it was subsequently divided.

Necessarily the question of the relation of the State to the Federal Government, its reserved rights, its sovereignty, must have an entirely different aspect as seen from the angle of Virginia and South Carolina, or from Kansas or Missouri. This very question was to raise a cloud upon the horizon of the nation's peace, even before the great author of that purchase went to his final reward.

In the thirty years of heated discussion which followed there is a certain sameness in the arguments and illustrations both on the part of those who maintained and those who denied the sovereignty of the State. It was the difference of opinion which was intuitive, almost necessary, between men attempting to fix the status of the States and regarding union from the genesis of Kansas or of South Carolina. In the light of subsequent events, it was not a lack of foresight or wisdom in Jefferson when he thought it expedient to "bring out more strongly the lines of the Constitution," and in the face of this new situation to establish in advance and unequivocally just what delegated and what inherent powers were vested in the States and the Union, respectively, upon their admission into the new Government.

From Webster, Clay, and Calhoun to Toombs, Douglas, and Lincoln, this vexed question was debated with constantly increasing acrimony, till at last a frenzied nation appealed from the forum of discussion to the field of arms—billions of treasure and 500,000 gallant lives were engulfed in the horrid vortex of that maelstrom.

Who will say that this frightful fratricidal slaughter might not have been averted had it been permitted to the wise and peace-loving Sage of Monticello to guide the councils of men whose minds were then tranquil and open to conviction "in bringing out more fully the lines of the Constitution" and settling this hidden, but inherent and deadly, difference between the original and the acquired States of the Union?

Says the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]:

It was to acquire New Orleans only that he (Jefferson) sent Monroe to France. * * * But Robert Livingston, our minister to France, availed himself of his opportunity and Napoleon's necessity and made the purchase, etc.

To attribute all the glory to Livingston might detract from the personal renown of Jefferson; it could not affect the credit due the Democratic party. Livingston, Jefferson's associate, his friend, and a part of a Democratic administration, shed the luster of his splendid service upon the great party of which, at that time, he was an honored servant.

I do not know of any sense in which Livingston was "our minister," that Monroe was not "our minister," or Jefferson "our President."

He certainly was neither an imperialist nor a Republican.

Imagine, if you can, Jefferson's immortal foreign minister sent to Paris by McKinley to negotiate the purchase of the Philippines, as he was sent by the Sage of Monticello to wrench Louisiana from the grasp of Napoleon, opening the negotiations in the language of his famous "Notes on Louisiana."

Colonies are never cherished for themselves—

Says Livingston—

but on account of the influence they may have on the general prosperity of the nation. And as one man at home contributes more to this than two at a distance, no wise nation colonizes but when it has a superfluous population, or when it has a superfluous capital that can not otherwise be rendered productive. * * *

It will readily be admitted that transmarine colonies add nothing to the strength of a nation. They are, on the contrary, weak points that are guarded at great expense of men and money, and more particularly when they are placed in warm and unhealthy climates.

Imagine the amazement of the advocates of the Dingley tariff; horror and indignation in the depleted ranks of the "stand-patters" when Mr. Livingston again announces to his new associates, who delight, in contradistinction to Jefferson and Monroe, to speak of him as "our minister," hear this old sound Jeffersonian doctrine from that same deathless document—

In San Domingo 20 per cent is paid by articles introduced by foreigners; this is indeed collected from the foreigners, etc. * * * But the money is paid by the planters; for it is always added to the price, and even an interest or profit charged on the duty itself, and a com-

pensation for all the vexations the merchant suffers. What, then, is the effect of this operation but to deduct at least one-quarter from the money which the planter has, with difficulty, drawn from France or elsewhere, and so far to impede the reestablishment of the capital that can alone render the island ultimately productive to France. * * * Nay, I will venture to say, that, unless the ports of San Domingo are thrown open to all the vessels bringing necessities, unless the inhabitants are permitted to buy cheap and to sell dear, by encouraging a competition between buyers and sellers, unless every species of vexation is removed * * * ages will elapse before San Domingo will cease to drain the wealth and strength of France without offering an equivalent return.

Spain's cession of Louisiana at San Ildefonso brought into a diplomatic game the two most commanding figures on the globe. The sage whose passion was peace and the chieftain whose god was war. Both shrewd, alert, and resourceful. Bonaparte determined to erect a new empire in the Western Hemisphere, and Jefferson intent upon saving it from the shackles of the tyrant. Between the two, Jefferson's great lieutenant, Livingston, passed like a courier, tireless and vigilant.

It is assumed that Jefferson did not realize the greatness of the drama in which he played so important a part, because he never demanded the whole of this vast domain, contenting himself with the repeated request for New Orleans and the Floridas. There is nothing more certain than to have demanded the whole of Louisiana would have been to have lost it. None understood this better than Jefferson. His long diplomatic service in Paris stood him in good stead; he knew the lofty pride of the First Consul, and the sensitive vanity of the French. The offer of money for this cherished empire implied the financial weakness and necessities of a nation, then dominating Europe, the suggestion that it could not be held by the haughty conqueror, was a challenge.

And yet Jefferson knew the needs of the Government, and the perils to which the newly acquired territory was subjected. With consummate tact, he directed the course of his great foreign minister. While demanding a port at New Orleans, the reasons assigned for the cession of a city, established the folly and the danger of any sovereignty, in any part of the ceded territory. Jefferson bided his time, while the First Consul in India, in Egypt, and in St. Domingo saw his cherished dream of colonization vanish like a mist, and with each repeated disaster, Livingston, determined and importunate, returned to the fray. Napoleon sought in Louisiana a source of supplies for Santo Domingo.

She may say that she needs Louisiana for the supply of her West Indies—

writes Jefferson to Livingston—

she does not need it in time of peace. And in war she can not depend on them because they would be so easily intercepted. I would suppose all these considerations might in some proper form be brought into the view of the Government of France.

Napoleon flattered himself that Le Clerc would soon subdue Santo Domingo, and thence proceed immediately to New Orleans. Jefferson knew the seriousness of that undertaking; he writes Livingston:

The idea here is that the troops sent to St. Domingo were to proceed to Louisiana after finishing their work in that island. If this were the arrangement it will give you time to return again and again to the charge, for the conquest of St. Domingo will not be a short work.

At last the long-expected war cloud looms black and ominous across the English Channel, and Napoleon himself is no match for Nelson on the sea. Jefferson realizes it, and drops this ominous suggestion to Livingston:

The day that France takes possession of New Orleans fixes the sentence that is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of two nations who in conjunction can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation.

A comparison of the correspondence between Livingston and Jefferson, or the Secretary of State, shows how the subtle and unanswerable arguments of Jefferson, uttered with the most exquisite tact and adroitness, all found their way to the eye and the heart of the First Consul, till at last, little realizing it, Bonaparte became a convert to the doctrine of Jefferson, uttered in a thousand seductive and convincing forms, that the true interest of France—yes, her honor and safety—demanded the cession of Louisiana to the United States.

Livingston, in high glee, declares:

I this day got a sight of a letter from the minister to M. Laussat, containing directions for giving up the country, and assigning the reasons for the cession. I was much flattered to find their reasons wholly drawn from the memoirs I had presented.

Jefferson's covert threat to "marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation" bore good fruit.

In assigning his reasons for the cession of Louisiana, Bonaparte declared:

They (the English) shall not have the Mississippi which they covet. Louisiana is nothing in comparison with their aggrandizement in all parts of the globe. * * *

I wish to take away from them the idea that they will ever be able to win this colony. I contemplate turning it over to the United States. (Hosmer, etc., 135.)

Napoleon was not in the habit of ceding territory to prevent its being taken from him by force.

Jefferson's diplomacy had noiselessly stolen from Napoleon that which he might, in another humor, have defied the world in arms to take.

But they tell us it was the genius of Livingston. Strange plenipotentiary acting in a matter of this vast import, without the advice or consent of the great statesman whom he always regarded with reverence and affection. Nobody knew better than Livingston the part Jefferson had played in this transaction.

That same charge had been made in Livingston's day, and he answered it with magnanimity and truth. He writes Madison:

As the President's views have been happily more correct than mine, as he has affected, without this harsh measure (the seizure of New Orleans), his great object; it certainly is not advisable to publish that we differed in sentiment. * * * The next point in which the letter may do harm is in authorizing an opinion, which the enemies of the Administration are most zealous in promoting, viz, that no credit is due either the President or his ministers.

Partial historians may delude a generation, or serve the petty purpose of the partisan; but I rejoice that in the archives of two nations there still reposes the incontrovertible proof of the invaluable services of Democracy's greatest President, and future ages will neither cavil nor question the assertion that the diplomacy of Thomas Jefferson doubled the domain of a nation which his guidance and wisdom have consecrated to the highest measure of liberty and happiness ever known among the children of men.

And the most amusing part of it all is the sweet simplicity and guileless trust of the gentleman's colleagues upon that side of the Chamber and the hilarious applause with which they greeted this most unique historical narrative. During three successive Congresses, I have heard the Rhoderick Dhu of that side of the Chamber call his compatriots to arms. I have listened in admiration and despair, as he stirs them to a forgetfulness of their sins as no other can. I came into the House the other day just before the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] was ready to address it. I was amazed at the attendance on that side, all dressed in its best bib and tucker. I asked what was the matter, and they told me in awed voice that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was going to speak. I sat down to listen with as much pleasure as any Republican on that side, though possibly not with the same edification. I was entranced by his eloquence, pleased by his boldness, and delighted at the fact that in that classic oration he was more inimitable and less dangerous than ever. Hitherto it has been a challenge. The last speech of Mr. DALZELL was a eulogy upon the Republican party. Eulogies are only pronounced above the body of the dead. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] "Ah," said the gentleman from Pennsylvania, "I come here to sing no new song, to make no new speech." The grand exalted ruler of the Ancient Order of Stand-patters, the high priest of protection, never uttered a truer thing than that. He said, amid thunderous applause, that he was going to plant the factory beside the farm. Oh, how they applauded that! They always applaud when Mr. DALZELL says they are going to plant the factory beside the farm. I don't know why. Do you know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] got that idea from Thomas Jefferson, the source of all political wisdom. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] He did it inadvertently, I admit, but he did it—that sentence that throws you into hysterics—and three times has Mr. DALZELL used it since I have been in Congress, and three times has that side of the House thrown a fit. Said Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to Benjamin Austin in 1816, ninety-two years ago:

"We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist."

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

You have been borrowing Democratic principles from that time until this, and claiming the credit for them; but I never thought that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the height of his splendid oratory, would become the humble disciple of Thomas Jefferson. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

This pernicious effort to disparage Jefferson and to deify Hamilton has its origin in the same national vice—Imperialism. You have become a world power; subject nations are held under a galling yoke, unwilling subjects to a nation whose political creed proclaimed to the world that "all men were created free and equal, and had an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

You declare that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and hold men in unwilling and enforced subjection.

The Constitution no longer follows the flag; and they who proclaim themselves the followers of Lincoln forget his declaration "That they who deny liberty to others shall not long retain it for themselves."

You have turned your backs upon the teachings of all your illustrious dead, save one.

There was a day when every American gloried in the immortal utterance of Henry Clay, that "It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity, in reference to all nations. If they can not command universal assent to the proposition, it is then demanded as to particular nations, and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the dispositions of Providence himself to suppose that He has created beings incapable of governing themselves."

Now, you prate like princes about the incapacity of your dependencies to govern themselves, as if you or I had ever been constituted the guardians of a people's liberties. Away with your "manifest destiny!" I tell you only kings claim to govern by divine right.

You give a yellow Filipino a privilege like a pill, and then watch his political pulse and bowels to see how he assimilates it.

Our forefathers gave this nation life, and risked their own to resist taxation without representation, yet you levy imports at Manila. By the inexorable logic of your pernicious system of government you are driven to abandon your political birth-right and to accept the doctrines of Alexander Hamilton, for without him there are none among "Those dead but sceptered sovereigns who still rule our spirits from their urns" to whom you can turn.

In order that he shall be an acceptable patron saint of Republicanism, you have retouched the picture until his best friend would never know him.

Book shelves groan with extravagant eulogies, under the pseudonym of biography, and your English cousins, delighted that this champion of caste and royalty has grown so great, rival you in this political canonization.

The simplest fact in his life is distorted out of all semblance of probability to fill out the faultless and fictitious figure.

This pleasure-loving, imperious, haughty Frenchman—high-spirited, knightly—possessing all the virtues and all the vices of a born courtier, whose blood still seethed with the fire of a tropical sun, is transformed into a colorless, spiritless, sinless, demure disciple of Cotton Mather. A pretty mess, this New England coterie, Lodge, Ellis, and company, have made of it! Hamilton was fitted in every way by temperament, opinion, and personal attractiveness to have graced the drawing-rooms of princes, but there was nothing, absolutely nothing, of the Puritan in him.

An Englishman by the name of Oliver has written what Hamilton's most ardent admirers are pleased to call an "adequate" history, in which he makes of him a demigod, and all the other Revolutionary heroes are demagogues or devils. He informs us—

Hamilton was a type of the statesman, Jefferson the sophist.

And again, we read such delectable stuff as this:

We may dismiss the theory of malign intriguers who perverted the judgment and poisoned the affections of the American people. The carefully organized misrepresentations of Samuel Adams, the smooth craftiness of Franklin, the heroics of Henry, and the phrases of Jefferson, etc.

We are solemnly informed that Aaron Burr, with demoniac malevolence, hunted to his death this devout Christian, who abhorred the practice of dueling, and who was driven by a false sense of duty and honor like a lamb to the slaughter.

Hamilton—

Says Oliver—

came by his death as he had spent his life, in the service of his country. He did not die in a private quarrel. If he had fallen at Yorktown or been killed, as nearly came to pass, by the heavy labors of his office, he would not more certainly have sacrificed himself to the interests of the nation.

In Lodge's Life of Hamilton we read the ingenious story that Hamilton believed that those American Jacobins (Democrats) were going to send things to the ding bow wows, "confusion worse confounded," and that he alone possessed the military genius and capacity to save the country in a war which never occurred, and that he would not make the picturesque general he fancied he was if he refused a call to the "field of honor." And in order that he might live to save the country from im-

pending ruin, he went out and stood at 10 paces, in front of a man of iron nerve, and a skilled marksman, and deliberately fired his pistol in the air. And Hamilton was a great logician, too.

Professor Edward S. Ellis, A. M., writes in a so-called history of Hamilton, and informs us:

All the venom in Burr was roused by his crowning defeat. He knew that Hamilton was the cause, and he determined to kill him. It would not do to stab him from behind or to hire some one to administer poison. Either method would have been vulgar, and the consequences to himself might be disagreeable; but he selected a method which essentially was just as malignant in its nature.

He resolved to force a quarrel upon Hamilton, etc., etc.

The manner of Hamilton's death in no way affects the value or character of his public service. I shall discuss the various accounts of this duel simply to illustrate the silly and transparent exaggerations of every act and every incident of Hamilton's life, in the effort to make him fit the niche prepared for him by his imperialistic votaries. I am in no sense an apologist for Aaron Burr; he was bad enough, but we should "give the devil his due."

Burr was neither a traitor nor a patriot. He was inordinately ambitious and absolutely selfish, and such selfishness in a public servant is only less odious than treason. He was a typical denizen of Wall street; he lived not to make his countrymen happy, but to make them profitable. They were his pawns and the earth his footstool. With his energy, his address, and his talents what a president of an insurance company he would have made, and what a howling success as the head of a trust. Burr was no model of conjugal fidelity, nor was Hamilton the ideal censor of such moral delinquencies.

Is it true that Burr causelessly hounded Hamilton to his death?

James Parton is not an especial admirer of Burr; he describes him as having "everything requisite for the attainment of permanent welfare except the ONE THING NEEDFUL—A CONSCIENCE."

In speaking of the hostile meeting between Burr and Hamilton, Parton writes:

Gates, De Witt Clinton, Randolph, Benton, Clay, Jackson, Decatur, Arnold, Walpole, Pitt, Wellington, Canning, Peel, Grattan, Fox, Sheridan, Jefferson, Wilkes, D'Israeli, Lamartine, Thiers, and scores of less famous names are found in Mr. Sabin's list of duelists.

In all that curious catalogue there is not the name of one politician who received provocation so often repeated, so irritating, and so injurious as that which Aaron Burr had received from Alexander Hamilton.

Cheatham himself, in January of this very year, 1804, had taunted him for allowing Hamilton to speak and write of him as it was then notorious he was in the habit of doing. "Is the Vice-President sunk so low," said this wretched calumniator, "as to submit to be insulted by General Hamilton?"

At every step of Burr's political career, without a single exception, Hamilton, by open efforts, by secret intrigue, or by both, had utterly opposed and forbidden his advancement. He had injured him in the estimation of General Washington. He had prevented Mr. Adams from giving him a military appointment. His letters for years had abounded in denunciation of him, as severe and unqualified as the language of a powerful declaimer could convey. From Burr's own table he had carried away the unguarded sallies of the host for use against the political opponent. The most offensive epithets and phrases he had so habitually applied to Burr that they had become familiar in the mouths of all the leading Federalists, who, as the reader may have observed, denounced Colonel Burr in Hamilton's own words.

Says Jenkinson in his history of Burr:

There is, therefore, no semblance of truth in the charge that Burr forced Hamilton to accept his challenge by the unusual and unwarranted form of the demand made upon him. He had strictly followed the precedent set by Hamilton himself on a similar occasion; the fault was Hamilton's alone that he could not truthfully make the disavowal demanded. It was true that he had for years been traducing Burr's character in every form his ingenuity could invent, and many scores of his letters existed to attest the fact. It was, indeed, out of his power to make the disavowal required, and his only refuge was to deny the right to be questioned.

The injury which led to the fatal encounter, the published statement of Doctor Cooper that Hamilton had expressed "a still more despicable opinion of Burr," was the last offense of twenty years of uninterrupted traduction, "the straw that broke the camel's back."

I agree that we should not judge the duelist of that day by the standard of this. But there is no logic by which you can pardon the acceptor of a challenge and condemn the sender. By that barbarous code he who was charged with an infamous offense could not clear his skirts by proving its falsity. To prove the charge false and fail to resent it was to aggravate the imputation of cowardice, in that day more odious than vice or crime. The same perverted public opinion which necessitated the acceptance forced the sending of a challenge.

To tamely submit to insult publicly offered was to invite the same odium which attached to the refusal to accept a call to a duel when sent by the offended party. His contemporaries thoroughly understood this. In writing of this affair Hamil-

ton's devoted friend and immortal eulogist, Gouverneur Morris, said:

In doing justice to the dead I would not injure the living—that Colonel Burr ought to be considered in the same light with any other man who had killed another in a duel. [Dickinson.]

No man understood this better than Hamilton. He had himself repeatedly resorted to this same method of resenting a real or fancied offense. Hearing that the President of the United States had made a slighting remark in no way as offensive as his habitual abuse of Burr, he immediately sent the following cartel to Mr. Adams:

It has been repeatedly mentioned to me that you have, on different occasions, asserted the existence of a British faction in this country, embracing a number of leading or influential characters of the Federal party (as usually denominated), and that you have sometimes named me, at others plainly alluding to me, as one of this description of persons. And I have likewise been assured that of late some of your warm adherents, for electioneering purposes, have employed a corresponding language.

I must, sir, take it for granted that you can not have made such assertions or insinuations without being willing to avow them; and to assign the reasons to a party who may conceive himself injured by them. I therefore trust that you will not deem it improper that I apply directly to yourself to ascertain from you in reference to your own declarations whether the information I have received has been correct or not; and, if correct, what are the grounds upon which you have founded the suggestions.

In that day this was the plainest kind of "fighting talk."

His opinions and practices are not recorded by political or personal enemies. Rufus King, the colleague in the Senate of his father-in-law—General Schuyler—and the life-long friend and admirer of Hamilton, in speaking of his opinions on this subject, says:

You can not, my dear sir, hold in greater abhorrence than I do the practice of dueling. Our lamented friend was not unacquainted with my opinion on the subject, but with a mind the most capacious and discriminating that I ever knew, he had laid down for the government of himself certain rules upon the subject of duels the fallacy of which would not fail to be seen by any man of ordinary understanding. With these guides, it is my deliberate opinion that he could not have avoided a meeting with Colonel Burr, had he even declined the first challenge.

He not only laid down for himself "certain rules upon the subject of duels," as his friend Rufus King says, but he lived up to them. Hamilton literally went through life "with a chip on his shoulder." He is the only prominent American of that or any other period who ever figured in a mortal combat before he was out of his teens. When a mere youth on Washington's staff he began this practice. Gen. Charles Lee criticised Washington and that general paid not the least attention to it. He does not appear to have been at all disturbed by it. Laurens and young Hamilton each insisted that he should have the pleasure of killing General Lee "a la mode." It was finally agreed that Laurens should act as principal and Hamilton as second. The challenge was accepted and Lee was shot and dangerously wounded.

Shortly after Hamilton retired from Washington's Cabinet he got into a heated argument with old Commodore Nicholson, who was an enthusiastic Jeffersonian Democrat and had very little patience for Hamilton's monarchical notions. The testy old commodore declared, "Why, sir, in asserting such political principles you are an abettor of Torists." Off went Mr. Hamilton in high dudgeon and immediately challenged the old commodore to mortal combat. Of course Nicholson accepted. Such invitations were not often refused in those days. All the arrangements were made for a duel. Mutual friends discovering that these two men had blood in their eyes and were about to shoot each other over a trifle interposed and prevented the meeting. Again this paragon of peace, who so deeply abhorred the brutal custom of dueling, came to the conclusion in 1797 that James Monroe had made some remark which reflected upon Mr. Hamilton's integrity or gallantry, it is not very clear which; Mr. Monroe was immediately challenged. Monroe asked Burr to act as his second. Burr declined to do so, but by the irony of fate volunteered to act as a peacemaker. He managed to reconcile the parties and prevented the duel.

Even so profound a scholar as Justice Brewer, in a recent address in Washington, declared: "His (Hamilton's) death brought an end to dueling in the United States and had its effect throughout the world." His biographers all paint Hamilton at Weehawken as a sort of second St. Telemachus, immolating himself upon the bloody field of the duello and by his heroic and vicarious sacrifice abolishing that sanguinary and pernicious practice. We are told by a wiser philosopher than Lodge or Brewer that "He who lives by the sword shall fall by the sword." It was pitiful, inexpressibly sad, to see a man in the prime of life and vigor, accomplished, eloquent, with a loved and a loving family, cut off in the meridian of his career. It was sad; but it was not surprising. He fell upon a field where he had not been an unfamiliar figure and by a pitiless

code which he had condoned or indorsed by the example and precept of a lifetime. He was no martyr in a good cause, but the victim of a bad one. Yet no detail is omitted and no story, however improbable, is untold which may tend to present this man as an innocent and deluded martyr to the perverted public sentiment of his day.

We are solemnly and seriously informed that "with malice toward none and charity for all," and after the man whom he had hounded for twenty years had mortally wounded him, he demurely fired his own pistol in the air, and yet the ball from that weapon cut a twig just above Burr's head, and Burr was not a tall man. Judge Van Ness, Burr's second, states positively that this is not true—that he fired first, and at Burr.

There is a little incident related by Todd, which throws a flood of light on this vexed question. After both men had taken their positions, and after they had raised their pistols ready to fire at the word "present," Burr facing the cliff and Hamilton looking over toward the city of New York, "One moment," said Hamilton, and then he removed his glasses, wiped them carefully with his handkerchief, and replaced them. The fatal word was then given. A man at a time like that does not carefully wipe his glasses to see how to shoot a pistol in the air.

It is true that on the night before this meeting Hamilton left a writing which does him no credit. In this he recants the teachings and practices of his life. When it is remembered that his own fireside had previously been desolated by this bloody and barbarous business, his own son, in the set phrase of the day, "had fallen in defense of his father's honor," and that even then no word of condemnation against "the code" escaped him, and that now when in a few hours he was about to face the man whom he had viciously traduced from his youth—for they had always been rivals, and had carried it to such an extent that even in the public prints Burr's enemies taunted him with the fact that he had tamely allowed General Hamilton to repeatedly insult him in the most public way—in the light of these facts that strange memorial sounds like a deathbed repentance. "It reads," said Burr, "like the confession of a penitent monk." The folly and wickedness of this cruel custom never dawned upon Hamilton till he could almost feel the ruthless lead of Aaron Burr crashing through his body.

Of course I do not mean to question the physical courage of Alexander Hamilton. Like a true son of France, whether on the field of battle or in private quarrel, he had hitherto always faced danger "with a gay and festive intrepidity."

It can not be denied, however, that Aaron Burr, with all his sins, uttered the simple truth when in that last ominous message to Hamilton he wrote:

Burr "having made great sacrifices for the sake of harmony; having exercised forbearance till it approached humiliation, he has seen no effect produced by such conduct but a repetition of the injury. A. Burr, far from conceiving that rivalry authorizes a latitude not otherwise justifiable, feels greater delicacy in such cases and would think it meanness to speak of a rival but in terms of respect. Such has invariably been his conduct toward Jay, Adams, and Hamilton, the only three who can be supposed to have stood in that relation to him."

Hamilton knew that he had driven his adversary to the wall, knew that he had pushed too far the almost stolid indifference of a patient man, at last rendered desperate and inexorable. It is more than probable, too, that he realized that in the heat of his anger he had done the man injustice, and it is not to his discredit that on this occasion, although believing in the code, he wished to avoid this last encounter. "Conscience makes cowards of us all."

The repeated assertion that the universal horror occasioned by the thinly disguised murder of Hamilton brought the code into instant disrepute is not only improbable in itself, it is in the teeth of history. Hamilton was among the very first and not the last of distinguished Americans to fall in a duel. The so-called "affairs of honor" between Barron and Decatur, Randolph and Clay, Jackson and Dickinson, Terry and Broderick, Cilley and Graves, all occurred after the scene at Weehawken. There was, long before 1804, a strong and growing sentiment against this useless and foolish custom fraught with so much agony to the innocent and helpless, bereaved by this monstrous relic of barbarism. It was not to the tragic fate of Hamilton, but the consistent lives and teachings of the illustrious men of that and succeeding periods, which at last set the seal of infamy upon this cold-blooded custom of scheduled murder. As early as 1779 Thomas Jefferson introduced a bill in the Virginia legislature providing that "Whosoever committed murder by way of a duel shall suffer death by hanging, and if he were the challenger, he shall be gibbeted." The moral courage necessary to introduce such a drastic measure, twenty years before this occurrence, did infinitely more to stop the infamous business than could possibly have resulted from the death of any man who

went through life challenging everybody whose language was offensive, from the President down, and at last fell by the bloody sword with which he so often had threatened the life of his foes.

Ah, gentlemen, I know you still must have a military hero. This imperialism, this tendency toward a central government, this effort to force and to drive into one compact mass all the States and to make an autocrat of what was once a President, has forced you to open the ponderous and marble jaws of the grave, to drag from the ceremonies of the tomb the only monarchist that ever preached in America.

Ah, you say that I do him wrong. You say that I slander him. No, Mr. Chairman! The thing which you glorify in him that was the one thing for which his contemporaries and his friends damned him. When he lay dead there in New York, when the shadow of the tragedy of Weehawken hung over him, Gouverneur Morris sought his dying friend; he ministered to him in his agony, and, bathed in tears, uttered the last eulogy above his pallid corse.

Yet that night in his diary, intended for no eyes save his own, he indicted this strange picture of Hamilton:

He was indiscreet, vain, opinionated. These things must be told or the character will be incomplete; yet it must be told in such a manner as not to destroy the interest. He was in principle opposed to a republican and attached to a monarchical government, and these, his opinions, were generally known, and have long and loudly been proclaimed. His share in framing our Constitution may be mentioned, and his unfortunate opinion can not therefore be concealed.

And Gouverneur Morris—surrounded by the assembled thousands who heard that immortal eulogy—paused, amidst his choking sobs, amidst his tears; he paused to ask those around him, in the name of the sanctity and pathos of death, to forgive Hamilton the thing for which the gentleman from Pennsylvania to-day would deify him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You need an emperor because you are imperialists, but there is no semblance of a parallel between the nationalism of Hamilton and the imperialism of Roosevelt. Those two characters have only this in common—a profound contempt for the Constitution and everlasting impatience of its restraints. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] Hamilton from his early boyhood, yonder on a tiny isle in the Caribbean, dreamed of power; Roosevelt hungers for authority.

Hamilton, with a superb disdain for contemporary criticism and an unalterable faith in the judgment of after ages, builded his immortal fame. Roosevelt is deterred by clamor and intoxicated by applause. Both are essentially military men. Hamilton's passion for war and his great capacity for order and command argues the correctness of his cherished belief that he possessed rare military genius, and had the youth who fortified Mount Washington and led the charge at Yorktown had twenty more years on his head he would have ranked the first generals of the Revolution. But he wore his ominous sword with the dignity of a great commander. He did not wave it above his head like a drum major. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] This man performed more than he promised; meant more than he said. Your new imperialist is strenuous in speech and fickle in performance. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Hamilton never wielded "a big stick." Gentlemen, there is too much of the baton about that "big stick." At best it is a shillalah. It is large, but it is light. It is an excellent thing with which to crack the heads of recalcitrant Congressmen, but I seriously doubt its efficiency in actual war. [Applause on Democratic side.] And if it be true that the Executive anathema has lately been hurled at an obscure vender of drugs here in Washington, and while the judge is hearing the case or the jury is out the White House condemns him to a jail sentence, then it must in shame be admitted that the "big stick" is being used to-day to kill rats. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] talks about our following Mr. Bryan and sneers at him as the "peerless." Mr. Bryan has no authority, no office, no patronage. He commands because the majority of the free men in the Democratic party respect him as a statesman and trust him as a man. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Bryan takes his followers by the hand; Roosevelt takes his partisans by the throat. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The majority on that side of the House, if I mistake not, does not agree with him "in my policies," yet you dare not murmur nor resist. Twice only in all his strenuous career have you raised your trembling heads. Once you refused to allow him to simplify spelling and you put the inscription back on the dollar. I knew you would do that. You revolted once, by a big majority of 225, got up on your hind legs, as it were, in holy horror and put "in God we trust" back on these vanishing dollars. That

was a last expiring effort to restore confidence. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, Mr. Chairman [laughter], when I think of that atrocious crime, that effort of the President to take "in God we trust" off the dollars that we used to have! Why Harriman said he destroyed our faith in railroads; Morgan said he destroyed our faith in high finance, and now Roosevelt comes along and destroys the last evidence Republicans ever see that there is a God. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, Mr. Chairman, when I think of that cruel blow to confidence—gentlemen, where is confidence? For years and years I was told that you had her under lock and key; that she rode sidewise or otherwise around the White House on a big elephant; that she was under the dominion of the G. O. P. Is she dead, has she gone on a long journey, or is she asleep? Where is that fickle goddess, confidence? Oh, Mr. Chairman, how much better could the President have occupied his time? Oh, Mr. Chairman, did it never enter the head of the President—and what in the name of God is it that never entered the head of the President—did it never enter the head of the President that he could have brought order to his shattered columns, hope to his broken-hearted followers, if, instead of striking out the only evidence we have that there is any confidence left in God or man, he had only directed those in authority to inscribe upon the back of those cerulean blue clearing-house certificates some such legend as this, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." [Laughter.]

Dominate a cowering party as he may, we are assured by the reflection that the organic law, which withstood the able and insidious assaults of Alexander Hamilton, will not be materially affected by the fantastic performance of his strenuous disciple.

The eternal principles of Jefferson and his followers are interwoven with the very woof and warp of the Constitution, protecting the rights of the citizen and perpetuating his liberties.

That sacred instrument is more than a creation—it is a growth, the crystallization of the experience, the privation, and the heroism of hardy pioneers, wise in their day, and sleeplessly vigilant in safeguarding that freedom, bought at such an infinite cost of persecution and peril.

For centuries neither the telescope of the astronomer nor the researches of science could solve the mystery of that misty light, that glimmering gossamer encircling the black brow of night; at last the spectrum revealed in this nebula unborn worlds, held in a shimmering gauze; revolving masses of incandescent gas, cooling through the passing cycles of time, growing denser without, shrinking within, forming smoky concentric circles, a whirling luminous fog, congealing into molten rings drawn by their own gravity into rude globes, and these spinning spheres shaped by the plastic hand of Divinity, like clay upon a potter's wheel, into planets and their satellites, new solar systems, swinging for the first time into their orbits in the trackless, fathomless depths above. Thus God peoples the heavens' luminous worlds.

I have fancied that those daring bands of exiles, forgotten by one world and lost in the dark wilds of another, living and dying in ignorance of the mighty destiny of their children's children, conscious only that they were free—I have fancied that He, "with whom a thousand years are as a day or a watch in the night when it is passed," saw the unborn and puissant nation through all the mists of misery, persecution, and death, through which succeeding generations passed, first to independence, then to the mastery of the land and sea.

In the vast womb of the wilderness the colonies took form and voice, varying in their orbits and splendor, but they differed only "as one star differs from another star in glory." In the hour of destiny each found its own place about the great central power, to which, like the planets, they were eternally bound, yet forever separate. The fathers, I declare to you, heard the voice of God when they covered this continent with States, even as the heavens are bespangled with the stars.

The same peril awaits the star and the State. The State dissevered from her sisters is lost, even as a planet wrenched from its moorings, comet-like, becomes the wandering vagrant of the skies.

Either, drawn by the compelling gravity of a central force into its mighty vortex, is annihilated by the power which should have been the source of light and life.

From the chaos of disunion and the wreck of centralization may He who ordained long preserve this constellation of States.

Let no new Hamilton arise to disturb or destroy their exquisite balance—harmonious, distinct, indissoluble, they shall remain eternal as the revolving stars. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. OLMSTED having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, one of its secretaries, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4856. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to lease San Clemente Island, California, and for other purposes;

S. 5983. An act authorizing certain life-saving apparatus to be placed at the Farallone Islands, off the coast of California;

S. 3722. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act providing for second and additional homestead entries, and for other purposes," approved April 28, 1904;

S. 513. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Maryville, in the State of Missouri;

S. 5594. An act for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at or near the easterly end of Michigan Island, Apostle Group, westerly end of Lake Superior, Wisconsin;

S. 4687. An act to relieve William G. Gosslin and his assigns of and from the effect of a release made by him and his wife, Marthena Gosslin, of certain land in California;

S. 2671. An act authorizing extra officers for the Army;

S. 5123. An act to authorize the extension of the public building in the city of Manchester, N. H., and for other purposes;

S. 6071. An act 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;

S. 5617. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept and care for gifts presented to vessels of the Navy of the United States;

S. 2969. An act for the relief of O. Maury & Co., of Bordeaux, France;

S. 4545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept conveyances in the United States of lands from the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 5262. An act to repeal an act approved April 30, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes," and for other purposes;

S. 5530. An act to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island;

S. 568. An act for the relief of Capt. George Van Orden, United States Marine Corps;

S. 1368. An act to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amounts paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900;

S. 3126. An act to carry into effect the judgment of the Court of Claims in favor of the contractors for building the U. S. battle ship *Indiana*;

S. 6006. An act to correct the military record of John M. Miller;

S. 4749. An act for the relief of Dewitt Eastman;

S. 5938. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war, and certain widows and helpless and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 158. An act for the establishment of a park at the junction of Maryland avenue, Fifteenth street, and H street, NE., Washington, D. C.;

S. 4713. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands belonging to the Indians on the Siletz Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon;

S. 6192. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war, and to certain widows and helpless and dependent children of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 5473. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy in certain cases to mitigate or remit the loss of rights of citizenship imposed by law upon deserters from the naval service; and

S. 3869. An act to amend the laws of the United States relating to the registration of trade-marks.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 41.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of Pigeon River

from its mouth, in the vicinity of Port Sheldon, Mich., for 4 miles, with a view to providing a 10-foot channel and turning basin, and to submit estimates for the same.

Senate concurrent resolution 44.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and to submit a plan and estimate for dredging and otherwise improving the navigation of each of the following-named waters:

The upper waters of the Pokomoke River from the town of Snow Hill, Md., up to or near the town of Gumboro, Del.

The Nanticoke River from the town of Seaford to the town of Middleford, in Sussex County, Del.

The Christiana River from the city of Wilmington to the town of Christiana, in Newcastle County, Del.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 10671. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple for certain lands of the Santee Reservation, in Nebraska, to the directors of school district No. 36, in Knox County, Nebr.;

H. R. 13875. An act for the relief of John V. Johnson;

H. R. 17510. An act to authorize the county of Ashley, in the State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew, Ashley County, Ark., at Portland;

H. R. 17512. An act to authorize the county of Ashley, in the State of Arkansas, to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew, Ashley County, Ark., at Wilmoit;

H. R. 6902. An act for the relief of Henry Rustan;

H. R. 16471. An act for the relief of George H. Penrose;

H. R. 17511. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew, at Parkdale, Ashley County, Ark.;

H. R. 14772. An act prescribing what shall constitute a legal cord of wood in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9079. An act to extend Port Arthur, in the State of Texas, the privileges of immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise;

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 29) to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. PAYNTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to present for consideration of the committee the facts in a matter of great importance—the Oregon and California Railroad land grant.

The area of land devoted to agriculture and the quantity of products derived therefrom must steadily increase to meet the needs of our rapidly multiplying population. The Department of Agriculture is rendering a service of incalculable value. By its assistance old lands are put to more productive uses and lands heretofore considered unavailable are becoming an unexpected source of supply. Present fruits and crops are being improved. Introductions from abroad enrich the long-settled sections, and drought resistants and improved methods are conquering the lands heretofore designated as desert. The millions appropriated to agriculture are an investment paying dividends every day and yielding the peaceable fruits of prosperity every season. The farmers more than any other single body of our people have planted the principles of our Republic throughout the land; around their every fireside are cherished the rights and liberties, secured and retained at an inestimable cost; while every lowing herd, fruitful field, and profitable orchard are the visible signs of such enfranchisement. It is the duty of the legislator, as far as he has right to act, to enable all available areas to render their contributions to the public welfare and the public support.

Therefore at this time I desire to present for the consideration of the House some facts relative to the present condition and future welfare of an agricultural district prepared by nature for the dwelling place of a prosperous and numerous people. This is the First Congressional District of Oregon, which I have the honor to represent. In it the fruits, grains, and plants that grow in temperate climes are profitably and abundantly produced. It is plentifully watered and has resources of water power that, either directly or in the form of electric current, will continually operate large and varied industries. It is also rich in the resources of the forest and the mine. Its opportunities are attracting to it capital in search of investment, labor seeking wages, and settlers seeking homes. This district is remarkable because of the great proportion of people who own their homes. The continual increase in the

population has emphasized the existence of a situation inimical to its development and settlement, and it is of this that I specially desire to speak. Senate joint resolution No. 48 of this Congress, now pending before this House, upon the favorable report of the Committee on the Public Lands, is the first step in the solution of a problem.

It has for its purpose the making available for development and settlement an area exceeding the combined areas of the States of Rhode Island and Delaware; it purposes to break the grip by which a great land monopoly holds such an area in idleness, without right, and restrains the people of the United States from the enjoyment of some 2,300,000 acres—2,000,000 acres patented and 300,000 acres claimed and awaiting patent—that Congress determined by law should be devoted to their use and maintenance. Briefly, the history is that by the act of July 25, 1866, Congress offered a grant of 12,800 acres of land for every mile of railroad which some company, to be designated by the legislature of the State of Oregon, should build from Portland to the California line. Such lands were to be the odd-numbered sections for 20 miles on each side of the line of the road, and in case any such lands were already occupied, then the company should have the right to select indemnity lands from lands lying within an additional 10 miles on either side. The line of the road would naturally run, and does run, through the heart of the Willamette, Umpqua, and Rogue River valleys, as fertile lands as any in the country. There was a company ready to apply for the grant, incorporated under the name of the Oregon Central Railroad Company, and was properly designated by the State legislature. It decided to build a road on the west side of the Willamette River from Portland southward.

Shortly thereafter a rival company was organized for the purpose of building a road on the east side of the river and making claim to the grant by the same name. These two companies were locally known as the "West Side Company" and the "East Side Company." The West Side Company accepted the grant within the time prescribed by the act of July 25, 1866, but it failed to build the road and finally abandoned all claim to the grant and received another grant by the act of May 4, 1870. The East Side Company induced the Oregon legislature to rescind its former designation and to designate the East Side Company on October 20, 1868. But as the time to accept the grant had now expired, the East Side Company applied to Congress to extend it, representing that the grant had lapsed. Congress so understood it and acted upon the theory that it was called upon to practically make a new grant and had the right to impose terms. Having changed its policy regarding the disposal of the public domain, it enacted, by the act of April 10, 1869, that the railroad company should sell the lands granted to actual settlers in quantities not exceeding 160 acres to any one person and at a price not exceeding \$2.50 per acre. That is, the company was given a bonus for construction purposes, to be derived from a sale of the lands and not exceeding \$32,000 per mile of road, by the proviso in the act that at the same time would locate settlers along the line. It was a wise and just policy.

It was to enable a useful thoroughfare to be constructed, yet at the same time prevent a land monopoly and encourage settlement. So the grant never became vested except by virtue of and subject to the provisions of this act of April 10, 1869. The present holder of the grant, the Oregon and California Railroad Company, was organized on March 17, 1870, and shortly thereafter became the successor to whatever interests the East Side Company had.

For many years the lands were sold in more or less substantial compliance with the law, and although disputes arose occasionally, no serious conflict of public welfare with private intention occurred until in the early part of the decade, 1890–1900, when the railroad company began selling the land in great quantities in flagrant violation of the terms of its grant, and when about the year 1902 it ceased selling altogether. With increasing immigration and industries these lands were in demand, but when applications for purchase were made they were almost entirely denied.

The amount sold since 1902, so far as I can ascertain, is a very small quantity. The people began to inquire what measures of relief were possible. Various organizations of a public character discussed the problem. It became a general issue. The refusal to sell is a serious impediment to our prosperity and growth. The legislature in 1907 prepared a solemn memorial appealing to the General Government for relief. That memorial was presented to the last Congress. Since the lands are almost wholly located in my district, it became my duty as the Representative to urge the Government to enforce the terms of the proviso and to protect the rights of the people.

On March 7, 1907, I addressed a letter to the Department of the Interior, which was answered by Hon. R. A. Ballinger, then Commissioner of the General Land Office; while in his opinion the matter was one for the courts to decide, he said in his letter under date of March 19, 1907:

The power of Congress to prescribe the proviso can not be questioned, in my judgment, in view of the fact that it was made in consideration of the extension of time granted the company, and the company is therefore without authority to sell these lands to any other person, in any other amount, or for a greater price than that prescribed in the proviso, and any conveyance which the company has attempted to make on a sale made in violation of the statute would not be sustained by the courts.

The matter was then laid before the Department of Justice, which, during the summer of 1907, sent Mr. B. D. Townsend, an attorney of North Dakota, to Oregon. He has thoroughly investigated the law and the transactions of the railroad thereunder. A summary of his findings is ably given in Senate Document No. 279, presented to this Congress. The history of the case has been previously briefly stated. The act of April 10, 1869, provided that the land should be sold in tracts not exceeding 160 acres, at a price not exceeding \$2.50 per acre, and to actual settlers. The restriction as to area and settlement followed the practice of the homestead laws. The following is a statement of the practice of the railroad company, the grantees:

There have been deeded in compliance with the law 127,418.57 acres. There have been deeded in tracts of 160 acres or less to settlers, but at a price exceeding \$2.50 per acre, 120,205.05 acres. There have been contracted under the same conditions 50,356.58 acres, making a total of 170,561.63 acres.

In any proceedings contemplated it is not anticipated that these sales, amounting to 297,980.20 acres, will in any way be brought into question.

There have been sold in quantities exceeding 160 acres, but less than 640 acres, 91,900.04 acres; in quantities exceeding 640 acres, but less than 2,000 acres, 57,802.02 acres; in quantities exceeding 2,000 acres, 366,266.20 acres, making a total of 515,928.26 acres. These large sales, being substantial violations of the law, were made as follows, according to dates given in the deeds:

From 1872 to 1898, if we exclude sales of less than 640 acres, 13,933.24 acres were sold.

From 1898 until the company ceased selling, including sales only in excess of 640 acres, 410,095.34 acres were sold. Many of the sales were made on contracts extending over a term of years and did not become known until deeds were issued. Thus the serious and important violations complained of by the Government and the people are of recent date.

Congress took every precaution to prevent the establishment of a great land monopoly. The Government now, finding that precaution openly and persistently nullified, has undertaken measures of relief. Moreover, the president of the controlling company announced in a public speech in September, 1907, at Oakland, Cal., in answer to questions by the governor of Oregon, that the policy of refusing to sell any more land in obedience to the law, or otherwise, which has been in force since 1902, with immaterial exceptions, was to be continued as a permanent policy. Congress is, therefore, presented with this question: Shall it permit a company which has persistently and flagrantly violated the law to now unlawfully withdraw and withhold from sale some 2,300,000 acres of land, for which there are numerous demands under the law, as a reward for continuous violations, or shall Congress authorize the Department of Justice to submit to the courts of the United States all the questions involved and ask all appropriate remedies, that injustice may not be done?

Mr. Chairman, at this time I ask unanimous consent to insert the following tables, and other matters pertinent to this subject, in my remarks without reading and to extend them in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAWLEY. I submit below the following tables from Senate Document No. 279, pages 9, 10, and 11, of this Congress for the information of the House, but which I will not read at this time:

Tabulated statements: As a part of the work heretofore prosecuted by the Department of Justice, a complete statement has been obtained from the public records, the records of the railroad company, and other sources, showing all sales made by the railroad company. The work in Oregon was completed November 1, 1907. Records made since that time are therefore not included in the statements tabulated. These statements include all conveyances executed by the railroad company, together with all contracts now pending. As to the former, the exact purchase price was ascertained in each instance; as to the latter, this was impossible; but sufficient information was obtained to justify the estimate of \$7 per acre as the average purchase price of the pending contracts, and this estimate is used so far as contracts are concerned in making up the following statements.

In these compilations no attempt has been made to distinguish sales to actual settlers from sales to speculators. It may be safely stated, however, that none of the large sales are to actual settlers, and that even a large proportion of the smaller sales were made to speculators.

Total sales.

Conveyances.	Number.	Acres.	Purchase price.
DEEDS.			
Act of July 25, 1896.....	4,159	588,078.62	\$2,901,954.68
Act of May 4, 1870.....	246	22,136.78	86,450.30
Total deeds.....	4,405	610,215.40	2,988,404.98
PENDING CONTRACTS.			
Act of July 25, 1896.....	883	154,335.16	1,080,346.12
Act of May 4, 1870.....	35	49,358.26	345,507.82
Total contracts.....	918	203,693.42	1,425,853.94
Total sales.....	5,323	813,908.82	4,414,258.92

Average purchase price per acre, approximately, \$5.42.

The following statement has been prepared to demonstrate the extent to which the conditions of the grant have been violated in the disposition of the lands. The sales are classified according to the number of acres conveyed and the purchase price. Conveyances for 160 acres or less are classified to indicate those wherein the purchase price exceeded \$2.50 per acre. As to conveyances for more than 160 acres, this distinction is not observed, because the excessive quantity of land conveyed rendered such conveyances violations of the conditions of the grant. It may be stated, however, that with two or three unimportant exceptions all of the conveyances of large quantities are also at a price in excess of \$2.50 per acre. Both grants are included in the following statements. Conveyances are treated separately from pending contracts.

Deeds conveying—	Number.	Acres.	Purchase price.
160 acres or less, at \$2.50 per acre or less.....	1,947	127,418.57	\$282,091.33
160 acres or less, at a price exceeding \$2.50 per acre.....	2,148	120,205.05	493,098.30
Exceeding 160 acres, but less than 640 acres.....	233	75,023.41	250,883.52
Exceeding 640 acres, but less than 2,000 acres.....	46	51,102.02	335,555.91
2,000 acres or more.....	31	236,466.35	1,626,773.92
Total deeds.....	4,405	610,215.40	2,988,404.98

The following statement contains the same information concerning pending contracts, except that no distinction is made as to purchase price for the reason that all of the pending contracts are for a price in excess of \$2.50 per acre.

Contracts to convey—	Number.	Acres.	Purchase price.
160 acres or less.....	857	50,356.58	\$352,496.06
Exceeding 160 acres, but less than 640 acres.....	46	16,876.63	118,136.41
Exceeding 640 acres, but less than 2,000 acres.....	7	6,700.36	46,902.52
Exceeding 2,000 acres.....	8	129,759.85	908,318.95
Total contracts.....	918	203,693.42	1,425,853.94

Combining conveyances with pending contracts, we have the following:

	Number.	Acres.	Purchase price.
Sales within limitations both as to quantity and purchase price.....	1,947	127,418.57	\$282,091.33
Sales within limitations as to quantity, but at a price exceeding \$2.50 per acre.....	3,005	170,561.63	845,564.36
Sales in quantities exceeding 160 acres.....	371	515,928.62	3,293,573.23
Total sales.....	5,323	813,908.82	4,414,258.92

To illustrate the point that the large substantial violations have occurred recently the following statement has been prepared. The sales are compiled by two periods, the first one from 1872 to 1897, inclusive, and the second one from 1898 to 1907, inclusive:

	1872 to 1897.		1898 to 1907.	
	Acres.	Purchase price.	Acres.	Purchase price.
160 acres or less, at \$2.50 per acre or less.....	100,458.16	\$215,879.47	26,960.41	\$66,211.86
160 acres or less, at a price exceeding \$2.50 per acre.....	55,240.39	206,140.32	115,321.24	639,454.04
Exceeding 160 acres, but less than 640 acres.....	34,223.50	80,388.75	57,676.45	288,633.18
Exceeding 640 acres, but less than 2,000 acres.....	11,668.54	42,117.21	46,103.84	340,341.22
Exceeding 2,000 acres.....	2,234.70	4,579.40	363,991.50	2,530,513.47
Total.....	203,855.38	549,105.15	610,053.44	3,865,153.77

The following table contains comparative totals of sales in quantities exceeding 160 acres, compiled for the same periods:

Period.	Acres.	Purchase price.
1872 to 1897.....	48,156.83	\$127,085.36
1898 to 1907.....	467,771.79	3,159,487.87

Again, taking the sales in quantities exceeding 2,000 acres, the contrast is even more marked, as appears in the following table:

Period.	Sales.	Acres.	Purchase price.
1872 to 1897.....	1	2,234.70	\$4,579.40
1898 to 1907.....	39	363,991.50	2,530,513.47

The one instance during the period 1872 to 1897 occurred in the year 1893.

Thus it appears that of 813,908.82 acres sold by the railroad company, only 127,418.57 acres were sold within the limitations of quantity and purchase price prescribed by the grant; and 515,928.62 acres were sold in quantities exceeding 160 acres, of which 363,991.50 acres were conveyed or sold to thirty-eight purchasers in quantities exceeding 2,000 acres to each purchaser, since the year 1897.

The foregoing tabulations appear inconsistent with the former statement that the large sales to timber men and speculators commenced about 1890. A word of explanation is necessary. With but one exception, all of the large sales were made by contract, providing for the payment of the purchase price in from seven to ten annual installments. Therefore, the large sales contracted in 1890 and succeeding years did not appear of record until the deeds were executed, commencing in December, 1897. The foregoing tabulations are based upon the date of the deeds, except as to pending contracts. The one exception referred to was the one instance of the large sale in 1893, which was a sale for cash instead of by contract. It should be added that many of the deeds were not recorded until long after they were executed, and several of the larger deeds have never been recorded.

In the foregoing tabulations no account has been taken of instances where more than one deed was given to a single purchaser. By combining the deeds executed by the railroad company to each purchaser, the extent of the violations will appear considerably greater than shown by the statement. Several purchasers received from ten to thirty deeds each, and in some of these instances each of the deeds was for 160 acres or less, and therefore appear in the compilations as non-violations.

NATURE OF THE GRANT.

The act of 1869 was passed at the earnest solicitation of the company which received the grant, and they fully understood its terms, and filed a formal consent and acceptance of them. They know and always have known what was given them, as is shown by the substantial compliance with the terms of the grant for many years, and by the character of the deeds given by them. The terms of the proviso became operative only when the lands were transferred to the railroad to be sold by it. The Government, in order to assist the railroad in the sale of its lands, raised the price of the public lands within the limits of the grant to \$2.50 per acre.

House Report No. 1301, from the Committee on the Public Lands of this Congress, says:

The grant extends entirely across the western part of Oregon, the richest part of the State, and embraces every odd section within 20 miles of the railroad, with 10 miles indemnity limits to compensate for losses within the place limits. Under the grants 2,800,000 acres of land have already been patented to the railroad company and approximately 300,000 acres more are claimed. By reason of delays in constructing the railroad, and from other causes not attributable to the Government, only approximately 300,000 acres were patented prior to the year 1893. Commencing with the last-named year, patents were rapidly issued until the year 1906, until the total amount patented was slightly in excess of 2,800,000 acres. So that the entire transaction is really more recent than the date of the original act would indicate. As a matter of fact, nearly all of the land has been received by the company in comparatively recent years.

NATURE OF THE DEEDS GIVEN.

On this subject I quote from Senate Document No. 279, page 8, as follows:

Nor was the railroad company unconscious of its offending. It realized the responsibilities it was incurring and adopted significant measures of defense. Prior to 1890 the railroad company had always given conveyances in the so-called "grant, bargain, and sale" form of deed, with implied covenants. There was no reason why it should change so long as it restricted itself to at least a substantial observance of the law. In 1891, however, it changed all of its forms of deeds and contracts and has ever since refused to execute anything but a quitclaim form of deed, except where it had by prior contract obligated itself to do otherwise. This is a most unusual circumstance. The title of the railroad company consisted simply of a grant from the United States. What liability did it seek to avoid by this unusual precaution?

Thus we find at about the year 1890 an unexpected and substantial demand for land, which gave the railroad company an opportunity to make wholesale violations of the terms of the grants with great profit. It immediately determined to take advantage of that opportunity, wholly ignoring the conditions of the grants, and sought protection against responsibility for these violations of the law by the adoption of the quitclaim form of conveyance. This policy was pursued by the company without restriction until 1902, during which period approximately 400,000 acres of land were sold to timbermen and speculators in quantities exceeding 1,000 acres to each purchaser.

I beg permission to insert here an editorial from the issue of February 26, 1908, of the Morning Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., a great newspaper. It has rendered invaluable assistance in this matter:

[Editorial of the Morning Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., February 26, 1908.]

RAILROAD LAND FRAUD.

Fraud has always marked the railroad land grants in Oregon. The land was obtained by fraud and the parts sold have been disposed of by fraudulent violation of the terms of the grants. More than 2,000,000 acres are held by the Southern Pacific in disobedience of those terms.

The Oregon and California Railroad repudiated the conditions attached to the grants for protection of the public interest from the very first. The land was given to the railroad in trust, to aid construction of its lines, and to be disposed of as the Government would have sold it to settlers. But the railroad assumed absolute ownership and has refused to sell the lands as the terms require—namely, at a price not exceeding \$2.50 an acre, in quantities of not more than 160 acres to each purchaser, and to actual settlers only.

Details of this unlawful grab have been exposed for the first time, completely and consecutively, by B. D. Townsend, special attorney for the Department of Justice. "The provisions of the grants restricting the manner of sales," says Mr. Townsend in his report, "have never been respected. The lands have been sold to any person, whether settler or speculator, in as large quantities as possible and at the highest prices possible. In making sales the railroad has always observed the law of supply and demand and has never obeyed the law of Congress."

The very purpose for which Congress inserted the restrictions in the grants—to prevent speculation in the land by the railroad and others in large quantities and creation of a great estate—the railroad has thwarted by ignoring the restrictions and asserting absolute ownership of the land. And now a vast proprietorship is in the hands of Harriman, which he announces he will keep.

The people of Oregon long have needed the information contained in the report of Mr. Townsend. The railroad has sold only 15 per cent of the land that has passed out of its hands in compliance with the granting acts. It now holds in violation of those acts, refusing to sell, 2,080,306.44 acres, or 72 per cent of what it has received from the Government. It has sold only 4½ per cent in compliance with the law.

The report shows that the land patented to the railroad amounts to 2,894,215.26 acres, and that the railroad has filed selections for 300,000 acres more; that the railroad has sold 610,215.40 acres and contracted to sell 203,693.42 acres additional, a total of 813,908.82; that it has sold in compliance with the acts of Congress—as to \$2.50 an acre price limit and 160-acre quantity limit to each purchaser—127,418.57 acres; that it has sold within the acreage limit of 160 acres to each purchaser, but exceeding the \$2.50 an acre price, only 170,561.63, and has sold in excess of the 160-acre limit 515,928.62 acres. Of the last-named total 363,991.50 were purchased by thirty-eight individuals, in quantities exceeding 2,000 by each purchaser, in the last ten years, since the demand for timber land has been active.

In the total of conveyances only 1,947 sales have complied with the \$2.50 an acre and 160-acre limits, and 3,376 sales have violated those restrictions. These totals do not take into account sales in which several deeds were made to one purchaser. Were this done the number of sales obeying the law would be somewhat smaller than 1,947. Between the years 1890 and 1902 the railroad sold 400,000 acres to timbermen and speculators in quantities exceeding 1,000 acres to each purchaser. Late in 1902 the railroad adopted the policy of refusing to sell, and in September, 1907, Mr. Harriman, in a speech at Oakland, Cal., announced that this policy would be permanent.

In 1891 the railroad ceased giving warranty deeds (bargain and sale deeds) and thereafter used the quitclaim form, thereby freeing itself from liability should title be menaced, as now seems likely to occur in cases of transfers in violation of the granting acts.

In the sales so far made, inclusive of deeds given and contracts to convey title yet pending, the average purchase price per acre has been \$5.42, realizing approximately \$4,500,000. If the terms of the granting acts had been observed, the railroad would have received for all the land not more than \$8,000,000. But it now asserts absolute ownership of the remaining lands, amounting to 2,080,306 acres and assessed for taxes in 1906 at \$18,000,000. Up to the present year the railroad has paid \$1,000,000 in taxes on the land. Up to 1891 the total taxes paid were but \$75,000. More than one-half the \$1,000,000 has been paid since 1902. In that year the railroad refused to sell any more land. Then assessors began marking up the land like other holdings. "In other words," says the report, "the greater portion of the taxes paid by the railroad company down to the present time have been incurred by it as a direct result of its own violation of the law. It is difficult to see how any equities can be predicated upon these facts." The total taxes paid by the railroad do not average more than 40 cents an acre.

Here, then, are facts that the people and the Government long have wanted. They reveal a long train of fraud reaching back thirty-five years. This fraud should be terminated. The railroad should be forced to release the lands still in its clutches, either by forfeiture or by order to sell them in obedience to the conditions of the grants. Early adoption of Senator FULFORD's resolution in the House is hoped for and then immediate proceedings in the courts.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS.

On this subject I insert the following from Senate Document No. 279:

The grants placed in the hands of a single proprietor nearly one-half of the lands of western Oregon, subject to conditions, however, intended to insure the distribution of the land in small quantities among the producing class. Notwithstanding these conditions, the greater portion of the land still remains in the hands of a single proprietor, which refuses to sell it, develop it, or improve it; simply holding it to share the benefits which shall result from the labor of others. The effect of these conditions upon commercial development does not require demonstration.

A large part of the land which has in this manner been placed beyond the reach of the American settler is considered by those most familiar with its character to be well adapted to make attractive homes for thousands of our citizens, with abundant opportunity for profitable industry.

In this connection it is proper to consider that the Oregon and California Railroad Company is now a part of a well-organized transportation system, which controls the commerce of approximately one-third of the United States. So far as western Oregon is concerned, this railroad system not only holds an absolute monopoly of transportation, but, through the manipulation of the land grant, it practically controls production.

The following facts are significant: The present transportation facilities of western Oregon are taxed to their full capacity in handling the products of the country. If the railroad company should abandon its present policy and dispose of its land grant to those who would develop it and subject it to productive industry, it is certain that the increased production of the country would be so greatly in excess of the present transportation facilities that competing transportation lines would be attracted to that State. It is equally certain that, with the Southern Pacific interests controlling substantially one-half of the land, no other transportation company, however formidable, is likely to venture into that territory to engage in competition with a system which virtually controls not only transportation, but also production. More than four-fifths of the land grant now held by the railroad company is situated in southern Oregon. At the time the railroad company withdrew its lands from sale, in 1902, southern Oregon was developing rapidly. It was largely this development which taxed the capacity of the existing transportation facilities.

NATURE OF THE LANDS.

These lands are of varied kinds—timbered, agricultural, mining, horticultural, and grazing. While I have not been over all of it, I have seen large portions. The lands lie in the lesser valleys, on the foothills, and on the slopes of the Coast Range and the Cascade Mountains. Even much of the timbered land can be used for agricultural and horticultural purposes, when cleared; and in many portions of it there are fertile open spaces. My information leads me to believe that a considerable portion of it can be used for settlement. Yet the nature of the lands, whether timbered, mineral, horticultural, agricultural, or grazing, can furnish no justification for a violation of the provisions of the law, and especially when tenders of purchase have been made in large numbers to the grantees according to law and sales refused. All kinds of lands are valuable elements in the general development and were reserved to the public use without distinction.

THE LANDS ARE IN DEMAND.

Hundreds of offers have been made by persons desiring to purchase these lands. Such offers have been made by responsible parties, and in many instances have been accompanied by a tender of the full price, as fixed in the law, and the intending purchasers have been willing to comply with the terms of the grant.

REASON FOR THE RESOLUTION.

Senate joint resolution No. 48 asks that the Attorney-General may be given authority to seek all proper remedies in the courts, including forfeiture. The resolution determines no rights but leaves all questions without prejudice to be determined by the courts. It was deemed necessary that the grantor, Congress, should definitely assert its right to reenter, if the remedy of forfeiture is to be decided by the courts to be the proper remedy against the grantees. This is the sole reason for asking Congress to pass the resolution. The resolution was prepared by the Department of Justice, which possesses information equalled in thoroughness only by that of the grantees. After long and adequate deliberation it decided to ask the specific instruction and authority stated in the resolution.

While the resolution recites that "suit or suits" shall be brought, in the discretion of the Attorney-General, it does so that it may not be contended that the Government has waived any right while asking special authorization under the resolution.

The Committee on the Public Lands of this House says, in House Report No. 1301, just issued:

Upon this view of the case the Attorney-General investigated the law concerning his authority to claim forfeiture on behalf of the United States. The Constitution commits the disposition of the public domain to Congress. This includes the power to annex conditions subsequent to a grant, and it is quite probable that a forfeiture for a breach of a condition imposed by Congress can only be claimed by the same authority. Therefore the Attorney-General has requested that Congress shall remove all doubt upon the subject by specifically authorizing him to claim forfeiture on behalf of the United States in suits about to be commenced.

It should be noted that the most important purpose of the resolution is to authorize a claim of forfeiture. The resolution does not arbitrarily declare a forfeiture, but authorizes the courts to ascertain whether the United States is entitled to a forfeiture, and if it so finds, to enforce the same. The Attorney-General already possesses ample authority to assert all other remedies on behalf of the United States. While the resolution directs the Attorney-General to enforce all rights and remedies, including that of forfeiture, it was drawn in this form to preclude any possibility of a construction that other rights and remedies were waived, it being expected that the Attorney-General will urge all remedies which exist in favor of the Government.

In another place in the same report it is said:

After a complete investigation of the facts the Department of Justice concluded to institute suit to enforce the rights and remedies of the United States in the premises. The Attorney-General has ample au-

thority under existing laws to invoke all these remedies except the remedy of forfeiture, concerning which considerable doubt exists. The object of the resolution is to remove this doubt.

STATUS OF PURCHASERS FROM THE GRANTEES.

A large number of amendments have been proposed and considered, but the Department of Justice has been unable to approve any of them. An amendment that would confirm title in purchasers of large quantities of the land would probably, in its opinion, result in defeating action against the railroad for the lands still undisposed of. There may be unknown contracts now in existence, as in the past, conveying the remaining lands as a body or large parts thereof. There is also involved in the effect of any proposed special validation of titles to large purchasers at this time, an early reorganization of the railroad company, and a mortgage made in 1887. The uncertainty on these points is a very serious matter. Until the suit is instituted and the real situation is ascertained, it seems impossible to know what can be and ought to be done in the interest of those who have purchased from the railroad in material violation of the law, without at the same time impairing the rights of the Government as against the grantees.

Moreover, it is understood that there is now under consideration, and to be submitted later as a separate resolution, a resolution which will afford all necessary protection to the purchasers in good faith from the grantees, and which will be mutually satisfactory to the purchasers and to the Department of Justice.

Members of the delegation from Oregon have deliberated over many amendments to the resolution, concerning the large purchasers, with the Department of Justice. They have considered it advisable, however, to support such proposals only as may be approved by the Department, lest the case of the Government against the undisposed-of lands should be weakened or defeated. The probability of large transfers, secretly and recently made in violation of the law, constitutes an element of great danger. Amendments may excuse the railroad for past violations of and from future compliance with the law. Purchasers from the grantees, as I understand, will not be affected by the passage of the resolution. Their status will remain unchanged. As pointed out by Judge Ballinger and in the printed hearings before the committee, action against them, if any be taken, will be to have their conveyances set aside. Should such action be brought it must be decided by the court, which will take into consideration all the facts and circumstances and considerations of public policy in arriving at its conclusion.

The resolution is a formal declaration by the sovereign of its intention to reenter if such is decided by the courts to be its right and the best remedy.

CONCERNING LANDS SOLD.

As I have said, there are nearly 300,000 acres the titles to which, I understand, will never be questioned. I think they can not be questioned. There are some 500,000 acres sold in large quantities. Upon many of these large purchases sawmills have been erected, or they are the sources of log supplies for mills. Many mills have built expensive plants, including logging roads. They are valuable and flourishing industries. The purchasers affirm they bought in good faith and supposed they were getting a good title. Upon this supposition they have made their improvements. I find no wish on the part of anyone to do an injustice, but a desire on the part of all to do all things that are right and equitable under the circumstances.

The purchasers of lands in large quantities from the grantees uniformly assert their belief in the validity of their titles. If they are correct, they have nothing to fear in any event. It seems quite possible, by stipulation, to arrive at a speedy determination of any questions relating to their holdings. Should there be found any case or cases where for any reason the courts could not afford adequate relief, Congress can do so when specific information has been presented.

The Committee on the Public Lands of this House, which has held long and exhaustive hearings, at which all interests were heard, and which has carefully considered all questions involved, in their Report No. 1301, dated March 24, 1908, say:

Many arguments were advanced by these purchasers to support their claim for protection at this time. The subject was thoroughly discussed before the committee. A number of these large purchasers were represented in person, by officers, and by counsel, and the Department of Justice participated in the hearing. The following general features were developed:

First. There is no uniformity in respect to the circumstances under which these large sales were made. It is impossible to define circumstances which were common to all of these cases. The most that probably can be said is that some of them bought the land in violation of the law, but ignorant that the purchases were unlawful.

Second. Every defense urged by these purchasers will be considered by a court of equity, and, if sufficient under the rules of equity, the rights of all parties will be amply protected by the court.

Third. The railroad company was reorganized early in its history, and as it is a purchaser from the company which originally became vested with the grant any amendment of the resolution protecting purchasers would be equally available to the railroad company. Moreover, on July 1, 1887, a mortgage of \$20,000,000 was placed upon the grant and the other property of the company by the railroad company, and each of the amendments proposed would have validated this mortgage and proven an effective obstruction to any suit against the railroad company.

Fourth. It is inadvisable for Congress or any Department of the Government to recognize in advance any equitable or legal rights growing out of these unlawful sales, in view of the fact that the Department of Justice proposes to base its suit against the railroad company upon these unlawful sales.

Fifth. Congress will have ample power to grant any relief to any parties if the final decree rendered shall appear to be harsh or oppressive, and Congress will then have the benefit of a full development of all of the facts and circumstances of these transactions.

It was urged on behalf of these purchasers that in all previous resolutions and acts of Congress directing suits for forfeitures, saving clauses were annexed in favor of innocent purchasers; but it was pointed out by the Department of Justice that in all such cases the ground of forfeiture was not based upon unlawful sales. Upon all former occasions the ground of forfeiture consisted of fraudulent representations as to the construction or completion of the road or some other transaction to which the purchaser was not a party, and in those cases the sales themselves were not in violation of law; but in this case the sales were unlawful and constitute the very ground for the claim of forfeiture. It is apparent that the former acts and resolutions relating to forfeitures furnish no precedent for this case. It is quite clear that Congress should not direct a claim of forfeiture upon the ground that unlawful sales have been made and at the same time in any manner recognize the validity of those sales.

This is a very important matter. A very plain and at the same time a very salutary law has been very flagrantly violated. The Department of Justice has requested Congress to remove every obstacle to the enforcement of the law. It is imperative that Congress should not, in attempting to do so, impose a still greater obstacle and take the risk of destroying whatever rights and remedies the people now have. Even though it be true that parties bought large quantities of these lands through ignorance of the law, they certainly are not in a position to ask Congress to destroy or impair any rights or remedies the Government has against the railroad company. Whatever consideration Congress may ultimately extend to these purchasers, it is clear that the rights of the people must be paramount in the present action of Congress and that no private interests ought to claim consideration in a way that would be to the detriment of the interests of the people, particularly when their equities can and will have full consideration by the courts.

NOT TO RELEASE THE RAILROAD.

It is vital that there should be no release of the Government's interests in the lands still held by the railroad company, for if they are released it amounts to a defeat of the wise and prudent terms of the grant and would be a gift at this time to the company of 2,300,000 acres of land, 3,600 square miles, exceeding the combined areas of Rhode Island and Delaware, three-fourths that of Connecticut, nearly half that of New Jersey, two-fifths that of Massachusetts, and exceeding one-third that of either New Hampshire or Vermont. Its value is more than \$35,000,000. Such a gift can be justified on no grounds whatever. It would be a permanent and serious detriment to our prosperity. The company has persistently ignored its obligations, and recently, in the person of its chief officer, openly repudiated them.

WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE LAND?

If the courts decide that the terms of the grant shall be enforced by specific performance, then the lands will be open to the citizens of the United States under those terms. If forfeiture is declared, then the lands return to the public domain and will be subject to the existing laws and the power of Congress to dispose of the public domain. The question as to the nature of the titles to this land having now become a matter of general public knowledge, it is necessary that the matter be determined as quickly as possible and the questions involved set at rest.

UNLAWFULLY HELD OUT OF USE.

Here is a body of land specifically reserved by Congress for homes for the people. Unlawfully it is a forbidden land. Those who desire to occupy it appeal to the Government to break down the barriers. The people resident in Oregon urge the natural right to grow in numbers and to the opportunity for developing their great natural resources. Oregon is a splendid land. Moses from Pisgah's height never beheld land of equal promise.

We, the people of Oregon, in behalf of our present and future citizenship, ask of Congress to instruct the proper authority to render this land available for the habitations of men.

OUR COUNTRY.

The United States is a great country. While we have only one-fourteenth of the area of the world and one-seventeenth of its population, we carry one-ninth of its commerce and have created one-fourth of its wealth. We have one-half of the total railroad mileage. We produce yearly one-third of all mining products, one-fourth of all manufactures in value, and one-fifth of all agricultural products. The population has increased since 1860 from 31,000,000 to 87,000,000; the wealth has increased

from \$16,000,000,000 to \$108,000,000,000—that is, in forty-seven years the increase in population has been 56,000,000 and the increase of our wealth has been \$92,000,000,000. We ask that Oregon shall have the opportunity to share fully in this unexampled growth and prosperity.

OUR APPEAL.

Oregon is a land whose beauty and charm possess the souls of her people. They love her dearly. She justly demands their devotion and bountifully repays their toil. She gladly welcomes those who come and rejoices in their prosperity. Although she has made excellent advancement in the past, and is now rapidly increasing in wealth and population, there is a serious and unlawful restriction on her progress. It ought to be removed. She appeals to her sister States for the assistance they alone can give. She asks only the fair enforcement of the laws, the rendition of justice and equity to all concerned, the protection of all rights, and that all of these things shall be done by an impartial court. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and yield it to Mr. SCOTT, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

During the above,

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like permission to put this in the RECORD with other documents of the kind concerning this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to insert certain documents in his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

At the conclusion of the remarks,

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the chairman of the committee [Mr. SCOTT].

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GODWIN].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GODWIN. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a bill here directing the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report to Congress upon the following subjects: The location and area of lands in my district that are swamp and overflowed, and susceptible of being drained and made fit for agriculture; the value and effect of drainage on such land and on the public health and upon agriculture; existing legislation of the different States and localities on the subject of drainage and operations thereunder; foreign drainage policies and their results, and the relation of the Federal Government to local authorities and legislation on said subject.

I am very much interested in the reclamation of the swamp lands in my State, and especially in the district which I have the honor to represent upon this floor. But of course I do not wish to appear selfish. I would like to see a general drainage bill passed before the end of this session. I believe there is no subject before this House that deserves greater consideration than legislation looking to the draining of the swamp lands of this country.

The farmers desire to know how they shall procure Federal aid to reclaim their swamp lands. Drainage bills have been introduced here, but Congress has failed to pass them. Why is it that Congress will not commit the Government to the policy of drainage when it has committed the Government to the policy of irrigation? The reclamation of the swamp lands is the antithesis of the irrigation of arid lands. There is too little water on the land above, and there is too much below. If the Federal Government, by act of Congress, is irrigating the arid lands of seventeen States in the West, where there is too little water above, why should it not, by act of Congress, drain the lands in the Eastern States, where there is too much water below?

I desire to read a short extract from the last report of the honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson:

The drainage of the swamp overflowed lands in the humid parts of the United States would extend or greatly improve agriculture over an area almost equal to that of the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. This makes farm drainage a matter of national interest and importance.

Now, the Secretary says that drainage would "extend or greatly improve" the condition of the farmers of this country,

and I ask why it is that the party in power should delay drainage legislation? You will note that the Secretary says that drainage laws would "greatly improve agriculture over an area almost equal to that of the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio," and still drainage bills have been introduced here session after session in the interests of the farmers of this country, and the majority party has permitted Congress to adjourn year after year without passing a single act, and when the farmers ask, "What did you do for us in the way of passing drainage laws?" the answer is, "Nothing!" You will note further that the Secretary says, "This makes farm drainage a matter of national importance." Now, I respectfully submit that if the reclamation of the swamp lands of this country has become a question of national importance, and we have no reason to doubt that it has, this Congress—I mean, this session—should not adjourn before it grants the relief desired by the people.

It has been ascertained by a recent examination by the Committee on Public Lands that the area of swamp land demanding immediate drainage legislation is approximately 50,000,000 acres. The reclamation of this area would increase the land values of the drainage districts more than \$5,000,000,000, and will increase the annual crop values more than \$1,500,000,000.

If it is possible to subdivide this enormous area into 40-acre farms it will supply 2,500,000 families with homes, and it will put 12,000,000 people upon lands that are now practically worthless. It is safe to say that those families will spend \$2,000 in houses and equipments and improvement for their farms. This will cause an expenditure on the waste lands of to-day of more than \$5,000,000,000. An average family of five will spend \$600 per year. That will mean to the business interests an increased trade of \$1,500,000,000 annually over what is now enjoyed.

These vast areas, scattered throughout the country, and many right at the doors of our great cities, offer an opportunity for relieving the overcrowding of cities. Their nearness to centers of population is assurance that when made habitable they will in a measure turn the pendulum of the population from the city back to the farm. On these farms there will be no isolation, no loneliness, and all will be happy. The fertility of soil and the nearness to markets assure dense population, with all the comforts and luxuries of the town and with the healthfulness and freedom of the farm and country.

In many sections of our country requiring reclamation by drainage nearly all the lands cultivable in localities where moisture is supplied by rainfall are already occupied.

The demand for land is increasing every year by the natural increase of native born and by the addition of 1,000,000 foreigners annually who must be provided with homes. What are we to do? We are not making more land, but the population is constantly growing more and more and the demand for land is growing greater and greater as the years go by.

It is beyond controversy that our people must be furnished opportunity to secure homes. Every year this becomes more and more the nation's duty. The greatest and noblest mission of any nation is to settle its citizens in comfort and plenty in homes of their own. As I said, the Government has set itself squarely upon the work of making homes in the desert, and already the sage-brush plain has become peopled with home makers waiting the turning on of the water to engage upon the work of building an empire in a region long vacant and voiceless.

National drainage is as important a work as national irrigation, and when undertaken it will show equal benefits. To-day our vast areas of swamp lands contribute nothing to the nation's wealth or happiness. They are a barrier to growth and development. North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Arkansas, Virginia, Maryland, Indiana, New Jersey, and many other States contain large areas of swamp and overflowed lands, the existence of which is a menace to human prosperity, health, and life.

We have already reached that period of our progress when a study of the conditions of this uninhabited region is imperative, and when a policy of reclamation on the part of the Government is demanded by all citizens who have the general welfare of the nation at heart.

We have many large swamps in North Carolina requiring reclamation by drainage, and one of the largest swamps of my State is of historic interest. It was known and the drainage of its fertile lands discussed in colonial times and in the early days of our country. The famous Irish poet, Tom Moore, while on a visit to the city of Norfolk, in Virginia, in 1803, wrote his famous ballad, entitled "The Lake of the Dismal Swamp."

I said the Federal Government is committed to the policy of

irrigation. An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of said lands was passed by the Fifty-seventh Congress and approved June 17, 1902. This act set aside all moneys received from the sale of public lands in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming as a special fund in the Treasury, to be known as the "reclamation fund," and to be used "in the examination and survey for and the construction and maintenance of irrigation works for the storage, diversion, and development of waters for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands in said States and Territories."

It will be seen that the provisions of this act did not apply to all public-land States in which the Government still holds lands. The States not included in this list may have been omitted, because very little public land is left in them or because they contained little or no land that needed irrigation. It can not be held, however, that by the enactment of this law the Federal Government was simply providing for the irrigation of its own land. The act provides for charges upon lands in private ownership, the charges to be sufficient to repay the money expended by the Government, or at least the part assessed as the equitable proportion that each body of land in private ownership should bear, and to be paid in not more than ten yearly installments. In other words, to the extent that irrigation projects benefit private individuals the Government practically lends the money, to be repaid one-tenth each year for ten years. The money thus repaid goes into the irrigation fund, to be used again in irrigating other lands.

Thus we have the Government, for purposes of irrigation, practically advancing money to individuals. The Secretary of the Interior was required before undertaking any irrigation to first have an examination made to determine if the project was practicable. If a favorable report was made, he was authorized to let contracts for the work.

But if the operation of this law had been confined to the States for which it was first enacted, all public-land States—that is, States whose land was originally owned by the Government and whose private holdings all were derived originally from grants from the Government—it might be claimed that this act was passed with the idea that the Government was spending its money for the purpose of improving its own property and that the improvement of private property was only incidental. But the Fifty-ninth Congress passed an act extending the provisions of this law to the State of Texas.

In Texas the Federal Government does not own one foot of land, except such as it may have bought, just as you or I could buy it. The lands of Texas never belonged to the United States. The magnificent domain of that imperial State was the property of the State, just as was the case with my State, and the others of the thirteen that were the parents of the Union instead of its children. On the idea that the Federal Government is expending its money for the improvement of its own property, there is no more reason why it should irrigate Texas than lands in North Carolina.

The Government is spending money for irrigation in Texas and other States west of the Mississippi, because such work is needed there. It is not spending it in North Carolina and other States east of the Mississippi, because it is not needed for this purpose. In the States whose arid deserts the Government is transforming into gardens of blossoms and bloom, the Government is doing the work, because it can not be done by private individuals.

The water has to be led from its source of supply many miles to reach parts of dry area, giving productiveness to the thirsting soil and life to vegetation all along the way, and extending broad trails of verdure into the desert. Take the case of an owner who lives 30, 40, or 50 miles from the source of supply. He could not get the water; to do so he would have to dig miles of ditches through other men's holdings before it could reach his land at all. He would have to get their consent and probably pay out more than his land would be worth, even when benefited by irrigation.

So the Government steps in and does a work beneficial to all. It is amply able to do it, and those who are benefited pay in easy installments for what they get.

We need not now approve or disapprove the policy of irrigation. It has been adopted. It is in operation and will continue. Only seventeen States and Territories are benefited by it. The others derive no benefits. The law is sectional in its operation and sectional in its benefit, but it is sectional only because one section alone needs work of this kind.

And yet, if we take a narrow view, this irrigation law not only does not benefit the States to which it is not applied, but to some extent it actually hurts them. By converting the deserts of the West into areas of the greatest fertility, the Federal Government is using its influence to keep turned to the West a tide of immigration that otherwise might turn southward. We are not losing, appreciably, on account of the irrigation of the West, but to the extent that if it affects our progress at all it affects it unfavorably.

What, then, shall we do? Demand that irrigation work be stopped? Our demand would not stop its course if we were willing to place ourselves in opposition to the interests of sister States. What we should do is this: Ask the Federal Government to do as much for us as it is doing for others. To this we have a right, and we should assert our right.

But it must be done in another line. We do not need irrigation. The Creator attended to that when He made the land wherein we live. From the mountains that lift their heads higher into the skies than any others on the Atlantic slope to the strip of sand that holds back the battling billows of the ocean there is no desert, there is no arid spot. The rains descend in due time and the unfailing streams wind their ribbons of deeper verdure through a smiling land as their waters go from their birthplace in the mountains to their rest in the bosom of the sea.

Instead of deserts we have swamps. As an original proposition it is just as proper for the Federal Government to expend money in draining swamps as in irrigating arid tracts. Since the States that need irrigation work are receiving it from the Federal Government the claims to drainage of such as need it become stronger. Their claim becomes a right that can not be denied, except through gross injustice. It is the right to equal treatment that equal members of this great Union have.

If the Government proposes to assume the attitude of a father to his children and irrigate the lands of the West, I, for one, insist that North Carolina is not a stepchild. She is as lovely a daughter as any in the family, and is entitled to as good as there is in the house.

The reports of the field operations of the Bureau of Soils of the Department of Agriculture contain much information about the swamps of North Carolina. The area of swamp lands is given as from 3,000 to 5,000 square miles. It must be nearer the latter than the former figure, for the area of what is called Hyde County Swamp is given as nearly 3,000 square miles. This swamp covers part of five counties. It could be easily drained because of its deviation above the adjacent surface.

Some portions have been already reclaimed. Some of this reclaimed land which has been in cultivation one hundred years produces 50 bushels of corn per acre without fertilization and without rotation. No State in the Union averages anything like this yield. The largest average production per acre ever known in the United States was only 30.8 bushels. Professor Emmons says of this land:

The swamp soils of North Carolina show a greater power of endurance than the prairie soils of Illinois.

I tell you these facts, my friends, not because you do not already know them, but because I wish you to know that the value of this land is recognized beyond the limits of my State.

The swamp land of North Carolina is nearly as great in area as that of the little Kingdom of Saxony, which has nearly 5,000,000 people. The swamps of this State, if drained, could easily sustain a larger population than the entire State has at the present time.

They would be capable of growing a vast variety of products. The rice produced in my district is superior to any other grown in the United States. Its superiority is so well known and so generally conceded that the planters in South Carolina and Georgia have for generations been buying it for seed.

It is not generally known, but it is a fact that, looked at in one way and in the best way, North Carolina is the second cotton-producing State in the Union. Of course, the majority of the cotton-growing States produce more cotton than North Carolina, but this State produces more per acre than any other, except Oklahoma, and the productiveness is rapidly increasing. Years ago North Carolina was far down the list, not only in number of bales grown, but also in product per acre; but she has been moving forward so fast that, in the latter respect, she is now next to the top. North Carolina is one of the three States that produce more than half a bale of cotton to the acre. These lands, besides producing an enormous yield of the common variety, would be suitable for the sea-island cotton, which is worth about twice as much as upland cotton per pound.

But the chief value of the drained lands in my State, and especially in my district, would be as the market garden for

the large cities of the North Atlantic seaboard. Their products, if moved by express, could leave their nearest market towns at sunset and be ready for the breakfast table in Washington or Baltimore the next morning, and could reach Philadelphia and New York by noon. The fringe of country down the Atlantic coast is peculiarly adapted to market gardening, not only because of its fertility of soil, but also because of its climate and its proximity to the great markets. In this part of the country isothermal lines do not run east and west, but north-east and southwest. Eastern North Carolina is warmer than northern Georgia or Alabama. It has about the same temperature as middle Georgia and Alabama. Its garden products are ready for the markets at about the same time as those of middle Georgia and Alabama, and are not more than half as far from them in distance or time. On this account market gardening has already become an important industry in this section, and with the addition of the 2,500,000 acres of the most fertile land in America, or the part of it that could profitably be devoted to vegetables, it could supply the large cities with vegetables earlier than the sections farther north, and at less cost for transportation than the sections farther south.

Drainage is of vast importance to the people of North Carolina, but in my district it is too vast an undertaking to be attempted by individual landowners, just as irrigation in the West is too vast an undertaking to be attempted by individual landowners there.

Generally speaking, the swamps of North Carolina are high enough above the sea level and above the neighboring water courses to make their drainage, while out of the reach of individual citizens, a small matter when considered as an undertaking by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I have been speaking largely for the entire State, and while I do not wish to voice the feelings or express the wishes of my worthy colleagues from North Carolina upon this floor, I feel that they will most heartily indorse all I have said. I believe that my district has a larger area requiring reclamation by drainage than any other district in the State, and, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the class of citizens I represent.

My district in North Carolina is peopled by representatives of sturdy races, whose struggles for liberty and freedom date back to periods before the Western World had a place in the dreams of men. It is peopled by men and women from the countries of Europe, who, oppressed in their own lands, long looked forward to American development that they might for themselves and children enjoy that freedom and that liberty of which they had heard and dreamed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I desire to talk for a few moments in a general way concerning the history of agriculture and its present material value, and of how the farmer has fared at the hands of the Government, and, lastly, of agricultural education.

George Washington was a man whose common sense amounted to genius, and this feature of his intellect, with a moral courage that may have been rivaled by the best men of history, but never excelled, wrote his name on the very highest arches of fame, there to shine forever and grow brighter as time goes by.

In his first message to Congress, January 8, 1790, he expressed the hope that the—

advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures by all proper means will not, I trust, need recommendation, nor am I less persuaded that you will agree with me in the opinion that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. * * * Whether this desirable object will best be promoted by affording aids to seminaries already established, or by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients will be worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature.

Notice that of the great triple interests which he mentions agriculture is first, and he links the promotion of agriculture with the university, which means that this industry has a scientific side of interest and value.

In his eighth and last message to Congress (1798), stressing the importance of agriculture, he says:

It will not be doubted that with reference either to individual or national welfare agriculture is of primary importance. In proportion as nations advance in population and other circumstances of maturity, this truth becomes more apparent and renders the cultivation of the soil more and more an object of public patronage. Institutions for promoting it grow up, supported by the public purse; and to what object can it be dedicated with greater propriety? Among the means which have been employed to this end none have been attended with greater success than the establishment of boards (composed of proper characters) charged with collecting and diffusing information, and enabled by premiums and small pecuniary aids to encourage and assist a spirit of discovery and improvement. This species of establishment contributes doubly to the increase of improvement by stimulating to enterprise and experiment, and by drawing to a common center the results everywhere

of skill and observation, and spreading them thence over the whole nation. Experience accordingly has shown that they are very cheap instruments of immense national benefits.

On March 1, 1785, was organized at Philadelphia the first society for the promotion of agriculture, and George Washington and Benjamin Franklin were elected members of it.

I can not further pursue the early history of the beginning of a growing sentiment for agriculture. I merely mention it to emphasize the importance of the subject. Agriculture is always put first in speeches, for there is where it belongs in sentiment and reason, but in the selfish and sometimes tainted efforts of men to lay hold of that which is not theirs, through the forms of law of their own contrivance, agriculture has been in practice sent to the rear, which is a reversal of the natural order of things and can be but temporary.

I shall, after looking at the farmer and his business from a political standpoint, devote whatever time is left to a general review of agricultural education, stressing particularly its study in the common schools, and what the country, through Congress, owes to the farmer in the aid of better educational facilities.

FARM PRODUCTION AND THE SURPLUS.

In this country there are now engaged in agricultural pursuits about 11,000,000 persons, more than one-tenth of the entire population of the nation. The value of all farm property, as shown by the census of 1900, was considerably over \$20,000,000,000, as the following table, furnished to me by the Secretary of Agriculture, exemplifies:

Year.	Number of farms.	Number of acres in farms, 1880-1900.		
		Total.	Improved.	Unimproved.
1900.....	5,737,372	838,591,774	414,498,447	424,093,287
1890 *.....	4,564,641	623,218,619	357,616,755	265,601,834
1880 *.....	4,008,907	536,081,835	284,771,042	251,310,793

* Not including farms of less than 3 acres, which reported the sale of less than \$500 worth of products in the census year.

The value of farm property in 1900, as given by the census, is shown below:

Value of farm property—1880-1900.

Year.	All farm property.	Farm land with improvements, including buildings.	Implements and machinery.	Live stock.
1900.....	\$20,439,901,164	\$16,614,647,491	\$749,775,970	\$3,075,477,703
1890.....	16,082,267,689	13,279,252,649	494,247,467	2,308,767,573
1880.....	12,180,501,538	10,197,096,776	406,520,055	1,576,884,707

* Value of land, with improvements, except buildings, \$13,058,007,995; value of buildings, \$3,556,639,496. The Twelfth Census was the first to collect separate statistics of buildings on farms.

* Including value of live stock on ranges as well as on farms. Value of domestic animals, \$2,979,197,586. This figure is more nearly comparable than that in table with the returns for value of live stock at earlier censuses.

* Including estimated value of live stock on ranges.

The value of farm products in 1899 was given by the census, viz:

Value of products.

Product.	Total.	Fed to live stock.	Not fed to live stock.
Total.....	\$4,717,069,973	\$974,940,616	\$3,742,129,357
Animal products.....	1,718,365,561	—	1,718,365,561
Crops *.....	2,998,704,412	974,940,616	2,023,763,796

* Includes forest products.

The number of persons at least 10 years of age engaged in agricultural pursuits in 1900 was classified by the census as follows:

Occupation.	Total.	Male.	Female.
Agricultural laborers.....	4,410,877	3,747,668	663,209
Dairymen and dairywomen.....	10,875	9,983	892
Farmers, planters, and overseers.....	5,674,875	5,367,169	307,706
Gardeners, florists, etc.....	61,788	58,928	2,860
Lumbermen and raftsmen.....	72,020	71,920	100
Stock raisers, herders, and drovers.....	84,968	83,036	1,932
Turpentine farmers and laborers.....	24,735	24,454	281
Wood choppers.....	36,075	35,962	113
Other agricultural pursuits.....	5,532	5,289	243
Total.....	10,381,765	9,404,429	977,336

The wealth production on farms in 1907 reached the magnificent sum of \$7,412,000,000, not including dairy products, which amounted to \$800,000,000. The animals sold from farms for the year 1907 were worth about \$1,270,000,000, aggregating the grand total of \$9,482,000,000.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS.

Of this production for the year ending June 30, 1907, the domestic exports of farm products were valued at \$1,500,000,000, four-fifths of which were plant products, and chief among them was cotton with the port value of \$482,000,000. The grain and grain products exported were valued at \$184,000,000, the unmanufactured tobacco at \$33,000,000, and oil cake and oil-cake meal at \$26,000,000, the vegetable oils at \$20,000,000, and the fruits at \$17,000,000.

Animals and animal products were exported to the value of \$255,000,000, mostly composed of packing-house products, worth \$203,000,000, or only \$4,000,000 under the high-water mark of 1906. Exported live animals were valued at \$41,000,000 and dairy products at \$6,600,000.

These figures I most earnestly commend to the sober consideration of the farmers of the country in order that they may fully realize the significance of the nation's agricultural interests and its national importance from the standpoint of comparison with other great industrial interests.

MANUFACTURING AND MINING INTERESTS.

The manufacturing and mining interests are the next largest, which, in round numbers, aggregate in value approximately \$15,000,000,000. There are employed in these industries about 5,500,000 persons as wage-earners. The number of owners of mines and manufactories were approximately 1,000,000 persons, making a total of persons engaged in manufacturing and mining in the neighborhood of 6,500,000.

RAILROAD INTERESTS.

The transportation by railroads is the next largest interest. The gross earnings ending June 30, 1906, on 222,340 miles of railroad amounted to \$2,326,000,000, and the net earnings amounted to \$788,887,896. The number of the employees for the same time was 1,521,355.

My object in giving these figures is to show how much greater, in point of fact—with no intention, however, to disparage the other great interests so briefly set forth—is the agricultural interest of the country and to emphasize this great difference. These combined figures are stupendous and tell a fairy tale of material growth and prosperity. Yet they do not tell half the story. If the future could only be read for one hundred years hence these figures would dwindle amazingly.

But I must note, in passing, that through land grants and money donations from the Government and people the railroads have received more than a billion dollars to aid in their construction, and that manufacturing and mining have been the particular wards of the Government for more than forty years, by virtue of the high protective tariff, and as such wards have been the recipients of unknown millions, and are yet its tender wards.

But what has the farmer received? Only here and there a homestead of 160 acres, upon which he has been compelled by law to locate, clear up, improve, and build a home, and become the pioneer of the country's growth, accompanied by sacrifice, and the creator of its social life and the provider of raiment and food for the Government's favorites.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL, SPECIAL PRIVILEGES TO NONE.

In this connection I desire briefly to mention the burdens that the farmer and his business have borne for so many years at the hands of the Republican party and its high protective tariff; that, notwithstanding this, the farmer has prospered, and I want to tell you that his prosperity is due to the age, his industry, thrift, and the remarkable fertility of the soil of our great country, and not to the sacred schedules of the Dingley tariff. The Dingley tariff is a fraud and a failure, as the late and continuing Republican panic has demonstrated. My party has always held that a high protective tariff was a monstrous fraud upon the farmers, and this belief is rapidly gaining ground in all parts of the country.

Agricultural implements and household mechanical implements are now sold abroad, after the expense of transportation is added, 20 per cent cheaper than in our own country. This is such common knowledge and so well known to the farmers everywhere that to illustrate it would be a waste of time.

At last, however, the friends of the high protective tariff say that the schedules will be revised at the next sitting of Congress. Whether or not they will be, if the Republican party should prevail at the fall elections, no human being can tell. That the high protective tariff has ever been an incubus upon the farmer can not be successfully gainsaid; and with-

out going into the history of this subject, I merely desire to give briefly some very interesting figures.

In the ten years from 1850 to 1860, when the Walker tariff prevailed, farm property doubled in value, while from 1860 to 1890, when the war tariff ruled for thirty years, farm property barely doubled again. The ten years between 1890 and 1900 marked an increase of nearly 25 per cent. But during this entire period there was an average increase in the value of urban and city property of about 75 per cent.

LITTLE GAIN TO THE FARMER.

And there is more of this picture for the farmer. He ought to frame it and hang it up in his dining room, so that he can study it while enjoying his meals, and he ought to tell his children how kind he has been to all the interests except his own. You will observe that in 1850 the farmer owned more than half of the country, while in 1900 he owned a little more than one-fifth, and to-day he owns scarcely more than one-sixth. The per capita wealth of the farmer remained practically stationary for the forty years between 1860 and 1900, while city property increased in the neighborhood of sixfold.

Of the \$78,000,000,000 of wealth growth or increase for forty years between 1860 and 1900, less than one-sixth of it went to the farmers, who made up at that time considerably more than one-third of the population, whereas, on the other hand, of the \$9,000,000,000 increase during the ten years between 1850 and 1860 more than 44 per cent of the increase went into the pockets of the farmers. These figures ought to be irrefragable proof of the contention that always has been made by the Democratic party, that high tariff, economically speaking, is the farmer's worst enemy. It is a well-known fact that something like four-fifths of the tariff is paid by the consumer and one-fifth by the exporter and foreign manufacturer. As the farmer is neither an exporter nor a foreign manufacturer, he pays his proportion of the four-fifths of the high tariff, which is robbery.

Without pursuing this subject any further, there can be no doubt but that there would be a marked reduction in the prices of many of the necessary articles of life consumed by the farmer on a reduction of the tariff, which it looks now would come to pass, for I verily believe the Democrats will come into power in 1909. That high tariff is not a panacea for political ills has been forever settled—that panics will come, as Democrats have always contended, when the tariff is sky high, has been also forever settled, and the Republican party has been "knocked silly" on this proposition.

The worst panic that this country has ever witnessed would have been experienced last fall had not the national and State banks seized upon and by force held the reserves that were in the banks throughout the country; and also did the banks, forcibly and without the consent of the depositor, hold the deposits of the country until the storm that lowered so threateningly in November and December had, in a measure, broken. The country banks were forced into this action by the great national banks located at the great financial centers.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION IN AID OF AGRICULTURE.

A number of bills have been introduced in this House for the purpose of aiding the agricultural interests of the country and especially for the purpose of giving aid to agricultural education. The bill that meets my approval in a greater degree than any of the others, and yet is not entirely satisfactory, is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman wish to yield?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I will yield.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. To what gentleman from Minnesota does the gentleman refer?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I agree with all the gentleman says in reference to the bill, and I suggest it was currently reported and generally believed here that he was taken off of that committee by the Republican Speaker of this House because he had introduced that particular bill.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I have understood it to be a fact, that because he introduced a bill looking to a larger diffusion of agricultural education among the masses, and I presume because it called for about \$10,000,000 by the way of an appropriation, which could only be for the benefit of the farmers and the agricultural classes of the country, he was let off or taken off of that committee. Whether this is true or not I am not able to say.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The fact is, though, he is off of the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. That is true.

This bill seeks to fix a tax equal to not more than 10 cents per caput of the population of every State, Territory, and

the District of Columbia, respectively, based upon the last census. This would give to Missouri a sum in the neighborhood of \$300,000 for the purpose of educating the people in things appertaining to agriculture and home making. I believe that the amount of the appropriation, at this time, is too great. The annual appropriation by the Government, under the terms of this bill, could not be less than \$10,000,000, to be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture through the agricultural colleges and experiment stations of the several States.

• Further, the bill requires the establishment of experiment stations in subdivisions of territory not to exceed fifteen counties throughout the States. It seeks to do so much, at once and arbitrarily by force of law, before the country, in my opinion, is ready for it, that the bill from this view point is subject to criticism. The bill is all right as to conception, but we are not prepared for it in its details. In my opinion, if we were ready for the appropriation, it would not be too much. Yea, the farmer is entitled to more when we are prepared to handle it in the right way. But we must grow for several years. However, I am in sympathy with its general purpose, and that is to simulate a deeper interest in the education of the children of to-day in matters pertaining to agricultural pursuits.

It has been currently reported that Mr. DAVIS was taken off the Committee on Agriculture for the reason that he had made his campaign upon a platform in which this bill was the chief plank, and because he had advocated, by correspondence with other Members of Congress, the importance of such a measure, which would redound to the interest of the farmer, especially in the rural districts, as to information valuable to farmers, through the experiment stations and the general diffusion of agricultural education.

HISTORY OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN MISSOURI PRIOR TO 1887.

I have for a number of years felt a deep interest in agricultural education and in its diversified phases.

Man is a land animal and can live only from the fruits of the soil, and he can build no civilization worthy of the name which shall endure that is not based upon agriculture. The closer his communion with this "open sesame" of life and its evolution the better and happier he lives.

The mysteries of agriculture and its science and its practical side can best be learned in a thoroughly equipped agricultural college, which includes the experimental station and the tillable farm, and such schools, manned with men and women in love with their work, sufficiently skilled in the technique and practical work, will give the highest results in the illimitable field of agriculture.

More than twenty years ago, when a member of the Missouri legislature, I had the honor to offer in the senate of Missouri a resolution. The preamble was rather too explicit in reciting past history with respect to the Congressional land grant of July, 1862, and the fund arising from the sale of lands granted to Missouri. This indulgence in history, however, was necessary to awaken public interest. It was necessary to use language calculated to stir the feelings of the public, and particularly of those personally charged with the sale of these lands and the management of the fund, as well as the management of the agricultural college. Hence, the resolution provoked a heated discussion, which resulted in the appointment of a committee to investigate the affairs of the Agricultural College of Missouri, then a mere department of the State University.

As the preamble of the resolution was regarded as rather too caustic, most of it was stricken out and that remaining was doctored so, when adopted, that it was as follows:

Whereas, from general reports and printed catalogues, some person or persons have changed, or sought to change, the name of the university from the "State University," as provided by the constitution of the State, to that of the "Agricultural College and University of the State:" Therefore be it

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the President of the Senate to make a diligent inquiry into the history of the legislation relative to these lands, and the establishment of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, the number of acres sold and the price per acre, the number of acres leased, and the number of acres yet unsold, the investment of the proceeds arising from the sale and leasing thereof, the kind of bonds and stocks purchased, the management of the agricultural and mechanical department of the university, the number of students, of professors, and their salaries, and everything connected with the history, control, and expenditures of such department; and, further, said committee shall carefully inquire of the board of curators of said university who sought to make the change of name above mentioned by what authority it was sought and for what purpose. Further, said committee shall have power and authority to send for persons as witnesses, for papers and documents, and to administer oaths and do all things necessary to a full and thorough investigation thereof; to employ a stenographer to take all the evidence, oral and documentary, considered important by the committee, and the same report to the Senate at the earliest day possible by resolution, bill, or otherwise, and are further authorized to have said report printed at once for the use of the Senate.

WHAT THE COMMITTEE REPORTED.

This committee met in the university building at Columbia February 4, 1887, and after an investigation of almost a week, spent in taking testimony covering the entire history of the agricultural college, its affairs and management, in due time made a report as to the agricultural college, what it had accomplished, and its future, in the following language:

To the senate and house of representatives of the thirty-fourth general assembly of the State of Missouri:

Your joint committee appointed to investigate the condition of the endowment fund, held in trust by the State for the use and benefit of the agricultural college, which is a department of the State University, beg leave to submit the following statement as part of the report to be hereafter made in full:

It will not be disputed but that the evidence taken before the committee shows clearly that the agricultural college has been a failure. The department has graduated during its fifteen years of existence just sixteen students, and only about three of them are farmers.

There has been paid to this department as interest on bonds and land leases something near \$135,000.

Unless some change can be made whereby better results can be obtained, it would be well for the legislature to abolish the law creating the institution.

The fact is, that the agricultural college is so interwoven into the web and woof of the university proper, that it has no identity, no individuality, and, rightfully, no standing at home or abroad. Time has proven that it can not succeed under the present environments and government. Money can not nor never has made a bad government a good one. The agricultural department should be as distinct as the law department or the medical department.

The interest fund would pay a very respectable faculty of professors whose hearts would be in the work, and this should be done, and the thirty-fourth general assembly should be wise and patriotic enough to do it.

Finally, we would recommend that, if the agricultural college can not be reorganized and placed under a different management, with a special faculty, whose purpose it shall be to educate and train the industrial classes for the various practical pursuits of life, it ought to be separated from the university and conducted under a distinct regime and be a distinct college.

It is believed by the committee that it is practical to place the agricultural college under a different management and still leave it a department of the university. Therefore, be it recommended—

M. R. SMITH, Chairman.

This partial report was signed by myself alone for the reason that it was thought to be too radical by the other members of the committee. But subsequent events, which I shall not now discuss, have fully approved of every word and statement made in it, and it is very gratifying to me that this is so.

Later on in the session the whole committee made the following statement as their final report, in the nature of an apology for the old management of the agricultural college:

To the senate and house of representatives of the thirty-fourth general assembly of the State of Missouri:

Your joint committee, which made a partial report of its proceedings herein, beg leave to submit the following as corrective and final:

Actual number of acres outside of railroad belt.....	260,305.22
Number of acres within railroad belt.....	66,737.88
Total number of acres accepted by the State.....	327,043.10
Total number of acres sold.....	249,906.13
Number of acres unsold.....	78,136.97
Sum realized from all sales of land.....	\$322,741.65
Auditor's report shows an investment in agricultural funds.....	\$287,000.00
Amount of deficit.....	\$35,741.65

This deficit, as far as the committee can determine, has been used in the payment of expenses accruing upon the sale of these lands, the investment of the price of the sales, and other contingent expenses.

Also some part was lost by Commissioner Sutherland's defaulting to the amount of \$2,800, and possibly more, since Mr. Todd testified that they could not get the books from him, nor a settlement.

The foregoing statements, accounts, and computations we believe to be true and correct, though we have not had the time to make as full an examination as we would like.

M. R. SMITH.
JAS. C. MCGINNIS.
J. M. PROCTOR.
JAS. P. WOOD.
W. W. COCKE.
R. H. WHITEHEAD.
J. A. ARBUTHNOT.

The Agricultural College of Missouri has an interest-bearing fund of upward of \$400,000, I would say. The exact amount I can not give.

CHANGES FOLLOW INVESTIGATION.

These reports set the public to thinking, and at the next session of the legislature matters at the university, so far as the agricultural department of it was concerned, were vigorously dealt with by a thorough overhauling, and the president of the university lost his position, and yet he was one of the ablest men who ever was at the head of the university. Feeling ran high at the way the agricultural and mechanical department had been managed.

The result, in brief, was what I had recommended in the report signed by myself, that the agricultural college be made an

independent department of the university for special work, and not a mere adjunct to it, used and subordinated to the university for its benefit, together with an absorption of its land-grant trust fund in the general educational work of the institution.

This investigation marked the beginning and growth of a school that ranks high and is to-day doing the very best special work along the lines of scientific and practical work in agricultural education.

I shall mention, at the risk of being charged with egotism, that I had the honor to introduce into the Missouri legislature in 1889 the bill for the establishment of the experimental station at Columbia. The experiment station grew out of, and was a part of, the Hatch Act, which passed Congress on March 2, 1887. The farmers of the country never had a better friend in Congress than Hon. William Hatch, of Missouri. The experiment station at Columbia is one of the very best, and is under the able management of Dr. H. J. Waters, who is deeply in love with the greatest educational movement of the age, and one destined to do more for the elevation of the human family than any other in the whole range of educational work.

For a succinct statement of just what the agricultural college was when it was investigated, I submit the following question and the answer to it by Professor Sanborn, then the so-called dean of the faculty of the agricultural college:

Q. Please explain why there are so few attending the agricultural colleges proper, as students?—A. Well, sir, in the first place, they nowhere in America have accepted the agricultural college as a necessity. Lands in this western country have always been so boundless in extent and so fertile that farmers could see no need of any education to enable them to become farmers; in their estimation no special education was required and no agricultural college was needed. This is the first reason, and the second one, in my opinion, is that our agricultural colleges here have never been equipped to do the work that ought to be done. The professor ought to be able to take the boys out on a farm connected with the college and show them the different breeds of stock and test the results of the different kinds of feed, and so forth, and also to show them the different varieties of fruits, cereals, and grasses, and so forth; the State farm here is entirely unequipped, and I have not felt like I could try to induce young men to come here. I have felt that boys coming to such a poor institution would really not take much interest in an agricultural education, and as a man of truth and honor I could not wish to induce them to come under false claims and pretenses; no college in the country could brag of more students than we would have if we were properly equipped. Kansas boasts of 400 students, but that includes everything; in their agricultural college proper they graduated but one last year, while we graduated five; but I say that in the sense in which we educate them they are not exclusively agricultural students. The difficulty is, the farmers of the country are not ready for what I regard the purely agricultural college; they have not been educated up to it yet and are not ready to receive it.

This is ancient history, but it is now and then well to get our bearings to see how far we have traveled and whether in the right direction. Within the last twenty-five years the world has made its decision "that a physical fact is as sacred as a moral principle," as a great educator said fifty years ago.

Upon this principle the character of education is rapidly changing, and to the forefront is being pushed industrial education by men and women of brains and courage, who shall win the very highest achievements for the nation. But I can not pause here to expatiate upon this entrancing subject.

I am anxious to add my meed of aid to help engage the interest of the agricultural classes to avail themselves of the great opportunities offered to them through the Department of Agriculture in Washington and through the agricultural colleges and experimental stations in every State in the Union, and particularly in Missouri.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

In this connection I regard it as appropriate to say something concerning the Department of Agriculture here in Washington. It is without doubt one of the most effective organizations of its kind in the world, and an outline of some of the most important things that it is doing will not be out of place. It is making careful investigations from day to day, through the Weather Bureau, of the condition of the weather of the country with respect to climatological influences on commerce and agriculture, and the results are given to the public daily through bulletins. The Bureau of Animal Industry is also very important, and through an able staff of experts is giving very thorough consideration, as I am informed, to the question of meat inspection, and this is very gratifying, for the reason that meat products go into every home in the land, and hence this work is calculated to protect the health of the people. It is also devoting much time and investigation to the diseases of animals, the importance of which every farmer and stock raiser knows, and is active in the investigation of conditions affecting quarantine measures in this and foreign countries, and also is active on the subject of opening foreign markets for American meat products, all of which is for the advancement of agriculture and the farmer.

The Bureau of Plant Industry is also very important. It would be too tedious to undertake to discuss in detail the work of this Bureau. However, it devotes much time to the study of plant life in its diversified forms; in the introduction of new crops from foreign countries; in the building up of new crop industries, and the improvement of them, as well as the study of the diseases affecting crops.

The great region west of the one hundredth parallel, known as the "Great Plains section," which is rapidly becoming the Mecca for farmers and people from Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, and other States, is being carefully studied by this Bureau for the purpose of determining what crops can be better grown in that section. Wheat growing was begun there something like seven years ago, and I am informed that there were produced last year from 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 bushels of a new wheat, worth in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000, and it is expected that this yield will steadily increase.

The fruit industry, which is becoming so important in the Middle West, comes in for careful observation, and I want to say that Missouri stands at the head in this respect. Her orchards, vineyards, and fruit plantations are the best, especially those in the southern and western portions of the State. This Bureau has done valuable service through its scientific investigations of the diseases of fruit and in helping to prevent the same. I am informed also that the Department has been successful in later years in greatly benefiting the fruit growers of the country by offering to them new methods of destroying insects that have heretofore so seriously damaged fruit crops. This work, perhaps, comes more directly under the Bureau of Entomology.

Soil surveys have been and are being made all the time throughout the country, and especially in Missouri, which are regarded as of considerable value. I should not forget also to mention the fact that the Office of Public Roads is stimulating and encouraging the improvement of roads, and this is one of the important features of the Department, and yet not enough along this line has been done to be considered of much value; but the future in this respect is encouraging, forecasting it by the bills introduced on road building.

While the Department of Agriculture is fundamentally for research, it is, of course, doing much in a general way. All research work is educational, and I must not forget to mention that this same kind of work is being done by the State experiment stations in a very promising and satisfactory manner.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN MISSOURI AT THIS TIME.

It is with considerable pride that I refer to the fact that Missouri is to the front in many respects in agricultural education, as well as in agricultural production. It has been stated recently upon good authority that nearly one-eighth of all the corn of the United States and more than one-tenth of the corn grown in the world is grown in Missouri.

I believe Missouri has the largest permanent productive school fund of any State in the Union, unless it be Texas. We expend in that State in a single year for schools—public, private, and denominational—about \$11,000,000, which is nearly 10 per cent of the entire assessed valuation of the State, and more than four times as much as is expended in all branches of the State government—executive, legislative, and judicial.

The Missouri State University and Agricultural College at Columbia are doing much toward advancing the higher education of the State. The agricultural college, an independent department of the university—and for the valuable work that it is now doing I claim some of the credit—under the able management of Dean Waters has rapidly advanced to the front rank of institutions of this kind in the United States. It is now graduating from twenty-five to forty young men and women every year, some of whom go into professional life as teachers and experts in the agricultural colleges and experiment stations of the country; but many of them, which is possibly more important, go back to the farms and become farmers and centers of influences in their communities for better farm work and a more aggressive and intelligent citizenship. Others become leaders in agricultural work as heads of departments and bureaus in the Government service. Dr. Beverly T. Galloway, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, is a Missourian and from the Agricultural College of Missouri; he ranks high in his profession, and Missouri is proud of him.

The agricultural college of my State is making a special effort to extend its influence into the homes of the State and to have the elementary branches of agriculture taught in the common schools of the country, which, while it is meeting with success, I am constrained to say, is not being pressed with that zeal and prophetic spirit that the work and cause merit. The normal schools, secondary and primary schools are, however, becoming interested more and more every year in this char-

acter of education, and I should not neglect to say that the normal schools generally are giving a course in agricultural education.

The Missouri State Fruit Experiment Station, located at Mountain Grove, Mo., and supported entirely by the State, is devoted chiefly to the development of the fruit interest of the southern part of the State, which section is rapidly becoming one of the greatest fruit regions in the country.

Summer schools at Columbia, Mo., conducted annually for this purpose, are designed primarily for the purpose of training teachers in elementary agriculture.

The continued future development of the country, it is conceded, must in a large measure depend upon maintaining the fertility of the soil, the greatest storehouse of the country's wealth. Mines become exhausted, forests are cut away, but the soil remains and must be kept rich to assure the nation's growth, and if not, it will decline rather than climb to greater heights of power and prosperity. These facts are of magnificent importance, and yet the importance of agricultural education from another point of view is of immense value, that of training the minds of the children of to-day to be the depositories of the mental dynamics of the future, which are yet to lift the world to better things. It is rapidly becoming recognized as an educational tenet that the training of the hand and mind must go together, and agricultural work in this respect is found in the school garden, nature study, etc. Research work of this kind is equal, if not superior, to any other, and is exceedingly valuable to the general building up of the child, both mentally and physically.

PLEA FOR MORE PRACTICAL EDUCATION.

I believe that education should be more practical, and this need not reduce the cultural influence and benefits in the least. Nothing can be more enriching to the mind of a child or a man than to learn the secret of communing with nature in her many moods and manifestations. The flower, the beetle, the glow-worm, the plant, the tree, the mountain, the river, and the starry heavens are all full of interest and suggestive of the most beautiful and useful thoughts, out of which have grown some of the finest passages in all literature.

Our common schools are rather extraordinary schools than otherwise. The children are given lessons in science, grammar, social economy, French, Latin, drawing, instrumental music, and so forth, often at the expense of learning English and how to spell and read well. They may know how to translate Latin, but not be able to render it into good English. This is farcical.

The need in common schools is thorough training in all the elementary English branches, in bookkeeping and business methods, in nature studies and object lessons.

Let the girls take, as part of their education in the higher branches, the lost science of cooking, housekeeping, and physiology. I am asking, first, for a safe foundation upon which to build a useful, as well as a beautiful, life, for people ought to be sensible, because most of them must earn their bread by work, and all of them ought to be compelled to do the very same thing—be employed in some useful occupation. To those who have means, with a love of learning, I commend a life of study, broad, deep, and thorough, well-rounded, if possible, by extensive travel and observation. We need great scholars; but the people need the industrial education that will make bread easier to win, and they need the time for meditation, the fruitage of nature study. For more than a century the people of America have been at work on the problem of rural reform. Some progress has been made, and we are now prepared for the complete accomplishment of what we have so earnestly sought, the placing of rural life upon a plane of profit, of culture, and power. We must commence at the bottom and readjust the life of the common people.

First, by increasing the earning capacity of the small farmers and by furnishing to them more comfortable homes, better schools, improved highways, telephones, free delivery of mails, and rural libraries. These improvements all require money. They can not be installed and maintained without it; hence, the basis of the better rural life is the greater earning capacity of the farmer. Farm renovation and the highest production are now fully understood, and they can be explained and illustrated in such a simple and practical way that it would be a crime not to send the gospel of maximum production to the farmer. Some persons say that the farmers are a hard class to reach and impress. That is not my experience. They are the most tractable of people if you have anything of value to offer—but they want proof. They do not take kindly to theories and they are quick to discriminate between the real farmer and the book farmer. Hence the message to the farmers must be practical and of easy application. Who shall bear this message? My experience is in favor of farmers of fair education

and acknowledged success on the farm. They are liable to make mistakes, from a scientific standpoint, in delivering it, but these mistakes are easily corrected. The main thing is to get the farmer to act, and no one can do that as well as a fellow-farmer. The scientific man is sure to outdo the thing and the farmer is often disgusted and will not hear him even though he brings the truth. In general, it is not the man who knows the most who is the most successful, but the man who can convince his hearers that he has the truth to tell to them.

THE PROCESS OF TRANSFORMATION.

The process of changing the environment of a farmer is like that of transforming a farm boy into a scholar. First, the farmer may be selected to conduct a simple and inexpensive demonstration. Second, an understanding should be made with the United States Department of Agriculture or the State agricultural college, or both, by which he is to follow certain instructions. Third, he is to have better seed furnished to him by the United States Department of Agriculture. If he succeeds, his name is published in the papers. Fourth, each month, when the Government's field agent goes to examine his experimental farming, many of his neighbors likely will be present, and therefore he will unconsciously strive to improve his farm, so as to be ready for company, and will cultivate his crops better. Fifth, a report of his extra crop is made in the country papers. His neighbors talk about it and want to buy seed. Sixth, he sells the seed of his crop at a high price, and his neighbors inquire how it was all done, and he is invited to address farmers' meetings and institutes, and all at once he becomes a man of influence and a leader in new and better methods.

In not a great while a body of such men will grow up in a township, a county, a district, and finally a State is transformed. Before a change or a reform can take root and be of any value the environment of the people must be broken up and modified or but little permanent good in the way of reform can be expected. The environment of the farmer generally is limited to a few miles around. The experiment and demonstration required to prove the method sought to be established must therefore be carried to this limited area, and it must be shown how easy and simple it is to do valuable work, such as to restore the fertility of the soil, to multiply the products of the land per acre, to increase the number of acres each laborer can till, and show an increased yield of several fold, as well as an increased profit from untilled fields by stock feeding and animal husbandry. This is the farmers' cooperative demonstration work.

EDUCATION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

I must insist that every State superintendent of schools and the deans of all agricultural colleges, including directors of experiment stations and all others interested, should persistently and unceasingly labor for a mature and up-to-date system of elementary education to be taught in all common schools, and especially in the rural schools of our country. This system is most admirably explained in Circular No. 60, by Dr. A. C. True, and which is issued by the Department of Agriculture. This circular, issued from the office of the Director of Experiment Stations, should be read by every wide-awake public school teacher and county superintendent in the land.

This laudable educational work can be best promoted through speeches and by printed letters and articles read before all kinds of farmers' meetings and institutes and agricultural boards, legislative committees and assemblies, and wherever an audience can be found that will hear.

The work certainly is attractive, and full to running over with new thoughts and new ideas which appeal to the imagination and are calculated to fire the mind with the zeal of a crusader on account of what can, beyond dispute, be accomplished by labor. Home, sweet home, with all of its charms and sad reminders floats through the mind with bewitching effect, but I must forego the poetry of my subject and adhere to the practical side.

WORK PROMOTED IN MISSOURI SCHOOLS.

Elementary agriculture is being taught in upward of 3,000 of the public schools in the State of Missouri, and the State's educators are generally alive to this great work and, I am certain, will press on and upward to the achievement of the noble work, philanthropic in a measure, that lies before them, for no more self-sacrificing, industrious, and poorly paid band of workers is to be found in the land than its school-teachers, who are almost always enthusiastic for the public good. I here ask to incorporate some letters from my district on this question:

PERRYVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Perryville, Mo., March 2, 1908.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I received your letter of inquiry to-day and take pleasure in answering at once. This is my first year at Perryville, but I succeeded in getting agriculture introduced into the freshman year of the high school. We have a class of fourteen or fifteen and they are doing good work. All

are very much interested. We have a regular text in the subject. In addition to the text we study the farmers' bulletins.

I am conducting a number of laboratory experiments with soils and seeds. For example, we take four different kinds of soil—clay, fine gravel, white sand, and humus—and test the capillarity of each, the water-holding capacity of each, and the amount of plant food in each, as shown by growing plants.

We test a number of different kinds of seeds for starch, proteids, and oil. We plant the seed in the spring and will carry on some more experiments in that line. We will do grafting and budding and spraying around over the town when the proper season comes for that. Also, we will take up the study of frost and its effects.

I have given the scholars a good start in the study of good stock and farm improvements. I expect to take up the home garden and flowers a little later.

Of course, we can not do the work as it is done where they are equipped for the work, but I assure you that what we do is appreciated and is valuable.

Along with this we have a United States weather observation station here, and that being a part of the Department of Agriculture makes the school work more interesting. I am quite sure that we will draw pupils from the country when our course is better understood. We have about seven country boys and girls in the class now.

Trusting that this information will be of assistance to you, I remain, yours, very respectfully,

J. WILL PIERCE, *Superintendent.*

Hon. MADISON R. SMITH,
House of Representatives.

BONNETERRE, MO., March 17, 1908.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your letter, I will say that we are doing systematic agricultural work in our school here. We have no school garden and so the pupils do a large part of the work on garden plats at their homes. We have systematic class instruction in elementary agriculture.

The school furnishes the flower and vegetable seeds for the children's gardens, and at the opening of school in September a school fair is held at which prizes are offered for the best specimens of different flowers and vegetables raised by the children.

The work has been very successful in the past and is being heartily supported by the people of the community.

Yours, truly,

A. C. MAGILL,
Principal of High School.

Hon. M. R. SMITH,
House of Representatives.

I am in receipt of many other letters, some of which show that systematic work in agriculture is being carried on, but it is in the rural schools that less interest is shown in the matter, most likely because the schools are of short duration and because provisions are not made for carrying on the work. I must add, however, that the letters are all favorable to better agricultural education and clearly show that considerable interest has recently been awakened in the subject.

THE IMPORTANCE OF NATURE STUDY.

Dr. James Ralph Jewell, a very eminent authority on this subject, states that "nature study has already infused new life into our school system, and when made a study as to the relations of man to nature and its forces it produces that general educational result, viz, the proper response of the individual to his environment."

By nature study the child and the teacher are made companions and teach each other and commune with each other, and both commune with the attractions and mysteries of nature together.

To learn to look up to God through nature with reverential spirit is an educational asset more valuable than gold.

The educational, ethical, and economic value of nature study and culture none deny and all admit, and to those teachers who know what it means elucidation is unnecessary, and if any yet do not know, permit me to exhort them to put off sleep until they do know, for the task is not hard.

But this practical value is outweighed by the æsthetic value, its effect on the sentiments of the child. The mental beginning of a true love of nature is the crowning result of nature study, and the chastest sentiments are born within the pure heart of the child, on which the highest conceptions of religion rest, as out of which blossom its rarest flowers.

School gardens teach many other things, among them private care for public property, economy, honesty, application, concentration, justice, the true dignity of labor, and love for the beauties of nature.

"Nature study and school gardens serve better," says President Elliot, "to cultivate the critical discernment of beauty and excellence in nature and in human nature than any other agencies of education."

In conclusion, to build and finish the best character should be the aim of us all, and everyone should help every other with charity to attain this best of all objects. Money, worldly honor, and all that they bring are fleeting and pass away. Only the graces of charity, as St. Paul used it, can create a moral and spiritual organism that shall outlive the wrecks of time and never pass away.

For this highest work the man or the woman bred in the country, blessed with this kind of education, will sooner turn to the graces of charity for the consummation of the noblest of

all the work that man can do—build an immortal character. [Applause.]

During the above,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, as I am not able to make them in the time allotted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SMITH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKS] is recognized.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Members of this House who believe that the time during which we have under consideration a particular bill should not be devoted to general debate. Notwithstanding that, however, I desire to make a few remarks other than those upon the bill. Twice during this session one of my constituents who occupies a seat on the floor of this House has been fit to attack my distinguished constituent who lives at the other end of the Avenue. Four years ago I had the pleasure of running against my colleague. He was then an "also-ran" candidate, and I will be glad to have the pleasure of running against him again on such a platform as he has given us here from his speech in the House. Then, I think, he will be only a "said-to-have ran" candidate, if I am any judge of the temper of the district. His remarks, perhaps, call for no reply from me. I simply wish to say that he has an office in Wall street, and that counts for something.

I wish to apologize for his position. If I thought that what he said had any effect upon that distinguished neighbor of mine, or that anything said here detracted from anything that he has done, or from his record, or from his attitude, or from his standing before the people, I should speak upon it at greater length, but I believe that it availed nothing.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. COCKS of New York. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to know to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. COCKS of New York. I am referring to a gentleman who is a constituent of mine and a resident of my district.

Mr. SULZER. Let us have his name.

Mr. COCKS of New York. He represents the Fourteenth District of New York.

Mr. SULZER. Tell us his name.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Mr. WILLETT, I think, is his name. I regret the gentleman is not here. I do not propose to say anything against him. I simply wish to apologize for him; that is all. Perhaps he does not wish me to say that, but at the same time—

Mr. SULZER. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKS] that his colleague [Mr. WILLETT] does not need the gentleman to apologize for him.

Mr. COCKS of New York. I expect that is right.

Now, as to the bill, I approach this subject from a little different attitude from most Members of the House. I am a farmer myself. I believe that this bill has taken good care of the interests of the farmer, notwithstanding the fact that we will doubtless hear from many on the floor of this House that the farmers are not receiving the recognition that they should have and are not having appropriated for their benefit a sufficient sum in comparison to the sums appropriated for the other Departments of the Government; but I, as a farmer, realize that this appropriation is for the purpose of helping a large class of our people that are engaged in a gainful occupation, and we can not justly compare that with the other Departments, because they look after the maintenance of our Government and its protection.

I believe we have gone very carefully over these items as embraced within this bill. We have provided for funds that are sufficient for the proper carrying on of the work in hand; and it is the desire of all, I believe, of those who really have the interests of the farmers, dairymen, and truck growers in this country at heart that this money spent by the Department of Agriculture shall be wisely spent, that some practical advantage shall arise from the expenditure. I do not feel, like some, desirous of obtaining vast appropriations just for the reason that we could say to our farmer constituents, "We have been able to induce the Congress of the United States to appropriate many millions of dollars for your advantage," but rather that we can show at the end of the year's work that we have added some knowledge that will be of advantage to the farmers of this country; that we have provided some helpful means

whereby they may raise full crops, and that they may combat the enemies by which they are beset. We are desirous that this work shall be conducted along practical lines. We are not so much concerned as to the abstract, scientific value of certain propositions as we are regarding their agricultural economic value.

Therefore, if we have not in some instances made as large appropriations as some Members think necessary for certain lines of work, it is because your committee have been convinced that the appropriations that it has made are those best calculated to attain that end.

I had proposed to make some further remarks upon the bill in general, but the chairman of our committee and other members of our committee who have spoken have covered that subject so fully that I do not feel justified in taking the time of the House in saying anything further on that matter. I believe they have expressed my own views better than I could have expressed them, and, as I know, there are a number of gentlemen who desire to be heard on this bill, I therefore yield the balance of my time back to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LAMB. I ask that the gentleman from Mississippi be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have asked this concession of time in order to discuss some of the features of the pending bill, the particular matter to which I want to direct the attention of the House being the failure of the committee to make proper provision for carrying on the invaluable work of the Bureau of Soils. If the purpose of the committee can be fairly devined from the controversial spirit in which the Chief of that Bureau was cross-examined when he appeared before them, I believe the friends of the Bureau, those who sympathize with its great work and have faith in its possibilities for good, have cause for alarm. Not only did the committee refuse to appropriate what is needed to properly and effectively conduct the experiments of the Bureau and to give to it a relative increase with the other bureaus, but they have, on the contrary, reduced the appropriation from what it was in the last bill. During the past five years the appropriations for the other bureaus have been steadily and wisely increased, but this Bureau, which has such an important—such a vital function—to perform, has suffered an actual curtailment in this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe this discrimination is unwise. I believe the work which this Bureau is doing is fraught with the greatest possibilities for good to the agricultural interests of this country. The purpose of the Department of Agriculture was declared in this language in the act creating it—

That there is hereby established at the seat of government of the United States a Department of Agriculture, the general designs and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

What more useful information could be diffused among the people than that which will teach them how to develop and conserve the productive qualities of the soil? There are only three sources aside from the sea from which we draw our national wealth, according to the statistical abstract. These three are the soil, the forest, and the mine. The waste of the timber wealth of the country is a matter of common knowledge, and I believe I can truthfully say, of common scandal, in spite of the good advice and most strenuous efforts of the Bureau of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture. I am glad to note that this Bureau has been properly cared for in the bill.

I want to call your attention to one or two passages from a very interesting and instructive speech delivered by our most competent forester, Mr. Pinchot, before the American Forestry Association a few weeks ago.

This will show our appalling prodigality in the waste of one of our three sources of wealth, and emphasizes the necessity, if any emphasis be needed, of all the more jealousy in guarding the other two:

Our timber, even at the present rate of consumption, so far as we can measure it, and giving every opportunity for covering mistakes by large estimates, is likely to last us between twenty and thirty years. And our timber is scarcely less necessary for us than our coal. Our forests, from which the timber comes, are vastly more necessary for us than our coal, for from the forests will ultimately come the one great source of power which is renewable and the only one of any great amount—that is, water power. And in our forests, through our water power, we shall find the great support of our future civilization. After a while, when coal is exhausted and oil and gas are gone, the only great source of power, so far as our knowledge of the physical universe now goes, will be water power, and the water power is absolutely and completely dependent upon the forests.

I will read another extract from that same speech, which while it does not refer to forestry, and is not therefore the opinion of an expert, is nevertheless the statement of a very

high authority, a gentleman who has given a great deal of thought to the matter about which he speaks:

There are two kinds of resources, renewable and nonrenewable resources. Resources which come out of the interior of the earth are nonrenewable. Those which come from the surface are most of them renewable. We have treated our mineral resources as if of those there was no end. Many of you here have seen natural gas pouring day and night out of great torches in the States of Indiana and Pennsylvania, from fields now exhausted. Many of you have seen iron mines in full swing where now they are gone; and the same is true of the coal. At our present rate of increase of consumption, our anthracite coal is good for only about 50 years, and our bituminous for only 100 years. That is, within a period of the nation's life which is equivalent to only a single decade in the life of an individual, the nation's supply of fuel, that most essential of all products for our present form of civilization, is likely to be exhausted.

We have treated our soils in precisely the same way. The figures are familiar to most of you. I will simply say that a billion tons of the most fertile soil on the most fertile land of the United States goes annually into the ocean. It is the largest of all taxes paid by the farmer, and one of the largest losses that the nation suffers. Hundreds of square miles a year are made practically uninhabitable, or at least unsuitable for the support of a dense population. The surface of the soil is renewable; the coal, the iron, the oil, the gas, once gone, can never be renewed.

Three natural sources of wealth, Mr. Chairman—the forests, which our Forester says will be exhausted in twenty-five or thirty years; the mines, which will last from fifty to one hundred years longer, and which, unlike the other two sources, the soil and the forest, when once exhausted, can never be restored. And now the committee proposes to curtail the appropriation for the further extension of our efforts to reclaim and preserve the productivity of the soil, the last and the most vitally essential asset of every nation.

No stronger proof of the folly and wickedness of the Dingley law could be demanded than the story which the waste of our forest and mineral wealth tells. Under the false pretense of raising revenue we have fixed our tariff schedules so high that the mines and forests of the world have been cut off from our reach. We have by sheer force of law had our destructive energies focused upon our own natural resources, foolishly believing they were inexhaustible, and now we are just beginning to wake up to the fact that our patrimony has been squandered. The President has summoned the governors of all the States to meet with him and with the Congress on the 15th of May to take counsel together in the hope that some means may be devised to bring us to our senses. I hope he may see fit on that good day to direct attention to the fact that the Republican party has by some legislative legerdemain so fashioned our tariff law as to concentrate all of our unsurpassed genius for waste upon two of our three sources of wealth, and at the same time to produce too little revenue to enable us to properly reclaim and conserve the other one.

Mr. James J. Hill, who is not only a captain of industry, but who is one of the really great men of this generation, in a masterful address delivered before the Minnesota State Fair a year or two ago, made this ominous statement:

It is certainly a moderate statement to say that by the middle of the present century, when our population shall have reached the 200,000,000 mark, our best and most convenient coals will have been so far consumed that the remainder can only be applied to present uses at an enhanced cost which would probably compel entire rearrangement of industries and revolutionize the common lot and common life. This is not a mere possibility but a probability which our country must face.

The waste of our other great mineral product—iron—has kept pace with our prodigality in our coal production.

I will read one other statement from Mr. Hill's great speech:

There is within reach, possibly, 1,500,000,000 tons of merchantable iron ore in the deposits of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan. This will keep our industry going, supposing consumption to remain stationary, for thirty or forty years. In the year 1950, as far as our own resources are concerned, we will approach an ironless age. For a population of 200,000,000 people our own supply of iron will have retreated almost to the company of the precious metals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not alone to legislate for the United States of 1908 or for our present generation, but we, as statesmen, must look to the future. We have no right to waste the magnificent estate that has come down in trust to us from our fathers, but we should so conserve it, we should so manage the affairs of this great Government as to hand over this splendid patrimony to our children unimpaired.

In addition to the natural increase in our population, we have marching toward our shores an army of a million immigrants a year. It is a matter of speculation, of course, what the population of this country will be in any given year in the future, but a number of statisticians have indulged somewhat in prophecy along these lines, and they all agree that by the year 1950 our population will have reached 200,000,000. Some of them far exceed that tremendous figure. I have seen the statement in the press—I do not know how true it is and therefore will not vouch for its accuracy—purporting to have come from the Speaker of this House, in which he says that he can remember when the

population of the United States was 18,000,000, and that in his opinion within the lifetime of men now living it will attain to the tremendous total of 400,000,000. Now, these are immense figures, Mr. Chairman, and they show a situation that is well worthy of our thought.

We have taxed ourselves as few people have ever voluntarily done to foster and encourage the manufacturing industries of the country. Recognizing that in some instances a monopoly is justifiable and advisable, we have passed patent laws in order to encourage inventors and inventions, so that when a man comes with a useful invention, with a device or an idea that is likely to lighten the burdens of men and bring more happiness to more homes, we give him letters patent in order that he may have a monopoly of the sale of the particular scheme or device, and so impose an additional tax upon the people by way of an increased selling price.

Suppose another wizard like Edison should rise up with some scheme or some device whereby he could double the value of our manufactures, or by a discovery of some process of mining he could increase the value of the product of our mines a billion dollars annually. Why, the people would rise up and call his name blessed.

The total value of our agricultural products last year exceeded \$6,000,000,000. Suppose, by some new process or discovery in the Department of Agriculture, a new means of soil reclamation, or soil conservation, or some new adaptation of soil treatment to plant life should be discovered by which the new lands of America can be made to produce as much per acre as the old lands of the Old World. The result would be an addition to our national wealth of not a billion dollars, but \$6,000,000,000, and the base of our industrial fabric so be broadened and strengthened against the siege of hard times and the storm of panic which must sooner or later come to all people. [Applause.]

Is it unreasonable to look for any such discovery? This Bureau has already made some remarkable discoveries. And I do not believe it is unreasonable to expect very much more from it in the future. This is a new country, Mr. Chairman. It is not far beyond the memory of our old men to recall the war whoop of the painted savage, yet it is not uncommon even in the new and fertile valleys of the Mississippi River to hear men speak of fields that are worn out. This is a shame upon ourselves and a sin against posterity. The very fields that were under cultivation when old Canute bade the restless ocean to recede are to-day, after all the centuries of cultivation, yielding more per acre than ever before in the history of England.

We produced in this country last year, according to the statistical abstract, an average of 15½ bushels of wheat to the acre. In England, where the land has been under cultivation for thousands of years, the average yield of wheat land was 33 bushels per acre. In Ireland the average was 37 bushels per acre, in Germany 28 bushels per acre. In all of the countries of the world where the lands have been in cultivation for thousands of years they are producing more than we are to-day.

The Bureau of Soils is doing a great work. There are 400 applications now on file with the Secretary asking for these investigations for soils about the country. Under the appropriation which this bill makes only 59 of the 400 applications can be granted. Now, these applications come from all over the country, from the East and from the West; from every geographical division of the country surveys are asked for in increasing numbers.

It is most natural that the farmers of this country, the people who are interested, and that means all of us, in conserving the productive qualities of our soil should be anxious to have these surveys made. They are anxious that every scientific fact that is possible to be developed and ascertained by experts in the Department should be made known in the hope that we may reclaim what are now becoming worn-out soils.

In the division of States in the North Atlantic group—Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, New Hampshire, and Maine—from 1890 to 1900, as shown by the census figures, the value of farm lands decreased nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars. From all sections of the country applications are piling in upon the Department asking to have these soil surveys made. They are coming from every section of the country asking the same thing.

In the South Atlantic States 103 are asked for; only 14 can be made. In the North Central States 85 are asked for and only 12 can be made. In the South Central division 134 are asked for and only 17 can be made. In the Western division 50 are asked for and only 8 can be made.

An instance of the success attending an intelligent interest on the part of the Government in the study and development of new and scientific methods of soil preservation is furnished

in France. The very fields that were in cultivation when all Gaul was divided into three parts twenty centuries ago are to-day the veritable garden spot of the world, and the soil that furnished sustenance for Caesar's legions then is keeping France in the very forefront of all the nations of the earth to-day.

Wheat lands in Minnesota in 1900, and Minnesota was above the average, produced 14.5 bushels per acre. In the beautiful valley of the Loire in France, which has been in cultivation ever since the wit of man was able to fashion a plow, the yield was 33 bushels per acre.

The fact that our soil is losing its productive qualities is not unique in the history of the world. This condition obtained in England more than a hundred years ago. Her statesmen, appreciating the fact that something would have to be done, established a bureau similar to this in the office of the home secretary, and scientific agriculturists went out through the country to make examination into the condition of the soils and the relation of the soil to plant life, and, in other words, did the things that are being done in our Bureau. No effort was ever more fruitful of happier results. The results were magical. The yield per acre was increased steadily and has yearly resulted in increased crops and increased land rents and increased land values.

In Germany exactly the same result followed, and these governments are to-day having translated into German and French and into other foreign languages the reports that our Bureau of Soils is issuing. They are making investigations along similar lines and making use of the information that comes from our investigations.

Yet the Committee on Agriculture here, instead of increasing the appropriation so as to meet the increasing demands of the people, has in this bill actually curtailed the amount appropriated for these surveys. The Chief of that Bureau told the committee in a most interesting statement that it costs more now, and he gives the reasons for it, to do a given amount of work than it did ten years ago, so that \$200,000 appropriated to-day, or rather \$80,000 to meet this particular work, will do less than \$80,000 ten years ago. It will take, according to the estimates of the Chief of the Bureau, \$200,000 to conduct experiments along the lines that the necessities of the situation require, \$200,000 a year—a mere bagatelle. Yet the committee appropriates for that purpose \$80,000.

According to his estimate, if \$200,000 a year were appropriated it would take twenty years to do the work. Now, can we afford, for the sake of saving \$120,000 a year, to take the chances on this matter? In addition to this, the Chief of the Bureau asks an appropriation in order to have what he calls "soil utilization work"—that is, men to follow in the wake of those who make the surveys to give practical and actual demonstrations to the farmers where the surveys are made, and thus show the advantage that will accrue from this particular work. They have done that in a number of places. It is through the instrumentality of the Bureau of Soils and this utilization work that the alkali lands of the West have been reclaimed, in California, at Fresno; at Yakima, in Washington, and in Utah and in a number of States. First, they made the survey of the soil and ascertained the conditions there, and then put the utilization men in and demonstrated that the alkali could be leached from those alkali plains and the land reclaimed to agriculture.

That has been demonstrated. Alfalfa, which is the most difficult of nearly all plant life to maintain in that character of soil, is to-day being grown successfully on these alkali lands in the West as a result, first, of the soil survey, and then of the demonstration by the utilization men of that Bureau. They have gone into the East first with their surveys and declared that those soils would produce a certain variety of tobacco valuable as cigar wrappers, a very high quality of tobacco. They did that in New England and they made some investigations in Texas. The Chief of the Bureau endeavored to persuade the Secretary of Agriculture to make a demonstration, to plant and see if his theory was correct. He would not do it. It was not the Secretary's judgment. It was not Doctor Galloy's judgment, he tells us. It was nobody's opinion but his own, but he finally persuaded the Secretary to allow him to make the experiment. He did it, and it proved successful in Connecticut, in Alabama, and in Texas, as a result, please bear in mind, of this demonstration made by these utilization men.

Now, for that work he asks an increase in the appropriations heretofore made. It is insisted that this is not a matter properly for his Bureau. I do not believe that is a good answer. It is purely a matter of administration. The money ought to be appropriated for the work, and I can not conceive how a bureau that is not directly interested in demonstrating the correctness of the theory of the survey can do the demonstration work more

effectively or will more surely get results than the bureau itself which has made the survey and has advanced the theory. I have no quarrel, of course, with the Bureau of Plant Industry. I do not think that any bureau in any Department is doing greater good than it is. I am taking no sides whatever in bureau politics. It is immaterial to me by which bureau the work is done, if only it is done. But I submit it ought to be done and the appropriation made in this bill is not sufficient to do it properly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman define what he means by "utilization men?"

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Utilization men are defined in the language of the Chief of the Bureau and if the gentleman will permit me, in answer to that question, I will print his statement on that. That will enlighten the House. Of course, the gentleman himself knows what the Department wants with these utilization men and what they mean by it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all. I do not understand what a utilization man is.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. A utilization man, roughly speaking, is a man who follows in the wake of the man who makes the actual soil survey. For instance, they send a man down in Texas and he makes a soil survey. He finds out those qualities, those elements present in the soil that in his opinion will render that soil suitable for the culture and production of a certain variety of tobacco. That is simply his theory. Of course we can not always make the facts square with our theories, so the chief sends along a utilization man, and he goes down there and makes the actual test. He gets some farmer to go in with him or perhaps to give him a small plat of land for that purpose. He makes a crop of tobacco on it under certain cultural methods that commend themselves to his judgment, and so demonstrates either the correctness or incorrectness of his theory. This was the procedure in the alkali lands of the Far West. For instance, they went out in the State of my friend from Washington and there made a soil survey.

They ascertained the presence of these alkaline salts to a certain depth in the ground, and they believed that subjecting the soils to certain treatment would render them fertile and productive. They thereupon sent a utilization man to demonstrate the correctness of their theory and—

Mr. MURDOCK. The utilization man came from the Bureau of Soils.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. That utilization man did. Now, the idea of the committee, as I understand it, is to turn that demonstration work over to the Bureau of Plant Industry and let them develop it. The point about it is this—

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman allow me? Is that Bureau of Plant Industry also under the supervision of the chief of the Agriculture Department, Secretary Wilson?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; and Doctor Whitney is Chief of the Bureau of Soils and Doctor Galloway is Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. HARDY. So your position is it does not make any difference who does it so there is provision made to do it?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. But there are \$80,000 only appropriated to make soil surveys. That is work that must be done of course by the Bureau of Soils. Only \$80,000 is appropriated for that purpose when in the opinion of the Chief there should be \$200,000, and if \$200,000 a year is appropriated it will still take twenty years to complete the survey of the farm lands which in his opinion ought to be surveyed.

Mr. COCKS of New York rose.

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

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes, I submit.

Mr. COCKS of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks it wise to have utilization men from two different bureaus traveling over the country on practically the same errand?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will answer that, though not as an expert. I have read what appears in the hearings on this subject, and I have been enlightened in private conversations by my friend from New York and by the chairman of the committee, and I am free to confess that I do not catch the full force of the argument that this is a duplication of work. Now, if the Bureau of Soils should send a man out to investigate alkali soils, for instance, and the Bureau of Soils did do it—

Mr. COCKS of New York rose.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I have not finished yet—

and the Bureau of Plant Industry should send a man out to investigate that same thing right there in that same neighborhood under the same climatic conditions, under the same atmospheric conditions, and soil conditions, that would be a duplication, but if this bureau was investigating the conditions of the alkali soils in Washington and another man from the Bureau of Plant Industry should go to Kansas and make an experimental test there to raise this, that, or the other vegetable product on certain soils there, that would not be a duplication of work.

The men would have been sent out from two different bureaus, and reports would have been sent in to two different chiefs, but they would all be printed at last by the Department of Agriculture, and the people would obtain the benefit from them, so it occurs to me that it is a mere technicality to say that it is a duplication of work. The Bureau of Plant Industry is a great bureau, and it is certainly doing a great work well; but the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Bureau of Soils must all lap over onto the work of some other bureau now and then. For instance, the Bureau of Plant Industry is making investigation to ascertain the effect of poisonous plants on animal life and how to eradicate them; plants that grow in the different parts of the country, in the pasture, in the pond, in the field. Cattle and stock generally grazing there drink the water and die, and people do not know what is the trouble.

Now, this Bureau makes an investigation to see if it is not due to the existence of certain plant life there, and they examine the animals, they make post-mortem examinations, and the Bureau of Plant Industry, mind you, is doing this, and properly doing it. That, of course, is overlapping to that extent the work of the Bureau of Animal Industry, but it is a very proper and necessary encroachment and should not be called "duplication." The Bureau of Soils may sometimes overlap the Bureau of Plant Industry, when they have ascertained by a survey that a given soil exists, and knowing the relation it bears to plant life make a demonstration crop to ascertain if this soil will produce the plant indicated. Now, it may be that in that particular way they are overlapping, to some extent, the work of the Bureau of Plant Industry, but it is not a duplication.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Will the gentleman yield? After all, as to the growing of the plant on that land after the soil survey, is not that a demonstration as to what particular plant will grow there—

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes. I stated just now there may be some overlapping, but here the committee fails to appropriate but \$80,000 a year to make the soil surveys.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me return to the thread of my argument, which has been somewhat broken by these interruptions. I want to call your attention more particularly to the experience of France. I think we could not do better than to emulate her example in many ways.

France is perhaps the best illustration of the wisdom of state aid in the reclamation of exhausted soils as well as in the development of up-to-date transportation facilities. The Government has not only aided the farmers in reclaiming and restoring exhausted soils, but it has the best system of waterways and public roads of any other government. What of it, you ask? Well, forty years after she had been beaten prostrate in the terrible war with Germany, when the Iron Chancellor, intending to strike her a blow that would make her a cripple for life, compelled her to pay an indemnity of a billion dollars, she is the most prosperous country in the world.

All the world stood aghast at what they believed was the fall of that great nation when this fine was imposed, but before they could realize what was happening she had not only paid off the tremendous sum, but she had spent almost an equal amount on internal improvements, and to-day she holds fifteen billions of interest-bearing securities of the other nations.

Political changes came in kaleidoscopic succession in the last century, but France is a nation of farmers. She has builded her house upon a rock, and the sun of her prosperity could not be long obscured by the clouds of political strife and war. Among the very first nations of this turbulent earth, first in all the elements that go to make a people great is Germany. There are 60,000,000 people in that great Empire, which embraces an area of 200,000 square miles—a little smaller than Texas. No people ever learned the lesson which we are trying now to teach better than the Germans did. Her progress in the past half century has been tremendous. She has gone out upon the open seas with her wares, and wherever shops are kept and the articles which civilized man requires for his comfort are offered for sale you will find the meaningful legend stamped in letters of light "Made in Germany."

While this is true, Mr. Chairman, the glory of Germany, the rock on which she has builded, is her agriculture. While her manufactures have gone forward by leaps and bounds, her growth has been symmetrical. She has not only increased her acreage, but by the application of scientific methods in soil reclamation and development the yield per acre in all cereals has been materially increased. The increase in yield in wheat in the past thirty years has been 20 per cent, and all other crops in proportion. As stated before, in 1906 our average yield of wheat was 15.5 bushels; the yield in Germany for that same year was 28.55 bushels. Our average yield of oats was 31.2 and her average yield of oats was 43.65. With what shame should we of this country hear of worn-out lands when we see the fields that were ripe with abundant harvests when Arminius destroyed the power of all-conquering Rome yielding more per acre to-day than ever before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, are we, in order to save the paltry sum of \$120,000, to shut off the investigation by this Bureau which may result—I do not say will result; we can not prophesy with absolute assurance—but which may, and we hope will result in the discovery of some methods of soil preservation and reclamation that will enable us to produce as much per acre as our neighbors across the sea? I think that is a serious question, one that is entitled to the attention of this committee. Take the great valley of the Red River of the North. It is contended by many statisticians that it is yielding less per acre as the years go on. What are we to do about it? The average yield per acre in Minnesota in 1890 was 15.5 bushels, and in 1900 it was 14.5 bushels, a loss of 1 bushel per acre on more than six and a half million acres. The average yield per acre in the two Dakotas has been decreasing for the past few years.

Here is the yield for the past three years:

Year.	Average production per acre (bushels).	
	North Dakota.	South Dakota.
1905.	14.0	13.7
1906.	13.0	13.4
1907.	10.0	11.2

What are you going to do about it? Are you going to refuse the appropriation on the plea that you have not sufficient money in the Treasury? Is it true that the representatives of the greatest people upon the earth, the people who buy more and sell more and produce more and consume more than any other people, are unable to devise a fiscal policy that will yield sufficient revenue to properly administer the affairs of the Government? If so, we ought to resign and let some others take our places who will exhibit sufficient statesmanship at least to properly administer the Department of Agriculture.

What about the Dingley tariff? Will not that "do the business?" We have imposed a tariff tax of 15 cents a gallon on the products of petroleum. Does that raise no revenue? Is this levied simply to keep out competition and thereby turn our farmers over to the tender mercies of the Standard Oil? What about the tariff on the products of the steel trust? Does it yield no revenue to Uncle Sam? We know it enables the steel trust to rob our farmers by charging them more for their agricultural implements, barbed wire, wire nails, and all the other products of steel than they charge the farmers of Australasia for the identical articles after transporting them 10,000 miles across the seas. Can not this fiscal heir of all the ages which enables the steel trust to pay one of its officials annually more in salary than we allow the Bureau of Soils in ten years; can not it, I say, scrape up enough revenue to enable us to continue the good work of this Bureau and so advise our farmers how to preserve the productivity of the soil to the end that he may produce enough on his acres to at least pay the tariff tax?

If the Dingley law has lost its charm, if it can no longer with success call spirits from the vasty deep, and if it, being earthly (as we on this side of the Chamber have always suspected), has gone the way of the earth, and yet having been worshiped so long has become too sacred to be profaned by the hand of the revisionists, then let us resort to another method of raising revenue—one that puts the tax on while the man who pays it looks and understands that he is paying it. Let us levy a tax upon the vices of men and not upon their virtues. Let the tax gatherer visit the saloon and the gambling house rather than the altar and the hearthstone. Five cents additional tax on every deck of cards would produce nearly three times over the revenue required to continue this Bureau in an effective way. Twenty-five cents more on every barrel of beer would more than pay the total cost of administering the entire Department of Agriculture.

We on this side of the Chamber are helpless to do more than suggest, but if I had not learned better by long experience I would at least indulge the hope that this suggestion might commend itself to the "party of great moral ideas." [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield fourteen minutes of the time granted to me to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT].

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration the agricultural appropriation bill. It has not been so many years since the Department of Agriculture was established, yet it is conceded by all that this was a good business proposition and has been of untold benefit to the nation and a great factor in the marvelous development of our agricultural resources, and that the money expended for its support was money that has been spent for a good purpose and has been repaid many times in the betterment and increased production of our agricultural products.

In this connection I desire to call your attention briefly to another of our great fundamental industries. I have listened to numerous fine addresses from the many talented gentlemen in this House since Congress convened, discussing the question of finance. I am going to take only a few minutes of your time, and I am not going to talk to you about greenbacks, for in California we use gold for money, with a little silver thrown in to make change.

During the past few months I have received, as no doubt many of you have, a wagonload of fine documents bearing on the question of banking and currency, all written by people who ought to know or think they know something about finance, and who have taken the subject up from almost every imaginable point of view. They all agree that the present financial column supporting the business interests of the United States is weak, and that it is impossible to take this column down and erect an entire new one.

You all agree that this financial column needs attention, but you do not all agree how it should be fixed, where it should be repaired, and what materials should be used.

Now, I propose that good judgment will warrant you in making a few repairs right at the base of the column, on its foundation. This is a material that can be used to advantage at any time in the foundation of your financial column—a real \$20 gold piece.

Gold, the product of our mills and sluices, is a legal tender in itself, a commodity that requires no drumming to sell, a standard of value never depreciating, a bright and rich reward for human industry.

While I have heard and read a great deal on the subject of finance, I have heard no man claim that his proposition on the financial question would do more than afford some relief, in a greater or less degree, and provide for cases of emergency. So that I consider it proper to suggest anything that can be done on practical, not theoretical lines, to afford some relief, not only in emergencies but all the time.

Now, while barrels of ink and thousands of tons of paper are being used and silver-tongued orators are explaining all the various intricacies of the currency question, I want to call your attention to the fact that right now, at the present time, while I am talking to you, the miners of the West are doing their duty, delving into the ground, working by day and by night, taking from Mother Earth this precious metal—gold; adding to the wealth of this nation, bracing up its financial condition, producing millions of dollars monthly, not in bank notes, not in greenbacks, but in pure gold, giving practical, not theoretical, but positive relief to your national finances.

Prior to the year 1848 the production of gold in the United States was practically nothing, when news came from far-off California, the then unknown country in the West, that James W. Marshall, working in the sluice at Sutter's mill, near Coloma, had discovered gold. Immediately there was a rush, and thousands of young men left their homes in the East to make their fortunes in the Golden State, which has turned out to be not only a Golden State, but also a perfect Garden of Eden.

You know the result of this discovery and that the amount of gold since produced gave the business interests of the United States a stimulus which they have felt and are feeling to this day, and which proved itself to be one of the strong factors in the rapid development of our country to its present greatness; and you should know that the gold produced by the hydraulic miners of California helped the credit of this nation during the civil war.

Following the discovery of gold in California was the opening of gold mines in other Western States, so that the production of gold in the United States, practically nothing in the year 1848, reached, in the year 1906, more than \$94,000,000 (\$94,373,800), and in 1907 to about the same, but probably a little less.

Product of gold in the United States for the calendar year 1906:

State or Territory.	Value.	State or Territory.	Value.
Alabama.....	\$23,500	Oregon.....	\$1,320,100
Alaska.....	21,365,100	South Carolina.....	74,600
Arizona.....	2,747,100	South Dakota.....	6,604,900
California.....	18,832,900	Tennessee.....	800
Colorado.....	22,934,400	Texas.....	3,400
Georgia.....	23,700	Utah.....	5,130,900
Idaho.....	1,035,700	Virginia.....	10,300
Montana.....	4,522,000	Washington.....	103,000
Nevada.....	9,278,600	Wyoming.....	5,700
New Mexico.....	266,200		
North Carolina.....	90,900	Total.....	94,373,800

Product of gold in the United States from the year 1792 to 1906:

Year.	Value.	Year.	Value.
1792 to July 31, 1834.....	\$14,000,000	1876.....	\$39,929,200
July 31, 1834, to December 31, 1844.....	7,500,000	1877.....	43,897,400
1845.....	1,008,000	1878.....	51,206,400
1846.....	1,149,000	1879.....	38,000,000
1847.....	839,000	1880.....	36,000,000
1848.....	10,000,000	1881.....	34,700,000
1849.....	40,000,000	1882.....	32,500,000
1850.....	50,000,000	1883.....	30,000,000
1851.....	55,000,000	1884.....	30,800,000
1852.....	60,000,000	1885.....	31,801,000
1853.....	65,000,000	1886.....	34,809,000
1854.....	60,000,000	1887.....	33,136,000
1855.....	55,000,000	1888.....	33,167,500
1856.....	55,000,000	1889.....	32,967,000
1857.....	55,000,000	1890.....	32,845,000
1858.....	55,000,000	1891.....	33,175,000
1859.....	50,000,000	1892.....	33,015,000
1860.....	46,000,000	1893.....	35,955,000
1861.....	43,000,000	1894.....	39,500,000
1862.....	39,200,000	1895.....	46,610,000
1863.....	40,000,000	1896.....	53,083,000
1864.....	46,100,000	1897.....	57,303,000
1865.....	53,225,000	1898.....	64,463,000
1866.....	53,500,000	1899.....	71,055,400
1867.....	51,725,000	1900.....	79,171,000
1868.....	48,000,000	1901.....	78,693,700
1869.....	49,500,000	1902.....	80,000,000
1870.....	50,000,000	1903.....	73,501,700
1871.....	43,500,000	1904.....	80,464,700
1872.....	36,000,000	1905.....	88,180,700
1873.....	36,000,000	1906.....	94,373,800
1874.....	33,490,900		
1875.....	33,467,900	Grand total.....	2,589,635,300

This is what I call a positive addition to the money of the United States; and when you consider the stimulus given to your business interests by the circulation of this amount of money, I believe that not one of you will deny this industry the consideration it certainly deserves at your hands. My proposition is that you do something to increase the mineral production of the United States; add, if you can, to your finances another \$100,000,000 annually in hard cash by increasing the production of gold.

In the West and in some of the Southern States, buried in the ground, some near the surface, yet much more buried deeper in the earth, is stored an inexhaustible quantity of this precious metal. And there are deposits sufficiently large for hundreds of millions of dollars to be taken out annually for centuries to come. And there are inexhaustible and unknown deposits of the other metals and minerals that are worthy of more attention than they are now receiving.

All that is necessary to secure them is good practical mining, and the Government can assist the practical miner in all branches of the mining industry in many ways by having men of science take up the subject and study the weak points of the industry, with the view of making mining safer, so as to stop the great loss of life such as has recently occurred amongst the coal miners and which occurs in all kinds of mining, give us more and better mining schools, furnish information that will lead to the opening of new mines, the working to greater depths and increased production of the present ones, and such knowledge as will permit of the operation of mines that can not be worked to-day at a profit, and also protect the people from fraudulent mining schemes, furnish information about new mining districts and information regarding the working and reduction of ores. It can do many things for the industry and give a helping hand in many ways to the elimination of those

difficulties encountered in the past. I will not go into details on this subject now, but will call your attention to but one illustration, to one branch of the industry in one place—that of hydraulic mining in the State of California—which for lack of proper Government aid has been throttled for the past thirty years and the nation thereby deprived of \$300,000,000 in gold.

During the past twenty years numerous public conventions have repeatedly passed resolutions and petitioned Congress for the establishment of a department of mines, with a Cabinet officer at its head, in order that the mining industry of the United States, which last year had a product valued at \$2,000,000,000, might receive the fostering care of this Government. The result of this concerted action has so far attracted attention that the President in his annual message at the convening of this Congress said:

A bureau of mines should be created under the control and direction of the Secretary of the Interior; the bureau to have power to collect statistics and make investigations in all matters pertaining to mining and particularly to the dangers of the industry. If this can not now be done, at least additional appropriations should be given the Interior Department to be used for the study of mining conditions, for the prevention of fraudulent mining schemes, for carrying on the work of mapping the mining districts, for studying methods of minimizing the accidents and dangers in the industry; in short, to aid in all proper ways the development of the mining industry.

We know it is useless to talk about a department of mines, but you can give us a bureau of mines. The gold industry alone warrants this action on your part, not considering the vast interests of the other branches of mineral production. For if gold mining be properly fostered by the Government, its production can be doubled, and a bureau of mines can do this.

But in considering mineral production gold is not first in the great mining industry; coal takes the lead, and it is needless for me to enlarge on the vast importance of coal mining. Iron and steel we must have, and anything that is done in their interest affects every industry in the nation, and I may call to your attention that recently in Shasta County, in northern California, iron ores have been successfully worked by electric process.

This is sometimes called the electric age, but this age is still in its infancy; and while we have a large copper production, the demand for copper must continue to increase as the use of electricity increases. And while there has been a flurry in prices of copper and copper-mining stocks, this branch of mineral production is so important and so connected with all manufacturing industries that it is entitled to the utmost consideration by the Government, so that the home production of copper will meet all requirements of the future.

I will not mention other mineral products, but have here a table giving the mineral production for the year 1906 in the United States:

Mineral products of the United States for the calendar year 1906.

Product.	Quantity.	Value.
METALLIC.		
Pig iron, spot value.....long tons..	25,307,191	\$505,700,000
Silver, commercial value.....troy ounces..	56,517,900	38,256,400
Gold, coinage value.....do.....	4,565,333	94,373,800
Copper, value at New York City.....pounds..	917,805,682	177,595,888
Lead, value at New York City.....short tons..	350,153	39,917,442
Zinc, value at New York City.....do.....	199,694	24,362,668
Quicksilver, value at San Francisco.....flasks..	26,238	958,634
Aluminum, value at Pittsburgh.....pounds..	14,910,000	4,262,286
Antimony, value at San Francisco.....short tons..	1,766	602,949
Nickel, value at Philadelphia.....pounds..		
Tin.....do.....		35,600
Platinum, value (crude) at New York City, troy ounces..	1,439	45,189
Total value of metallic products.....		886,110,856
NONMETALLIC (spot values).		
Bituminous coal.....short tons..	342,874,867	381,162,115
Pennsylvania anthracite.....long tons..	63,645,010	131,917,694
Natural gas.....do.....		46,873,932
Petroleum.....barrels..	126,493,936	32,444,735
Clay products.....do.....		161,032,722
Cement.....barrels..	51,000,445	55,302,277
Lime.....short tons..	3,197,754	12,480,632
Sand-lime brick.....do.....		1,170,005
Slate.....do.....		5,668,346
Stone.....do.....		66,378,794
Corundum and emery.....short tons..	1,160	44,310
Crystalline quartz.....do.....	24,082	121,671
Garnet for abrasive purposes.....do.....	4,650	157,000
Grindstones.....do.....		744,894
Infusorial earth and tripoli.....short tons..	8,099	72,108
Millstones.....do.....		48,590
Oilstones, etc.....do.....		268,070
Arsenious oxide.....pounds..	1,474,000	63,480
Borax (crude).....short tons..	58,173	1,182,410
Bromine.....pounds..	1,283,250	165,204
Fluorspar.....short tons..	40,796	244,025
Gypsum.....do.....	1,540,585	3,897,975
Lithium minerals.....do.....	383	7,411

Mineral products of the United States for calendar year 1906—Continued.

Product.	Quantity.	Value.
NONMETALLIC (spot values)—continued.		
Marls.....short tons..	19,104	\$7,341
Phosphate rock.....long tons..	2,080,957	8,579,437
Pyrite.....do.....	261,422	931,305
Sulphur.....do.....	294,153	5,096,678
Salt.....barrels..	28,172,380	6,658,350
Barytes (crude).....short tons..	50,231	160,367
Cobalt oxide.....pounds.....		
Mineral paints.....short tons..	49,921	521,729
Zinc white.....do.....	74,680	5,999,375
Asbestos.....do.....	1,695	28,565
Asphaltum.....do.....	138,059	1,290,340
Bauxite.....long tons..	75,332	368,311
Chromic iron ore.....do.....	107	1,800
Feldspar.....short tons..	75,656	401,531
Fibrous talc.....do.....	61,672	557,200
Fuller's earth.....do.....	32,040	255,400
Glass sand.....do.....	1,089,430	1,208,788
Graphite (Crystalline).....pounds.....	5,887,882	238,064
Graphite (Amorphous).....short tons..	16,858	102,175
Magnesite.....do.....	7,805	23,415
Manganese ores.....long tons..	6,921	88,132
Manganiferous iron ores.....do.....	41,300	122,400
Mica.....pounds.....	1,423,100	252,248
Mica (Scrap).....short tons..	1,489	22,742
Mineral waters.....gallons sold..	51,407,668	8,559,650
Monazite and zircon.....pounds..	847,275	152,560
Precious stones.....do.....		208,000
Pumice stone.....short tons..	12,200	16,750
Quartz (flint).....do.....	66,697	243,012
Rutile.....pounds.....		
Sand, molding, etc., and gravel.....short tons..	31,842,572	11,489,420
Talc and soapstone.....do.....	58,972	874,356
Tungsten.....do.....	928	348,867
Uranium and vanadium.....do.....		
Total value of nonmetallic mineral products ..		1,016,206,709
Total value of metallic products ..		886,110,856
Estimated value of mineral products unspecified ..		200,000
Grand total ..		1,902,517,565

This is a remarkable showing of mineral production, yet the only recognition this great industry is receiving at the hands of the Government to-day is a few small divisions in the Geological Survey in the Interior Department. An annual mineral product in the United States of \$2,000,000,000 certainly deserves consideration at your hand equally with the other industries of the country. Increase their production, and you increase the prosperity of this nation; increase the prosperity of the nation, and your finances will take care of themselves.

In the past year we have been horrified by the many frightful accidents in our great coal mines. Disaster has followed disaster until there is a general demand that the United States Government do something that will tend to decrease this untold fatality in our mines.

FATAL ACCIDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

In the coal mines of the United States in 1906, 6,861 men were killed or injured, the number killed being 2,061 and the number injured being 4,800.

The number of men killed in the coal mines of the United States for each year from 1890 is shown in the following table:

Number of men killed in the coal mines of the United States, 1890-1906.			
1890.....	701	1900.....	1,493
1891.....	1,076	1901.....	1,594
1892.....	859	1902.....	1,828
1893.....	965	1903.....	1,794
1894.....	957	1904.....	1,939
1895.....	1,057	1905.....	2,097
1896.....	1,120	1906.....	2,061
1897.....	947		
1898.....	1,049	Total	22,840
1899.....	1,243		

The total number of men killed since 1889, as shown above, is 22,840. It will be noted that as many violent deaths have occurred in the coal mines of the United States during the last six years as during the preceding eleven years, the number of fatal accidents having practically doubled within that time.

The loss of life is simply enormous, and it is time that this Government did something that should lead to relief. And I trust that the Committee on Mines and Mining, of which I am a member, will be able to report a bill that will receive your favorable consideration. This committee is hard at work on the subject and fully realizes that investigations should be made by the Government that will give results and help to stop this awful slaughter. The coal-mine operators and the miners both admit that they do not understand properly the subject and disagree amongst themselves as to many of the points involved. I recently visited one of the great coal mines in Pennsylvania, and, though making only a hurried trip, could see ample room for men of science to expend their energies and talents in proper scientific investigation of this subject and the investigation of other subjects connected with the great coal-mining industry.

There has been in the past few years a great deal of attention given to the subject of the destruction of our great forests, and one of the important divisions of the Agricultural Department is that of Forestry. It has been stated to me that 40 per cent of the coal in the coal fields in some way or other is wasted, varying in different localities. If it is important to look out for our forests, which can be renewed, is it not equally important to look out for our supply of coal, which can not be replaced? So that, in considering the proposition of a mining bureau, you can do much for the great coal-mining industry.

The same propositions hold good for all the other branches of mineral production, and I ask you to give the proposition of a mining bureau careful consideration and do something for the mining interests, the same as you are doing for the agricultural interests, and you will assist in doing something on practical lines that will help to make that solid foundation for your financial system which it requires, so that it will stand firm and secure in all storms, in all emergencies, and for all time. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

During the above,

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, here are several tables showing the gold and mineral productions in the United States, and also accidents in coal mines, which I would like to have printed in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Also during the above,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to continue my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, if my friends across the aisle who seem to be so interested in knowing what "soil utilization" means, will come over here, I can show them what it is.

Several MEMBERS. Come over here.

Mr. GRIGGS. You are afraid to come over here. I knew you folks were getting scared, but I did not know that you were so badly frightened. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The line between soil survey and soil utilization, on the one side, and plant industry on the other is a very shadowy one, though they are wide enough apart and entirely distinct in the beginning. The duty of the soil survey, first, is to survey the soils and make maps of the districts and areas so surveyed, ascertaining the character of the soils. That is one branch of the soil survey. Another, and this brings it down to the very shadowy line between soil utilization and plant industry, to which I have just referred.

After ascertaining the character of the soil and drawing the map comes the investigation in the laboratories of the Bureau, both as to the physical and chemical properties of these soils, and in that connection the study of any particular problems of soil fertility, soil fertilization, and soil management, which may be found necessary in order to furnish a scientific basis for the improvement of the crop-producing power of those soils. When necessary a broader field of study comes up for the adaptation of the various types of soil to the particular varieties of plants to be grown best on that soil. The adaptation of cotton, or corn, or other plants particularly as known in my district, such as the tobacco investigations, demonstrate the need of the utilization division of the Soil Bureau. The Soil Utilization Bureau and that of Plant Industry ought to work hand in hand.

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

Mr. GRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from Georgia knows, does he not, that for the most part, with the exception perhaps of one or two small areas, all this utilization work in the tobacco culture to which he refers has been turned over to the Bureau of Plant Industry?

Mr. GRIGGS. I understand that perfectly well, but not all of the Soil Utilization Bureau, because:

The Bureau of Plant Industry intends to improve the tobacco industry by conducting experiments in breeding and fertilization, but they do not propose to help or assist the farmer in the practical methods pertaining to the growing of this highly specialized crop.

Now, that represents the difference as clearly as it can be stated.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of Plant Industry declined to make the experiment in the tobacco culture that the gentleman from Georgia refers to, and that that was made then by the Bureau of Soils against the advice, or rather contrary to the opinion of the Bureau of Plant Industry?

Mr. GRIGGS. I can not answer that question.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It is so stated by the Chief of the Bureau of Soils in the hearings.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would say that I would like very much to answer that question, but I do not want to occupy the time of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GRIGGS. I am much obliged to my friend from Kansas. On account of the very crowded condition of business in the House right lately, following an alleged agreement between the President and certain gentlemen unnamed to do certain things, to which they had to be driven, before this Congress adjourned, I can not under Republican practice, procedure, and rules here take up any more time than I am taking. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The development of the tobacco industry in Florida was started in about 1887 with the production of a small acreage in the immediate vicinity of Quincy, Fla. It was found that the soils and climate of this region were particularly fitted for the production of a high grade wrapper and filler tobacco. The production of tobacco spread slowly and was confined to a single Florida county until 1899, when the Bureau of Soils of the Department of Agriculture undertook soil surveys and the study of the tobacco soils of the United States. The first soil survey made in Florida was one of Gadsden County. This was undertaken to determine the character of the different types of soil upon which the best tobacco was raised and the greatest profits secured. It was found that the wrapper leaf tobacco could be produced only upon a certain definite soil type in its perfection, and the extent and area of this soil was mapped in Gadsden County. It was also found that the filler tobacco was produced on totally different soils, which would not raise the more valuable wrapper tobacco.

Since this first survey additional soil surveys have been made of the nearby counties of Leon and Jefferson, in Florida, and of the Bainbridge area, comprising the southern portion of Decatur County, Ga. The soil survey of Gadsden County comprises 350,000 acres of land. Nine different types of soil were found, only two of which are particularly fitted to tobacco culture. In the Leon County area 432,000 acres were surveyed and twelve different types of soil were found, of which again but two were suited to tobacco culture. The total area of Jefferson County amounted to 370,000 acres, with fifteen different types of soil, only two of which were suited to the production of high-grade tobacco. The Bainbridge area covered 233,000 acres, embracing nine different types of soil, one of which was well suited to the filler tobacco and another was suited for the production of the highest grade cigar wrapper.

On the basis of these soil surveys extensive purchases of land have been made, both by local and outside parties who desired to engage in tobacco culture, and in many instances land which was previously valued at from \$5 to \$10 an acre has increased in value, because it has been shown to be suited to tobacco culture, to upward of \$100 per acre. Not only has this great increase of land values followed the completion of soil surveys, but the tobacco industry has spread from its original restricted locality, near Gadsden, through three Florida counties and into three counties in Georgia—Decatur, Grady, and Thomas. It is a well-known fact that at the present time outside firms desiring to engage in tobacco culture are awaiting the completion and publication of the soil surveys of Thomas and Grady counties, Ga., in order that they may purchase land in the full light of all the knowledge thrown upon the character of these tobacco soils by these reports.

In individual instances in Decatur County plantations which before the survey was made were held at a nominal value of, say, \$2,000 to \$5,000, have been sold to tobacco growers at a price of \$50,000 to \$60,000, and this price was paid solely because the soil survey showed that the land upon the plantation in question was suited to the production of these special crops.

The representatives of the soil survey have assured the people of my district that there are large areas of soil within these southwestern counties upon which the filler tobacco may be grown to advantage. They also assure me that there are much smaller areas, especially near the Florida line, where the soils are well suited to the production of the shade-grown wrapper tobacco. Already residents of this district are attempting to grow the shade-grown wrapper upon lands which they think well suited to its production. The production of this tobacco involves an expenditure of not less than \$1,000 per acre before the first crop can be grown. The opinion of the soil expert in regard to the quality of these lands is absolutely necessary before these gentlemen can feel safe in investing their money upon such an extensive scale in a new enterprise which is being developed within the district. Whatever is true of this section is true of all others.

In the beginning of such an important industry it is not only necessary that the services of the soil expert should be secured for the proper selection of the land, but the cultivation and fertilization of this land for tobacco production differs so materially from the ordinary cultivation and fertilization demanded by cotton, corn, and sugar cane—the common crops of the district—that the services of an expert in soil management are needed during the inception of tobacco culture to advise directly with the growers who are starting this new line of work.

This one crop, tobacco, pays into the United States Treasury annually, from the internal revenues of the taxes imposed, a sum four times as great as is appropriated for all the investigation work of the Department of Agriculture, and it would seem that some portion of this money might well be spent in the extension of an agricultural industry which pays so largely and so directly the expenses of the maintenance of the Government.

Another great study which promises to add millions of dollars to the annual producing capacity of American farmers is that of a detailed study of the adaptation of the more than 400 different types of soil existing in this country to the particular varieties of staple crops which may best be grown upon them. It is the common experience of every practical cotton planter that only a few of the nearly 200 different varieties of cotton may be grown to advantage on the soils which are found upon his plantation. In one instance which has come to my personal knowledge a skilled cotton planter secured seed of an improved variety of cotton, which he planted upon his plantation. Now it happened that he had three distinct varieties of cotton soil upon this plantation, and within the bottom lands this variety of cotton grew to a great height and produced few, if any, productive cotton bolls. Upon the gentle slopes which bordered this cotton land the cotton found a situation similar to that upon which it had been developed through many years and produced a splendid crop of first-class upland cotton, while upon the eroded hillsides which constitute a portion of the farm, the stalks were few and spindly, and the amount of cotton produced scarcely paid for the labor and expense involved.

Now, there are, however, varieties of cotton which are suited to each one of these three states of soil conditions, and if this planter had been fully informed of the character of cotton which was especially suited to production upon each one of his three types of soil he might have raised a full crop over his entire plantation, instead of raising a full crop upon less than one-third of it. This merely serves to show that no amount of labor could make this one variety of cotton grow to equal advantage upon the different types of soil found upon this plantation, and this fundamental fact is true of all cotton plantations of the South, upon which are annually raised \$650,000,000 worth of this staple. When, through the efforts of the Bureau of Soils in studying the adaptation of soils to the different varieties of cotton, it shall be possible to tell each planter what specific variety of cotton to produce upon each of the soils found upon his farm, the annual profits derived from this crop will be far more than doubled, and, in my opinion, the returns secured by American agriculture from this single piece of information would far more than pay to the American public all of the sums which have been or shall be expended for the purpose of securing this information in regard to soils.

The same is true of the other great staple crops, corn, wheat, oats, rice, tobacco, and various fruits and market, garden, and truck crops. The work of this Bureau in investigating the soils and the soil resources of the nation and the undeveloped agricultural possibilities of the different localities and different States is fundamental in its character and underlies the efforts along all other agricultural lines, whether in the production of plants or of animals. It is the basic knowledge upon which all experimentation and the development of American agriculture must rest.

The State of Georgia comprises a total land area of 37,747,200 acres of land. Of this amount 26,392,057 acres are included in farms, but only 10,615,644 acres of all this area are improved farm lands. The undeveloped agricultural resources of Georgia constitute two and one-half times the portion of the State which has already been developed. It is through the operation of such forces as those controlled by the Bureau of Soils that the greater part of this unutilized agricultural domain may be made productive and profitable. The State of Georgia itself is doing its best to develop these resources and to increase the prosperity of its agricultural classes.

Within the year provision has been made by the State for eleven agricultural high schools, one in every Congressional district of the State, and the locations for these high schools have been selected through the cooperation of the Bureau of Soils, which

furnished trained experts to advise with the State authorities in the selection of such localities as would be most representative of the broader classes of soils and the agricultural possibilities of the State. With each one of these eleven agricultural schools and in addition the agricultural college and experiment station of the State working upon local problems, the soil surveys in the different portions of the State are becoming of greater value than ever before. The students at these colleges and schools will learn beyond a question or a doubt the character of crops which may be raised upon these soils, the methods by which the land must be prepared, the fertilizers which must be used to insure the best results, and having learned these upon the experimental farms through their own practice, on returning to their homes they may, through the use of the soil-survey maps, put this information to its practical use on their own farms and their home communities.

In this way, and through the use of the soil-survey maps, the entire State of Georgia will in due time become one of the great experiment stations of which the information secured in one locality may be applied in others more remote, and whereby the wasteful methods of incomplete knowledge may be supplanted by those of a scientific understanding of the capabilities of every acre of soil. The same is true of other States and of other communities, and a great impetus to the agricultural production and industry of the country may be given through a proper support of these basal investigations which underlie the practice of all agricultural art. I shall not attempt to go through the whole range of this subject the country over, but I shall at the proper time offer an amendment increasing the appropriation for the Soil Bureau by \$100,000. I shall then present a few more remarks on this great question. [Applause.]

Therefore, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words with regard to the 320-acre dry-farm bill, commonly known as the Smoot bill, which Members from the West are endeavoring to impress upon the consideration of Congress and endeavoring to have passed. I ask permission to insert at this point a copy of the bill, in order that it may be considered in connection with my remarks. The bill that I shall insert is not the original bill introduced by Senator Smoot, but is a compromise bill agreed upon by Senators and Representatives from the Western States, and introduced in the Senate by Senator Smoot, and in the House by the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, Mr. MONDELL:

A bill to provide for an enlarged homestead.

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who is a qualified entryman under the homestead laws of the United States may enter, by legal subdivisions, under the provisions of this act, in the States of Colorado, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, and the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, 320 acres, or less, of nonmineral, nonirrigable, unreserved and unappropriated surveyed public lands which do not contain merchantable timber, located in a reasonably compact body, and not over 1½ miles in extreme length.

SEC. 2. That any person applying to enter land under the provisions of this act shall make and subscribe before the proper officer an affidavit as required by section 2290 of the Revised Statutes, and in addition thereto shall make affidavit that the land sought to be entered is of the character described in section 1 of this act, and shall pay the fees now required to be paid under the homestead laws.

SEC. 3. That any homestead entryman now occupying lands of the character hereinafter described, heretofore entered by him, upon which final proof has not been made, shall have the right to enter public lands, subject to the provisions of this act, lying contiguous to his former entry which shall not, together with the original entry, exceed 320 acres, and residence upon and cultivation of the original entry shall be deemed as residence upon and cultivation of the additional entry.

SEC. 4. That at the time of making final proof as provided in section 2291 of the Revised Statutes the entryman under this act shall, in addition to the proofs and affidavits required under the said section, prove by two credible witnesses that at least one-eighth of the area embraced in his entry was continuously cultivated to agricultural crops other than native grasses beginning with the second year of the entry, and that at least one-fourth of the area embraced in the entry was so continuously cultivated beginning with the third year of the entry.

SEC. 5. That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the right of a qualified entryman to make homestead entry in the States named in section 1 of this act under the provisions of section 2289 of the Revised Statutes, but no person who has made entry under this act shall be entitled to make homestead entry under the provisions of said section, and no entry made under this act shall be commuted.

SEC. 6. That whenever the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any tracts of land subject to entry under this act do not have upon them such a sufficient supply of water suitable for domestic purposes as would make continuous residence upon the lands possible without serious hardship to entrymen, he may in his discretion designate such tracts of land, and thereafter they shall be subject to entry under this act without the necessity of residence: *Provided*, That in such event

the area cultivated in any such entry shall not be less than one-eighth of the entire area of the entry during the second year, one-fourth during the third year, and one-half during the fourth and fifth years after the date of such entry.

Before taking up the bill itself let us review for a moment the public-land policy of our country. Going back to the year in which the national homestead law was passed and following on down the several acts of Congress looking to the settlement of the public lands of the United States, the policy of our Government has been to place public lands into private ownership. The Government has never attempted to make money out of the public domain. The Government has never attempted to obtain for the lands which it had at its disposal any compensation that might at all have been considered commensurate with the value of the lands that were given to the public. The Government has said to the people: "Go upon the public lands; make homes there; build towns and cities and villages in the wilderness; erect churches and schoolhouses; maintain roads and highways and bridges, and for the hardship that you will endure in laying out the great work that is before you as pioneers the Government will give to you a small parcel of land." The laws have been varied under which land has been granted to the settler by our Federal Government. Under the provisions of some of the laws residence upon the land was required. Under the provisions of other laws the laying out of certain improvements, the setting out of trees, etc., were what the Government required. Under the provisions of other laws it was required that a small amount of money should be paid by the settler to the Government for the land in question, and at all times it has been the policy of the Government to establish homes and receive for its compensation a greater nation of splendid communities and thrifty, prosperous people. Look to the States of the Mississippi Valley; look to the States of Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. The tremendous progress that has come to those States during the last half century is in large part due to the generous policy of the Government in the handling of her public domain. The same policy has existed in part with regard to the public domain of the Western and Mountain States, and the largest part of the available land that is of highest use for agricultural purposes has already been acquired by the private individual, and in that section of country as a result of this policy there are to-day thousands upon thousands of splendid properties and happy homes.

We have now come to the time when the present land laws are inadequate to meet the demands of the present character of land that is available for settlement. Millions upon millions of acres of land in the arid and semiarid regions of the West are to-day waiting the share of the plow to be converted into producing fields, but our land laws are insufficient, and as a result these millions upon millions of acres of land are to-day lying idle, or at any rate are not used for their highest producing purposes. The dry farm homestead bill has for its object the granting of a homestead of 320 acres to the individual settler. The terms of this bill are more rigorous than the terms of the general homestead law and the terms have been made more rigorous in order to comply with the demands of the Eastern Representatives and Senators who do not understand the situation that confronts the people of the West. We propose under this bill to grant to each homesteader who has not heretofore used his right the privilege of acquiring 320 acres of unappropriated, nonirrigable, nonmineral public lands, which contain no merchantable timber, providing that the homesteader will live upon this land for a period of five years and make during that five years improvements which will show to the United States his good faith in taking the land for a home. We ask this because the present homestead law is inadequate to the condition of the lands that remain unappropriated and which are known as public lands. For the most part the lands that still belong to the Government in the West are arid or semiarid in character. Until the last few years it was supposed that they were desert, that they were unfit for settlement, and that unless water could be turned upon the lands from some running stream that it would be forever impossible for our people to successfully maintain homes thereon.

But our people have been progressing in the science of farming and agriculture as they have been progressing in other lines, and it has now come to the point where the rigorous demand upon even the soil of the United States, abundant and extensive as it is, is such as to warrant the farming of the lands which heretofore have been regarded as of no more importance than an equal area of desert waste. By means of lately discovered methods of tilling the soil; by means of lately discovered grains and forage plants; by means of lately discovered or transplanted trees and shrubs, we have found that it is possible to make these very desert lands attractive, and while not of the value of the lands that have been in settlement for these

many years, yet capable of contributing in large part to the resources and wealth of the Western States. One hundred and sixty acres, however, of this kind of land is not sufficient for the farmer who seeks in this hard means to establish his home and make the soil fruitful. The area of 320 acres that we ask for under this bill, in my judgment, is not as sufficient an area as we should ask for, but it is the area that in the judgment of the Members from the West should be asked for at this time, and therefore, it is the amount that I shall contend for in the remarks that I make. Three hundred and twenty acres of land sounds like a large area to the person who is accustomed to living amid green fields, splendid orchards, and bountiful gardens, but let me say to you that 320 acres of the land that is to-day available under the provisions of this bill, if we can enact it into law, will not by any manner of means represent in value 80 acres or 40 acres of the tremendous areas that were granted without cost under the homestead law to the settlers of the Middle West and of the Pacific coast and Mountain States.

Already we have magnificent lands in Idaho and in the other States of the mountain region. We have lands there that are as fine as any lands in our whole United States, but these lands have been acquired by private individuals; these lands have been settled for many years the same as lands in your States in the Middle West and in the East. The lands that this bill would apply to are not lands of this character, but are lands that to-day are covered with sagebrush and grease wood and juniper shrub for the most part and which have such little value that although the years have passed by during which the people of the West and of the whole country have had the opportunity of acquiring them under the provisions of a 160-acre homestead law, they have not yet been acquired. As an evidence of the fact that the lands that remain to-day unsettled are not the equal of the lands that were available for settlement twenty or thirty or forty years ago, let me say this: There was a time when nearly every entryman who filed upon a piece of land made final proof. By and by as the best character of lands became absorbed by private ownership many of the entrymen were unable to make final proof because of the character of the lands upon which they settled or the climatic condition of the country. By and by one out of every two who entered upon a piece of land found himself unable to comply with the provisions of the homestead law before making his proof, notwithstanding the expenses he had already been put to in making his entry and establishing his home, and this condition of affairs has continued with the lands of better character being eliminated constantly until last year about four persons out of every five who made entries upon homestead lands were compelled, by reason of the hard condition that they found themselves laboring under, to abandon their homestead entries and try to make a living for themselves or for their families by some other means. Only one homestead entryman out of about every five completed his proof, which goes to show that the character of the land that is still available for settlement is not comparable with the character of the land that was available for settlement in Idaho, in Wyoming, and in the other Western States and States of the Middle West twenty-five and thirty and forty years ago.

As a further evidence of the fact that the present land laws are not adequate I call your attention to the slow rate at which the public lands are being acquired under the homestead law under its present terms limiting entry to 160 acres of land. The figures which I give apply to the States mentioned in the bill with the exception of North Dakota, and North Dakota has been omitted from the terms of the bill as it has been reported from the House Committee on the Public Lands.

	Area final homestead entries, 1907.	Total area vacant pub- lic lands.	Years re- quired to absorb land at present rate.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Acres.</i>	
Arizona.....	12,467	45,571,305	3,655
California.....	60,770	1,859,109	31
Colorado.....	145,677	28,472,303	195
Idaho.....	176,548	30,989,840	113
Montana.....	185,790	51,308,631	277
New Mexico.....	165,608	49,890,637	301
Nevada.....	6,981	61,204,087	877
Oregon.....	127,410	19,739,649	155
Utah.....	6,436	38,279,631	5,948
Washington.....	333,423	6,290,980	188
Wyoming.....	105,400	36,726,337	345
Total.....	1,327,510	370,392,409	285

These figures tell a remarkable story. They tell that in Idaho if the public lands available for homestead entry continue to be acquired in as rapid degree, or rather, I should say, in as slow degree as they were last year, it would require one hundred and thirteen years before all the available lands would be disposed of. These figures tell that it would take two hundred and eighty-five years for all the lands in the States which I have enumerated to pass into private ownership, and offer a powerful argument in support of the bill for which I contend.

The President of the United States realized the limitations of the present law, as fully appears from the message which he sent to this Congress when we assembled in December last. In that message he declared:

The land-law system which was designed to meet the needs of the fertile and well-watered regions of the Middle West has largely broken down when applied to the dryer regions of the Great Plains, the mountains, and much of the Pacific slope, where a farm of 160 acres is inadequate for self-support.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office says in his report to the Secretary of the Interior for the year 1907:

Dry farming, or the raising of crops in semiarid regions by special methods of agriculture, has passed the experimental stage in many localities. No law adapted to the entry of lands suitable for this purpose exists, as the desert-land law is inapplicable, and the homestead law, besides requiring residence, is too restricted in the area of land that may be entered.

I therefore recommend the enactment of a measure applicable only to those States and Territories containing semiarid lands, permitting the entry, under the agricultural classification above, by any qualified resident citizen of the State or Territory where the land sought to be entered is situated, of not exceeding 640 acres of land (in as compact a form as possible) not capable of artificial irrigation, which does not contain sufficient moisture to produce a natural growth of trees, and which, because of the fact that it does not furnish potable water sufficient for domestic use or because of other conditions arising out of the semiaridity of the land, is not suitable for continuous habitation. Residence should not be required as a prerequisite to patent, but proof should be required of the planting and raising of consecutive crops of valuable agricultural products (other than native grasses) for a fixed period before final proof; provided, however, that careful restrictions be imposed to insure that the entries are made for the sole use and benefit of entrymen for the purpose of actual cultivation and not to increase range holdings, create monopolies of land, or other abuses.

Now a word in regard to how this land will be farmed and why it is necessary that 320 acres be granted to the homesteader instead of 160 acres. If the entire area of land could be cultivated and farmed every year we would not ask that the settlers be granted 320 acres of land; but such is not the case. We have discovered after years of experience, fraught with dire hardship, that grounds that have been regarded as desert lands are capable of fair production if rightly handled. We have devised certain means of handling the land. We utilize the rainfall and moisture that two years afford for the purpose of raising a single crop. In other words, in all this region of country where this law will apply, for the most part the settlers who will acquire the lands will not be able to raise more than about one crop in every two years, and God grant that they may raise a crop as often as that. They need 320 acres in order that they may let 160 acres lie idle during a season, while the other 160 acres will be furnishing the sustenance for the family. The 160 acres that will be lying idle will be summer fallowed. It will be plowed deep. Vegetation of every character will be prevented from growing upon this land and the land will be husbanded in such manner as to conserve the moisture of the year as far as may be possible within the soil. In the fall of the year, or in the early spring succeeding, a crop will be sown which will be harvested in the succeeding fall. During that year the other half of the farm will be permitted to lie idle, or rather will be summer fallowed and cared for in order that moisture can be conserved in the soil there, that it may be put in fit condition to produce a crop the succeeding year when the first tract will again take its turn in being summer fallowed. But even then, with all the hope that I have for the benefits that will accrue by the passage of this bill, I know that the condition of the farmers who will acquire this land will be hard indeed.

This land under the very terms of the bill is land upon which water can not be placed by artificial means, land upon which water can not be placed from reservoir or from running streams. If such were the case it would not be classified as nonirrigable. It is what we might call "bench land"—land that lies just above the lands that have been made possible of cultivation by means of water being turned upon them. The passage of this bill will enable the farmers of the West who go upon this land to benefit not only themselves, but to benefit the settlers who live upon the lower lands where irrigation is possible. Everybody knows that as the higher lands are cultivated year by year the water is conserved within the ground and this will be a benefit to the lands that are lying below, and will in time permit the waters that go with those lands to be used for other irrigation purposes. Another reason

why I urge the passage of this bill lies in the fact that in our great States of the West much of the land is not to-day aiding in the support and maintenance of State and county governments. There is no means that is practicable by which revenues from Government lands can be turned into the treasuries of our counties and our States. Take, for instance, the State of Idaho. Probably not to exceed one-tenth of all the land within that magnificent State is to-day in private ownership. What is the result? Why, the property owners of that one-tenth of the area of the State of Idaho are compelled to pay taxes for the support of State and county governments, extending over the entire area of the State. But someone says that where people are not, there is no expense to government. This is a false deduction. It is true in every country that very often police regulations bear down more heavily upon sparsely settled communities than they do upon communities that are thickly settled, and it is true throughout the entire West that while a county or a State may receive taxes from one-tenth of the land within its domain that that State would soon be declared recreant to its duty if it failed to protect the life and property of the citizens who live in the most remote portion of its domain. We need that every acre of land shall be reduced to private ownership in order that the highest use of the land may be attained and in order that it may become capable of bearing its share of the burden of the expense of county and State government.

This bill is not in every detail the bill that I would pass if it were within my power. Probably this bill does not represent the wishes of any Member of Congress in either the House or the Senate from the Western States. This bill is the result of repeated conferences. Some Members of Congress believe that we should grant to these settlers a 640-acre homestead. For myself I believe that if the time is not ripe now for the grant of a 640-acre homestead, that after the bill which we now propose has done its work, in the course of not many years the remaining land must be disposed of under a still larger homestead law. The 320-acre provision of this bill represents the combined judgment of the Members of Congress of both House and Senate from the Western States. Again, this bill provides that a person who has filed upon a homestead, but who has not as yet made final proof, may have the privilege of acquiring an additional 160 acres of land of this character, providing the land upon which he entered is land of the character described in this bill, and providing the additional 160 acres of land which he may select is contiguous to the land he has already entered upon. I believe in the provisions of that section, but I do not believe that the provisions go far enough. I think that no matter whether the settler has completed his proof or not, if he has acquired 160 acres of land of the character of that contemplated in this bill, that he should have the privilege of acquiring an additional 160 acres of land, and that that limitation should not be fixed upon the person who has made final proof; but, as I said, this bill represents the combined judgment of the Members from the different States from the West, who have held repeated conferences upon this measure, and this is another point where my judgment was overruled by the judgment of others. And so I could go on. I could enumerate other features that were objectionable to me, or which I was in favor of, but which were not included in the measure. This is not necessary, and I shall simply say that on the whole I believe the measure is a just measure, that it is a necessary measure, and that if it is passed now it will do much to aid in the settlement of the unsettled portions of the Western States, of which Idaho is one.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I have had handed to me this moment the following clipping from the Washington Times of this date:

GALLINGER FAVORS ANTIBETTING BILL—BELIEVES SENATE WILL PASS MEASURE AFTER CONSIDERATION—ERROR IN PHRASING NULLIFIES BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE.

"Yes; I am in favor of the bill," said Senator GALLINGER, chairman of Senate District Committee, to-day, when asked about the Sims measure to repress race-track gambling, which recently passed the House as an amendment to the bill to widen the Benning road.

"At the same time, the bill can not be passed at once. It will doubtless be taken up by the committee at its meeting Friday. But it will probably have to be referred to a subcommittee and duly considered by that subcommittee. It is not likely that a bill of this importance can be forced through. It is entirely likely that the legislation will be passed in due time, but just when it is impossible to say."

Senator GALLINGER pointed out that there might be objection to passing the bill in the form in which it passed the House, and that the Senate might prefer to put it through as a separate measure.

In this connection the attention of Senator GALLINGER has been called to a blunder made by the House in passing the bill to widen Benning road and these other bills:

For the extension of Ninth street NW.

For the extension of Girard street NW.

For the extension of New York avenue from its present terminus, near Fourth street NE., to the Bladensburg road.

Senator GALLINGER has been apprised by the Commissioners, who in turn had been advised of it by Auditor Tweedale, that in passing these bills the word "appropriated" has been stricken out and the expression "authorized to be expended" substituted. Auditor Tweedale has informed the Commissioners that under the language the measures would be unenforceable, and that the courts construe appropriation laws strictly.

It will be necessary for the Senate to change the language in accordance with this suggestion before the proposed legislation is enacted.

Friends of this legislation are very uneasy for fear some serious blunder was made in the passage of this bill that will render it null and void.

I fear no such results. It is true that upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the amendment was made whereby the word "appropriated" was stricken from the bill and the words "authorized to be expended" substituted. I did not seriously resist the amendment for the reason that I had no time to look up the usual language used in such bills, and as Mr. MADDEN is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a very able and careful member of that committee, I had not thought that he was not accurate in the language inserted as his amendment. But this constitutes not the slightest obstacle in the way of getting the bill through expeditiously. I drew up the amendment at my seat with lead pencil in a hurry, and I hope the Senate will, if thought best, make any amendment that will in any way strengthen the law, and I have not the slightest doubt that the House will readily concur in the Senate amendments without sending the bill back to the House District Committee or by nonconcurring in the Senate amendments, causing the bill to be sent to conference. While I have spoken to but one member of the Senate District Committee, I have no doubt that the Senate will act expeditiously, and all fears upon the part of friends of the measure, I think, are groundless.

Local public sentiment could hardly be stronger in favor of this legislation. Every newspaper in the District has spoken favorably of the legislation. I now read from the Evening Star a report of the proceedings as reported in yesterday's issue of that paper:

STOPS TRACK BETTING—HOUSE PASSES BILL TO PREVENT GAMBLING AT BENNING—CREDIT DUE TO MR. SIMS—HE PERSEVERES TO SUCCESS DESPITE REPEATED OPPOSITION—PUTS ASSOCIATES ON RECORD—ONLY FOUR REPRESENTATIVES FINALLY FOUND LINED UP AGAINST THE MEASURE.

"It shall be unlawful for any person or association of persons in the District of Columbia to bet, gamble, or make books or pools on the result of any trotting race or running race of horses, or boat race, or race of any kind, or on any election, or any contest of any kind, or game of baseball."

Through the energy and legislative resourcefulness of Representative SIMS of Tennessee, ranking minority member of the House District Committee, betting at Benning yesterday afternoon received what may be its death blow. Mr. SIMS managed to secure the passage, as an amendment to the bill for the widening of Benning road, of his measure, introduced in the House last Friday, amending section 869 of the District Code so as to prohibit gambling and book making in any form anywhere in the District of Columbia. The existing law against book making on races forbids it only within a mile of the city's boundaries.

This happens to be one case where credit for a praiseworthy enactment of this sort may justly be given to one man. Representative SIMS in this fight had no help of his colleagues on the District Committee, that committee having voted at last Thursday's regular meeting against the bill which passed the House yesterday. It is true that the committee had under consideration an antigambling measure prepared by Representative CAMPBELL of Kansas, chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee, but it is a perfectly safe bet that Mr. CAMPBELL's bill, which had been tabled, certainly would not have seen the light of day during the present Benning meet if at all during the present session.

The bill for the widening of Benning road had no sooner been read in the House, sitting as the board of aldermen of the District, when Mr. SIMS jumped to his feet.

MR. SIMS'S AMENDMENT.

"Mr. Chairman," he cried, "I move to amend the bill by inserting an additional section." Here is the section which later, after trials, tribulations, and considerable opposition, was enacted:

"That section 869 of the act of Congress entitled 'An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901, be amended by striking out the words 'in the cities of Washington and Georgetown' and the words 'or within said District, within 1 mile of the boundaries of said cities.'"

Representative CRUMPACKER of Indiana reserved a point of order upon the amendment, and Mr. SIMS, after reading section 869 of the District Code, explained as follows:

"Under a decision of the court it has been held, as I understand it, and as I am informed, that under this section of the code, it does not include the Benning track, and does not make it, therefore, unlawful for any person to bet on a horse race at Benning; but by striking out the words 'in the cities of Washington and Georgetown' and 'or within said district within 1 mile of the boundaries of said cities' it reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person or association of persons in the District of Columbia to bet, gamble, or make books or pools on the result of any trotting race or running race of horses, or boat race, or race of any kind, or on any election, or on any contest of any kind, or game of baseball."

"The object of the amendment is simply to extend the antigambling laws of the District to the entire District, so as to make gambling and betting unlawful in every part of the District. Under the language of the section as it is in the act, it is within 1 mile of the limits of

the city of Washington, and 1 mile does not extend to the limits of the District of Columbia, and therefore the courts are without jurisdiction to enforce the law."

After a few facetious remarks from the irrepressible CHARLIE LANDIS, Mr. CRUMPACKER, who had reserved the point of order against the amendment, again secured the floor.

"I reserve the point of order," he said, "for the purpose of ascertaining what the amendment really meant and what its significance really was. I find that it is to extend the antigambling law to the race track at Benning, where I suppose it ought to apply if it applies anywhere. The amendment is doubtless subject to a point of order. It is somewhat illogical to amend the bill in this way, but I do not propose to stand in the way of the enactment of proper antigambling laws for the District. I believe in that kind of legislation, and, therefore, I withdraw the point of order and will support the amendment."

Mr. SIMS thanked Mr. CRUMPACKER, and Representative KAHN, of California, a member of the House District Committee, rose to his feet.

POINT OF ORDER RAISED.

"I desire to make the point of order," said Mr. KAHN, "and to say in that connection that this matter has not been before our committee in such a way that the committee could take action on it. It is an unusual way to come in here and offer an amendment on a bill of this character, and I submit it is of sufficiently serious importance to be considered by the committee. I make the point of order."

On request of Mr. SIMS, Mr. KAHN temporarily reserved his point of order that Mr. SIMS might explain the attitude of the District Committee.

"A bill of this kind," said he, "except broader, and going to the extent of making it unlawful to make wagering contracts on futures, was introduced and went to the District Committee. I offered this provision as a substitute for the bill, and it was voted down. Then, after consideration of the bill, which included this and other matters, the bill of the gentleman from Kansas was tabled. So the subject-matter has been considered by the committee, but I am sorry to be compelled to say that it did not meet with the approval of a majority of those present."

"I hope the gentleman from California will not make the point of order, because here is a law which plainly says it shall be unlawful to lay wagers and make bets within 1 mile of the limits of Washington and Georgetown, leaving all the rest of the District without protection of a law which is thought to be necessary within the city. Now, if the existing law is a good law 1 mile beyond the limits of these cities, why is it not a good law a little farther—to the limits of the District of Columbia, which does not exceed 10 miles square. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his point of order."

But Mr. KAHN was obdurate. He insisted that the bill was brought up in committee for the first time at the last meeting and was not fully considered. He said he was just as anxious as Mr. SIMS to limit gambling; that he had never laid a wager on a horse race in his life, but he did not think this was a proper way to legislate, and insisted on his point of order, which was sustained by Representative DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, in the chair.

Representative SHACKLEFORD, of Missouri, who has a profoundly serious countenance and a fund of unconscious humor, asked Mr. SIMS why it was, if he wanted to stop gambling, he desired to widen Benning road so the gamblers could get to it more easily.

Mr. MANN, of Illinois, seeing an opportunity for some fun, demanded that Mr. SIMS answer whether or not the bill was in the interest of the Benning race track.

RACING WITHOUT BETTING.

"I certainly did not think so," replied Mr. SIMS, "and, moreover, the amendment I offered was to prevent betting, not horse racing. You can go out and see all the horses run you want to and spend all the time you want to there and not lose your money." [Laughter.]

"Benning would not last very long if there was no betting there," suggested Mr. MANN.

"This matter of betting," remarked Mr. MADDEN, drolly, "is like the question of the bedbug; there is not so much objection to the bedbug but to the infernal method he has of getting a living." [Laughter.]

The Benning bill was then laid aside and other District matters taken up.

THE HOUSE LINED UP.

Mr. SIMS got in his slick and resourceful legislative tactics when the Committee of the Whole arose and reported action on the various bills. When the bill for the widening of Benning road was reported to the House—of course without the Sims amendment, that having been stricken out on a point of order—Mr. SIMS moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia, with instructions to report the bill back with his previously offered amendment in it. A vote was taken on this proposition and the "noes" seemed to have it, but when Mr. SIMS called for a division the record showed seventy Members in favor of Mr. SIMS's proposition and only four against.

Then the Tennesseean moved that the bill be called up as amended and passed.

"The bill has been recommitted to the committee," remarked Uncle Joe.

"With a direction for them to make a report," returned Mr. SIMS.

"But the gentleman from Tennessee did not put 'forthwith' in his motion," commented the Speaker.

"Well," said Mr. SIMS, nothing daunted, "I move that 'forthwith' be added to the motion."

Again the bill was laid aside while measures for the extension of Ninth street, Girard street, and New York avenue were disposed of, and then Mr. SIMS returned to the charge, by moving to reconsider the vote by which the bill for the widening of Benning road was recommitted to the District Committee. The motion was agreed to, and then Mr. SIMS, extricating his measure from the parliamentary tangle into which it had inadvertently been led, moved to recommit once more in the same language with the lacking "forthwith" added.

Chairman SMITH, of the committee, wanted to know what "forthwith" meant—whether it meant at once or within twenty-four hours.

"It means at once," said Mr. SIMS, belligerently.

"It means forthwith," remarked the Speaker pacifically.

BILL REPORTED AND PASSED.

After some more sparring, Chairman SMITH rose and announced that he was ready to report the bill with amendment. A vote was then taken on the Sims amendment and on the bill, and the measure was passed without further opposition.

At the close of the festivities Mr. SIMS was warmly congratulated by his friends on the House floor for the masterly manner in which he had handled an intricate parliamentary situation.

The House also passed during yesterday's District day session bills to provide for the registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District; to regulate the establishment and maintenance of private hospitals and asylums in the District; to amend an act to extend Meridian place NW.; to extend Ninth street NW. from Barry place to Euclid street; to extend Girard street NW. from its present terminus to Fifteenth street NW.; to extend New York avenue from its present terminus near Fourth street NE. to the Bladensburg road; to extend the time limit for the completion of the lines of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Company twelve months; to allow firemen injured in the course of duty to be treated at the expense of the firemen's pension fund, and to license all drivers for vehicles for hire and tax them \$1 a year.

COMMISSIONERS MUCH GRATIFIED.

The members of the Board of Commissioners this morning expressed gratification over the success of Representative SIMS yesterday. The Commissioners propose to make every effort to secure the bill's approval in the Senate.

Commissioner Macfarland, who has been persistently fighting the gamblers at Benning for some time, said to-day:

"I am exceedingly glad that the House adopted the Sims amendment and I trust the Senate may adopt it soon enough to stop the gambling at Benning during the present race meeting. I still think that it could have been broken up by vigorous action under the present law, but in view of the difference of opinion about the law, amendment of it seems more necessary than ever. The Commissioners recommended legislation as the most certain method of stamping out this evil, just as Governor Hughes did in New York, and in this as in their other efforts in this matter have met with similar opposition and misrepresentation. For example, the suggestion has been made that it was not respectful to the law and the courts to make a vigorous effort to break up the operations of the gamblers at Benning, in view of a court decision that a particular case based on certain evidence and on an indictment drawn in a certain way could not be maintained. There was nothing in the decision to show that a case with a better indictment and different evidence would not be upheld by the same court. No court has ever suggested that the present law is void for unconstitutionality or any other reason. As a matter of fact, the police are preparing to file informations on evidence collected under the very same law which it has been claimed would not permit us to make arrests. My idea is that the best way to show respect to the law is to enforce it. However, the prompt passage of the Sims amendment will stop the gambling at Benning, and every good citizen should advocate it earnestly."

Commissioner West said: "The passage of the Sims bill in the House meets with my hearty approval, and I hope that it can be taken up promptly in the Senate and enacted into law. Under the law passed in 1891 book making and pool selling were legalized in the territory occupied by the race track, and the law has been upheld by the courts. Under these circumstances the way to abolish race-track gambling in the District of Columbia is to repeal this law. The action of the House is, to my mind, a step in the right direction, and I do not believe that the Senate will fail to act when that body appreciates, as in my judgment it will, the fact that public sentiment in this District is overwhelmingly in favor of the abolition of race-track gambling here."

The following is an editorial appearing in the Evening Star of the same date:

THE SIMS AMENDMENT.

The Sims amendment, adopted yesterday by the House after a strenuous performance in which the author of the proposition showed a high degree of parliamentary skill, strikes a deathblow at race gambling in this District. If adopted by the Senate in its present form, it will put an end to the semiannual performances at Benning, which cost the people of the capital heavily, both financially and morally.

By eliminating the words of the statute "within 1 mile of the boundaries of said cities," the amendment carries the prohibition against gambling in all forms to the District boundary and puts an end to the shameful discrimination between the games of chance played at tables or with apparatus or cards and the gambling device which masquerades under the guise of the sport of racing horses.

But the Sims amendment goes further and seeks to spread upon the statute a definition which will leave no possible question as to the intent of the law in the matter of race betting. The proposed new language is as follows:

"Anyone who anywhere acts as a layer of odds or bookmaker, or by any means induces or entices others to bet, directly or indirectly, whether he does or does not make a memorandum of bets or in any way records them, is liable for making books under this act."

This clause is designed to meet the situation created by the first of the now pending decisions of the court, which, by classifying a bookmaker occupying a fixed position in the established betting ring as one who sets up a gaming table, within the meaning of section 865 of the code, led to the evolution of the ridiculous, but at present effective, expedient of keeping the bookmakers on the move. If the clause is adopted, any method of receiving bets, wherever the bookmaker may stand, whether at rest or in motion, whether carrying a chart or sheet or working solely through memory, becomes illegal and punishable.

The great requirement, however, is met by the simple device of cutting from the statute the words "within 1 mile of the boundaries of said cities," which establish a zone of permissible race-track gambling covering nearly two-thirds of the total area of the District.

The measure, thus happily secured by dint of Mr. SIMS's persistent and skillful efforts in the House, now goes to the Senate for consideration. The fact that it is in the form of an amendment to a street-widening bill does not lessen its significance or the responsibility of the upper House in the premises. The local sentiment in favor of the abolition of race-track gambling is unmistakable. Let the Senate committee open its doors to the people and there will soon be no chance to doubt the demand of the community that the anomaly of the law which permits gambling in one part of the capital and prohibits it in another be ended.

It is hoped in the public interest that the action of the Senate on this bill will be as prompt and decisive as that of the House has been.

The following is an editorial from the Washington Herald of same date:

CONGRESS AND RACE-TRACK GAMBLING.

If the Senate does its simple duty promptly—a duty that should not consume ten minutes—the race-track gambling evil, which now disgraces the National capital, can be suppressed before the week is out.

Of course the Senate will perform that duty. Certainly Chairman GALLINGER, of the District Committee, and all the Senators who value the good name of Washington City may be depended upon to see that no obstacle be put in the way of the passage of so righteous a measure.

Thanks to Representative SIMS, the House, by practically a unanimous vote, has passed a bill, clear and to the point in its provisions, which wipes out the mile limit and exempts no part of the District of Columbia from the operation of the antigambling law. Unincumbered and aiming directly at the Benning lawlessness, the bill leaves no loophole for argument or obstruction. The House naturally went on record overwhelmingly against further public gambling within the very shadow of the Capitol.

If the Jockey Club can continue its racing meets without the disgraceful and demoralizing gambling features so injurious to the business as well as the morals of the community, no possible objection can be raised to them. On the contrary, the meets will be welcomed. But if, as the Jockey Club itself admits, racing depends upon gambling, then the sooner the whole business is outlawed here, as it has been outlawed in nearly all cities, the better for the capital of the nation.

Now, it is in order for the Senate speedily to complete the good work of the House.

The foregoing newspaper articles and editorials speak for themselves. They show that the demand for this legislation is urgent. Immediate action is demanded by all good people everywhere. I have received a flood of letters congratulating the House on its good work, and all, without the exception of one, urging prompt and energetic action by the Senate, and I believe the hopes of the supporters of this measure will be realized at as early a day as it is possible for cautious and careful consideration to be given to this measure by that great body at the other end of this Capitol.

Mr. BELL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, during the time allotted me I desire to enter upon a fuller discussion of the great question of government aid to the public roads of the entire country. I am a member of the vast army of agriculturists, whose means go most largely to the support of government, but whose material interests find the least consideration at the hands of the national governing body. The farmer needs better roads for the transportation of his crops, and the time has come, in my opinion, for the National Government to inaugurate a policy that shall give him the best system of roads known to the world.

The good-roads question is no longer a merely local one. The great questions of transportation have given the country roads of the entire country an importance equal to that of the railroads and of the public waterways. No matter how much of agricultural or mineral wealth is transported over these systems of transportation to final destination and market, the initial transportation of all of it is over the country road. From the farms or mines to the stations or the wharves is the first element of the transportation problem, while from wharves and stations to the market is but its second phase.

The first element falls most heavily on the producers of agricultural and mineral wealth and very frequently destroys what under more favorable circumstances might have been a profitable venture. Bad roads from the mines or farms to the wharves or stations either call for the transportation of a lighter load or the maintenance of an unnecessary number of transporting animals. Good roads will provide larger loads with less power, a saving in time, expense, and trouble.

What value comes from the farms and mines?

The Agricultural Yearbook for 1905 gives the following figures showing the productive power of the farms in that year:

Cornbushels	2,707,993,000
Wheatdo	692,979,000
Oatsdo	953,216,000
Barleydo	136,651,000
Ryedo	28,486,000
Buckwheatdo	14,585,000
Potatoes, 1904do	332,830,000
Hay, 1905tons	60,531,000
Cotton, 1904pounds	6,722,000,000
Tobacco, 1904do	700,561,000
Hops, 1905do	51,200,000
Flaxseed, 1904do	23,401,000
Rice, 1904do	1,163,000,000
Sugar in United Statestons	342,000

These figures indicate an enormous tonnage originating at the farm and carried in its initial journey to market over the country roads. So much for the grain products.

Animals.	Number.
Milch cows	20,810,000
Cattle, including milch cows	68,738,000
Horses	21,714,000
Mules	3,584,000
Sheep	50,869,000
Swine	53,087,000

These, with the exception of the milch cows and a part of the horses and mules, form an enormous item of farm tonnage

going over country roads on the initial journey to market. The number of horses, mules, and cattle provided for hauling over bad roads is unnecessarily increased, and this, together with the expense of their maintenance, makes a burden on the farmer which in all good conscience should be removed.

It has been estimated that good roads throughout the country would do away with the necessity for 2,500,000 of the horses, cattle, and mules now required for carrying farm products to shipping points.

The mineral products were:

Gold, 1904fine ounces	16,780,000
Silver, 1904do	168,320,000
Coal, 1904tons	314,562,000
Pig iron, 1905do	22,992,000
Crude petroleumgallons	4,917,812,000

These are immense tonnages and represent not only the railroad and water transportation, but that other transportation, the one neglected and forgotten, the transportation to the shipping points.

The total mileage of all the railroads in the country in 1904 was 212,348 miles. The improved county roads in California alone in that year aggregated 50,000 miles, or nearly one-fourth of the railroad mileage of the country. Maryland had 16,000 miles; Massachusetts, 20,000; New York, 14,000. These four States have an aggregate of improved roads of nearly one-half the railroad mileage of the country. From this it will be seen how great is the aggregate of the improved and unimproved country roads of the country, equal factors in transportation with the railroads.

The freight carried by all these roads in 1904 aggregated 1,275,000,000 tons, or the unthinkable quantity of 2,550,000,000,000 pounds, earning for the railroads \$1,374,100,000, or more than \$1 per ton. There were 9,840,000,000 cars of freight traveling over the country that year. Can anyone figure out the enormous number of wagonloads, the enormous number of trips made by the 15,000,000 horses and mules carrying these colossal weights to the nearest station? Will anyone say, in the face of figures like these, that the initial transportation necessitated for this enormous railroad traffic should not have the most favorable consideration at our hands?

NATIONAL AID TO RAILROADS.

The United States has not been niggard in its donations to railroad corporations. From the Land Office report of 1903 it appears that the National Government has patented to railroad corporations up to June 30 of that year an aggregate of 64,000,000 acres, and to States for the use of railroads 40,000,000 acres, or a total of railroad grants of 104,000,000 acres, and for wagon-road grants 2,500,000 acres, or less than one-fiftieth as much. Is it fair to make fish of one element of transportation and fowl of another?

Besides all this, the United States Government has guaranteed the indebtedness of the Pacific railroads, amounting, principal and interest, to \$138,000,000. The waterways of the country, through the various river and harbor bills that have passed through Congress since the formation of the Republic, have been given by direct appropriations from the Treasury of the United States about \$450,000,000. Transportation from the shipping points to market over railways and boats has had ample attention from the Government of the United States, while transportation from the farm to the shipping point has had almost nothing.

In any estimate of aid to railroads the indirect aid given them by the Government should not be overlooked. If we consider that we are now paying the railroads \$40,000,000 per annum for the carrying of mails, and that we have been paying a possible average of \$20,000,000 per annum since 1887, payments for services which in France the railroads are required to perform for mere nominal sums, it will be seen that the railroads have been given an indirect Government aid from which farm transportation has been excluded.

THE COST OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM TO FARMERS.

It has been stated that it costs as much to deliver a bushel of grain 5 miles to the railroad in Illinois as it then costs to carry it 1,100 miles to Buffalo. In the tobacco region of West Virginia it costs five times as much to deliver that product 8 miles over mud roads as it then costs to carry it more than 400 miles to Richmond. Estimates have been made which show that it requires ten days' hauling, on an average, for each farmer in the United States to carry his produce to market. The Twelfth Census reported 5,739,756 farms in 1900. Counting one person to the farm engaged in delivering for ten days a year, the time consumed would amount to about 57,000,000 days, which at \$3 per day for man and team would require

\$171,000,000 per annum. With the present system the farmer must take the good weather for delivery, as it is only in such weather that the roads are passable. With better roads he could not only haul more, but utilize the bad weather periods, when he could do little work on the farm, for delivering his farm products to market.

A French farmer rarely carries his produce to market when he can work in the field. He selects a time for hauling which is too inclement for his work in the field. When it rains or snows or when it is too cold for farm work he loads his wagon for market, and despite rain or snow or cold is able to carry three or four times as much with the same number of horses as the farmer can in Georgia, Iowa, or the average American State. Investigation has shown that the average cost of transporting a ton over a mile of dirt road in the United States is about 25 cents. The consuls of the United States abroad have sent facts from twenty-three points in European countries which show that the cost of carrying a ton over European improved roads is between 10 and 12 cents. It is perfectly fair to assume that, after allowing for all differences in condition in this country, a system of improved roads would reduce the ton mileage to about 12 cents, a saving of about one-half. It has been estimated again that a billion dollars per annum are paid in the United States for dirt-road transportation alone, and an improvement that promises to save half that sum to the farmers is certainly worthy of the most serious consideration. The census of 1900 reports 10,000,000 and more persons engaged on the farms. The saving to each person would amount to about \$50 per annum. The average annual farm wages are less than \$400 per annum, which would be increased through this saving about 8 per cent. If the number of farms be used in the calculation, the saving would be about \$88 per farm, or 20 per cent on an average wage of \$440.

These illustrations are pertinent, and may be extended indefinitely, but enough has been shown to warrant the conclusion that our present system of roads increases unnecessarily the burden of expenditure to the farmer, wastes his time and energies, besides making it impossible for him to grasp all the elements of self and home development which our marvelous opportunities and civilization provide.

WHO MAKE THE ORDINARY ROADS?

The construction and improvement of the common roads of the country, the roads over which the initial transportation of our products must to the largest extent be made, the roads over which the necessities of life and raw materials must pass to sustain the life and promote the health, comfort, and prosperity of the whole people, is a burden which for one hundred years has rested solely on the people of the rural districts. The cities and towns provide their own streets and avenues and are exempt from service or tax as to the rural roads. These roads are to the largest extent made by the farmers themselves under legalized requirements, upon ill-considered plans, and without coordination or purpose or plan. The men are warned out to work the roads under the supervision of an overseer not fitted for the work and without power to enforce the little fitness he may have. Where taxation has been resorted to it has been local, falling upon the farmers or road users, and not general, with the result that where good roads are most needed there the poorest are to be found and vice versa. The States have for one hundred years or more been tinkering with the roads, and in most cases they are in a worse condition to-day than they were before. The States have not proceeded under the requirements of a well-devised plan for a general system of roads and have for the most part been unable to bear the tremendous expense generated by the good-roads movement.

After one hundred years of crazy patchwork we are able to show a system of roads in which 5 per cent are good, 10 per cent fairly passable, and 85 per cent bad, indifferent, execrable, or worse. When Sam Jones said that he could dive off the sidewalk in a certain Western town and go boot-top deep in mud, no one smiled, as that was apparently the ordinary condition of things; but when he added parenthetically the words "head foremost," a roar of laughter followed the statement, and the extravagance of the statement simply emphasized the truthfully horrid condition of many of our roads. Fifteen per cent may be called roads and all the balance mere rights of way.

To build an improved road according to well-devised plans costs from \$100 to \$400 a mile where sand and clay are used, and from \$3,000 to \$9,000 per mile for macadamized roads. Under the present system it has been estimated that our dirt roads cost about \$12 a mile. It is evident that a system which affords \$12 a mile can not be relied on to give roads that cost

\$400 a mile, much less the better roads costing \$3,000 a mile. It is also evident that the States generally working alone can not reasonably be expected to furnish the means to build a general system of macadamized roads, and yet it is to that system that the United States must come if it is to compare in any sense with the enlightened countries of Europe in any system of well-devised roads.

California in twenty years has expended \$49,500,000 on 50,000 miles of county roads, but is still a long way from the haven of a complete system of good roads. Connecticut appropriated \$225,000 in 1903 to build 450 miles of roads, paying \$3,000 a mile for gravel roads and \$6,500 per mile for 16-foot macadamized roads. Illinois appropriates \$25,000 a year to aid the counties in their improvement of roads. Maryland appropriates \$10,000 a year to keep up and improve 16,000 miles of roads. The counties of Maryland maintain about 900 miles of shell, stone, and gravel roads. It is estimated that the counties of this State spend annually for road maintenance about \$600,000 and that the people pay in tolls on 497 miles of toll road about \$140,000. The average hauling distance in Maryland is 6.7 miles and the average load per horse about one-half a ton. The average cost of hauling a ton 1 mile is 26 cents and the cost of macadamized roads 20-foot wide, macadamized 12 feet, is from \$4,000 to \$6,000 a mile. In 1904 the legislature of Maryland appropriated \$200,000 for the construction of macadamized roads.

Massachusetts appropriates \$450,000 per annum for constructing and \$60,000 for maintenance. This State has already put \$6,000,000 in her roads, and has recently appropriated \$2,250,000 more for a five-years expenditure. The 12 to 15 foot stone roads of the State cost about \$5,750 a mile, and the gravel roads from \$3,000 to \$4,000 a mile. Up to October 1, 1905, they had built 615 miles of roads. There are 20,000 miles of road in the State, of which 1,900 will eventually obtain State aid. The great body of the roads in this State will have to be improved locally or go without improvement.

From all these considerations it is evident, to my mind, that the States can not be looked to with any degree of assurance for that aid which will improve the public roads used by the neighborhood farmer. The only hope for an aid that shall be all sufficient and permanent is from the National Government. [Applause.]

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PHASES OF THIS QUESTION.

From 1789 to 1822 Congress appropriated money in aid of internal improvements, principally for the construction of roads and highways. Since 1822 the policy of the Government has been adverse to appropriations for roads, although about \$450,000,000 have been appropriated for rivers and harbors, improvements as clearly inhibited by the constitutional provisions and arguments as improvements of the public roads. In 1822 Congress made an appropriation in aid of the Cumberland road, which was vetoed by President Monroe in a message which has been accepted ever since as sound constitutional law and as an authority. An analysis of the appropriating bill and of the message vetoing it does not support the contention that Congress has not the right to appropriate to aid in the construction of public roads, but, on the contrary, expressly warrants such an appropriation. The particular bill vetoed not only appropriated money in aid of the Cumberland road, but went further, very much further, and in this extension beyond the mere appropriation was held to be unconstitutional. The Cumberland road bill of 1822 appropriated money for the construction of the road, not under State auspices, but under national auspices. The right of Congress to appropriate money to the States to be used by the States for building roads was clearly upheld by Monroe, but the right of the National Government to enter upon a general scheme of public improvements for itself, directing them, controlling, and owning them, was denied. This is all there is of the question. Congress, under strict State rights construction, may constitutionally appropriate \$25,000,000 a year, to be divided among the States in accordance with some equitable plan, the States being required to use said money for the improvements designated, to own and to maintain them afterwards.

The advocating an appropriation of \$25,000,000 per annum by the General Government to the States for the improvement of public roads by the States is not an abandonment of State rights, nor is it in any sense, as has been intimated in influential quarters, "a milestone in the progress of constitutional thinking." Jefferson thought this way; Madison so thought, as did Monroe and Jackson. State rights as a doctrine was clearly upheld by all these men in their every reference to public improvements, and the right of Government to appropriate to the

States upheld in the same breath. In advocating this measure of appropriation of the National Government to the public roads no States-rights advocate advances in constitutional thinking, but simply asserts boldly and clearly what the older States-rights leaders made clear in their day. Following is an extract from President Monroe's veto message which is worthy of the careful reading of every man in this body, and which explicitly upholds our constitutional right to appropriate money absolutely to the States for the improvement of the public roads in the States. [Applause.]

On page 167 of volume 2 of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents by Richardson, the following language, being a part of Monroe's great State paper, appears:

Good roads and canals will promote many very important national purposes. They will facilitate the operations of war, the movements of troops, the transportation of cannons or provisions, and every warlike store, much to our advantage and to the disadvantage of the enemy in time of war. Good roads will facilitate the transportation of the mail, and thereby promote the purposes of commerce and political intelligence among the people. They will, by being properly directed to these objects, enhance the value of our vacant lands, a treasure of vast resource to the nation. To the appropriation of the public money to improvements having these objects in view and carried to a certain extent I do not see any well-founded constitutional objection.

In the same document Monroe laid down the principle by which such an appropriation should be governed while reiterating in strong language the undoubted right. He said:

That Congress have an unlimited power to raise money, and that in its appropriation they have a discretionary power, restricted only by the duty to appropriate it to purposes of common defense, and of general, not local, national, not State, benefit.

Every States-rights advocate in the land may lawfully advocate the appropriations asked for by either the Latimer or Brownlow bill, without surrendering a single iota of his convictions, for the improvement of the public roads of the entire United States through a system devised for the entire country and carried out by the States themselves is an appropriation of money "for general, not local, purposes; national, not State, benefit."

Jackson, in vetoing the Maysville road bill, very properly held that as the road was entirely in a single State, and the appropriation for a single road that it violated the principle of "general, not local; national, not State, benefit."

President Jackson also suggested, both in his annual address and in the veto message referred to, another method of a constitutional aid to the public roads of the country, and that was a division of the surplus revenue among the several States according to their ratio of representation. A division of the surplus was accordingly made and the constitutionality of the Williams bill, now before us, placed beyond controversy. [Applause.]

Beginning with the early years of the last century, there is an almost uninterrupted succession of acts, reaching down as far as the present generation, appropriating money for the construction of roads—some for military purposes—in the different States, the total of these appropriations running up into many millions of dollars.

By act of March 29, 1806, the construction of the famous Cumberland road, stretching from the Potomac to the Ohio River, was authorized, and from time to time supplementary acts were passed extending the road into Indiana and Illinois, the last appropriation being made by act of May 25, 1838, and the total of appropriations for that road aggregated \$6,832,945.05. The total of appropriations by Congress for public roads up to and including 1838, was approximately \$17,000,000. From that time to the present road construction on the part of the Government, except such as was done by the War Department for purely military purposes, may be said to have stopped altogether, but from 1893 to the present time small annual appropriations have been made for public-road inquiries and demonstrations, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, the total of which amounts to \$401,000.

It will be of interest to note in this connection that there is a total mileage of all public roads of 2,151,570 (1904), of which 153,662 miles were improved roads, surfaced with gravel or stone or other materials, the total cost on account of them in all the States and Territories being \$79,771,417.87.

In my opinion we have an undoubted right to do what is asked for by any one of the three bills now before us, the end of each being the appropriation of about \$24,000,000 or \$25,000,000 to the States to aid them in the improvement of the dirt roads of the country, this end being reached in two of the bills by direct appropriations and in the other by an apportionment of the surplus revenues among the States in the ratio of their representation.

WHAT THE STATES WOULD RECEIVE.

In each of the bills the paramount idea seems to be that the appropriation or the apportionment shall be in the ratio of representation or population. Estimating the population of the country to be 80,000,000 and the appropriation or apportionment \$24,000,000, the sum of \$300,000 would be appropriated or apportioned to every million people in a State. Using this ratio, we calculate the following as each State's share, and with it give the area in square miles of each State:

State.	Distributive share.	Square miles.
Alabama.....	\$540,000	52,000
Alaska.....	18,000	560,000
Arizona.....	36,000	112,000
Arkansas.....	300,000	53,000
California.....	440,000	158,000
Colorado.....	150,000	108,000
Connecticut.....	270,000	4,980
Delaware.....	54,000	2,050
Florida.....	156,000	58,680
Georgia.....	660,000	59,475
Idaho.....	48,000	84,806
Illinois.....	1,400,000	56,650
Indiana.....	750,000	36,350
Indian Territory.....	117,000	31,400
Iowa.....	690,000	56,026
Kansas.....	440,000	83,080
Kentucky.....	640,000	40,400
Louisiana.....	410,000	48,730
Maine.....	200,000	33,040
Maryland.....	330,000	12,210
Massachusetts.....	840,000	8,315
Michigan.....	720,000	58,915
Minnesota.....	510,000	83,365
Mississippi.....	460,000	46,810
Missouri.....	980,000	69,415
Montana.....	72,000	14,618
Nebraska.....	300,000	77,510
Nevada.....	12,000	110,000
New Hampshire.....	123,000	79,305
New Jersey.....	560,000	7,815
New Mexico.....	57,000	122,580
New York.....	2,217,000	49,170
North Carolina.....	540,000	52,250
North Dakota.....	93,000	70,795
Ohio.....	1,240,000	41,080
Oklahoma.....	117,000	39,030
Oregon.....	123,000	98,000
Pennsylvania.....	1,800,000	45,215
Rhode Island.....	125,000	1,850
South Carolina.....	400,000	30,570
South Dakota.....	120,000	76,650
Tennessee.....	600,000	42,050
Texas.....	900,000	265,780
Utah.....	81,000	84,970
Vermont.....	102,000	9,565
Virginia.....	540,000	42,450
Washington.....	150,000	69,180
West Virginia.....	280,000	24,780
Wisconsin.....	600,000	56,040
Wyoming.....	27,000	97,890

These figures show the almost exact distributive share of each State on a basis of \$300,000 to 1,000,000 people. A comparison of the amounts received, with the areas of the States receiving them, reveals some remarkable incongruities, and makes it certain that while a division according to the ratio of population is just under one phase of the discussion that it is remarkably unjust upon another. The very States that need aid, States rich in mineral if not agricultural wealth, would receive almost nothing, while other States that have received tremendous sums in the way of river and harbor appropriations and who have relatively small areas, would receive abnormally large sums. It seems to me that if the Government has the right to appropriate money for general purposes that it has the undoubted right to distribute its largess by a method which will enable the smaller and weaker States, with smaller population and larger area and demanding a much larger number of roads, to receive a much larger sum than their ratio of representation or population would permit them to receive. It seems to me also that patriotism demands that the richer and more populous States shall consent to receive a smaller sum than that demanded by the ratio of population, in order that the other States may receive a greater sum. By this means and by this means alone a general system of good roads can be established throughout the country and the general good of the country be most largely conserved.

Being satisfied that this patriotism exists in this body and that it will voice its sentiment in this manner, I submit the general proposition that no State shall receive more than \$1,000,000 per annum and that no State shall receive less than either \$300,000 or \$400,000 per annum. I have calculated the expenditure upon each of these bases and find that in neither case will the requirement be more than \$25,000,000 per annum.

State.	On \$300,000 basis.	On \$400,000 basis.
Alabama.....	\$500,000	\$500,000
Arkansas.....	400,000	400,000
Alaska.....	300,000	400,000
Arizona.....	300,000	400,000
California.....	500,000	500,000
Colorado.....	300,000	400,000
Connecticut.....	300,000	400,000
Delaware.....	300,000	400,000
Florida.....	300,000	400,000
Georgia.....	600,000	600,000
Idaho.....	300,000	400,000
Illinois.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Indiana.....	700,000	700,000
Indian Territory.....	300,000	400,000
Iowa.....	600,000	600,000
Kansas.....	500,000	500,000
Kentucky.....	600,000	600,000
Louisiana.....	400,000	400,000
Maine.....	300,000	400,000
Maryland.....	300,000	400,000
Massachusetts.....	700,000	700,000
Michigan.....	700,000	700,000
Minnesota.....	500,000	500,000
Mississippi.....	400,000	400,000
Missouri.....	700,000	700,000
Montana.....	300,000	400,000
Nebraska.....	300,000	400,000
Nevada.....	300,000	400,000
New Hampshire.....	300,000	400,000
New Jersey.....	300,000	400,000
New Mexico.....	400,000	400,000
New York.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
North Carolina.....	500,000	500,000
North Dakota.....	300,000	400,000
Ohio.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Oregon.....	300,000	400,000
Pennsylvania.....	800,000	800,000
Rhode Island.....	300,000	400,000
South Carolina.....	400,000	400,000
South Dakota.....	300,000	400,000
Tennessee.....	500,000	500,000
Texas.....	800,000	800,000
Utah.....	300,000	400,000
Vermont.....	300,000	400,000
Virginia.....	500,000	500,000
Washington.....	300,000	400,000
West Virginia.....	300,000	400,000
Wisconsin.....	500,000	500,000
Wyoming.....	300,000	400,000

Let us do this, do it now, and do it continuously for thirty years, and the problem of good roads will be solved for all time to come.

In conclusion, I desire to incorporate as a part of my remarks a copy of the bill which I have introduced and which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

A bill (H. R. 16988) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be established in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways.

SEC. 2. That the object and purpose of said Bureau shall be to cooperate with the various States and Territories of the United States in the construction and improvement of permanent public roads according to the provisions of this act; to make investigations and experiments in regard to the best methods of road making and the best road-making materials; to cooperate with the various States and Territories of the United States in the construction of object-lesson roads; to publish and distribute bulletins and reports on the subject of roads and road improvement; to bring about, as far as may be, a uniform system for the repair, improvement, and construction of the public roads throughout the United States.

SEC. 3. That there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a chief of said Bureau of Public Highways, to be known and designated as Director of Highways, who shall be selected with a view to his practical knowledge of the construction of highways and whose salary shall be \$—— a year. The President shall detail from the Engineer Corps of the Army an officer not below the rank of captain, who shall act as assistant to the Director of Highways, and the said Director shall be authorized to appoint, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, such inspectors, clerks, and messengers as may be necessary for the proper transaction of the business of the said Bureau, and the amount required to pay the salaries of the Director and of the said office force, and also the necessary contingent expenses of the said Bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for the year ending June 30, 1909, are hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the said Director of Highways shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall exercise general jurisdiction over all matters and acts coming under the control of the said Director by virtue of this enactment.

SEC. 4. That after the expiration of six months from the date of the approval of this act any State or Territory or civil subdivision thereof, through the proper officers having jurisdiction of the public roads, may apply for aid in the improvement or construction of the public roads or sections thereof located in said State or Territory.

SEC. 5. That the said Director of Highways shall make and promulgate all needful rules and regulations under which the various States and Territories or civil subdivisions thereof may apply for and receive the benefits of this act. The said rules and regulations shall be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 6. That no State or Territory or civil subdivision thereof shall be entitled to receive the benefits of this act until it shall have established, to the satisfaction of the said Director of Highways: First, that

the highway, or section thereof, sought to be improved or constructed is of sufficient public importance to come within the purview of this act, taking into account the use, location, and value of such highway, or section thereof, for the purposes of common traffic and travel and for the delivery of the mail of the United States; second, that the requisite right of way for the improvement and construction of the highway, or section thereof, has been secured; third, that the highway, or section thereof, when constructed or improved will be maintained and kept in repair without recourse upon the United States; fourth, that the State or Territory or civil subdivision thereof has provided for the payment of its portion of the total cost of the improvement or construction as provided for in this act.

SEC. 7. That one-half of the expense of the improvement or construction of any public highway of any State or Territory or civil subdivision thereof that may receive the benefits of this act shall be paid by the Treasurer of the United States, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture issued upon the requisition of said Director of Highways, out of any specific appropriation made to carry out the provisions of this act, and that one-half of the expense thereof shall be paid by the State or Territory or civil subdivision thereof in which the highway or section thereof is located: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the said State or Territory or civil subdivision thereof from receiving credit for labor, material, and machinery used in the construction or improvements of said highway or section thereof: *Provided further*, That no money shall be advanced by the United States in payment of its proportion of the expense of the improvement or construction as herein provided for, except as the work of actual construction progresses, and in no case shall the payment or payments made prior to the completion of the work be in excess of 80 per cent of the value of the work actually performed.

SEC. 8. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000,000, to be disbursed in five annual installments of \$20,000,000 each, as hereinafter directed, the first of said annual installments to be available in and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909: *Provided*, That any part of such annual installment not expended during the then current fiscal year shall not be covered back into the Treasury, but shall be available for the work to be carried on in and for the fiscal year next thereafter succeeding.

SEC. 9. That the sum of \$20,000,000 hereby appropriated for each of the fiscal years next succeeding after the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, shall be apportioned among the States and Territories of the United States in the proportion which the population of each State and Territory bears to the total population of the United States: *Provided, however*, That no State or Territory shall receive in each year an amount larger than \$1,000,000 nor less than \$250,000.

SEC. 10. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and they hereby are, repealed.

I am of the opinion that the subject of good roads is to-day the most important before the American people. It is a subject which has been sadly neglected by our National Legislative bodies, but the time is at hand when we must seriously consider this question and legislate along the lines suggested in the foregoing bill, or else we must and will be called to account by the millions of interested and anxious people throughout the length and breadth of our land. The great mass of agricultural people of our country are beginning to realize that they are being discriminated against when year after year we appropriate millions upon millions for rivers and harbors, for transportation and commerce, which are in nowise more important than the initial transportation, which is so great a burden to the farmers in all sections of the United States. We can not afford and must not neglect such a vitally important matter, but let us get together as one man and build good roads for 80,000,000 of waiting people who make this the greatest country in all the earth.

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

Mr. WILLETT. Mr. Chairman, during my absence for a few moments this afternoon I have learned that one of the Members of this House, a colleague of mine, made a few remarks in which he referred to me personally.

Now, so far as any remarks I have made on the floor of this House are concerned, there is not a word I have uttered that I am not willing to defend and combat against any assault; and particularly is this true of anything that my belligerent Quaker colleague may say regarding my utterances upon this floor in the past. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As I read his remarks, that have been handed me by the reporters, I see an evident purpose of concealing from the mind and thought of his hearers the real man he was talking about. Now, I think it can be fairly said concerning me that in anything I have said on the floor of this House there has been no purpose on my part to conceal the person of whom I spoke. When my colleague from New York [Mr. SULZER] insisted upon knowing against whom it was Mr. COCKS was directing his remarks, then it disclosed this colloquy:

I am referring to a gentleman who is a constituent of mine and a resident of my district.

Mr. SULZER. Let us have his name.

Mr. COCKS of New York. He represents the Fourteenth District of New York.

Mr. SULZER. Tell his name.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Mr. WILLETT, I think, is his name.

[Laughter.]

If there is any name ever indelibly impressed upon the mind of Mr. COCKS, I think it is the name of WILLETT. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I had the honor of run-

ning against this gentleman in a Republican district normally 15,000. I took the standard of Democracy and went up and down that district advocating the principles of the Democracy, and if you had seen the coat tails of my belligerent friend as he followed me up and down you would have been astonished at the agility with which he traveled. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COCKS of New York. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. WILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Will the gentleman please indicate at what election was it that there was a 15,000 majority?

Mr. WILLETT. I say that the district normally had a 15,000 majority.

Mr. COCKS of New York. I assume we never had a normal vote in that district.

Mr. WILLETT. You never drew the Republican normal majority. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COCKS of New York. What candidate ever did receive it?

Mr. WILLETT. I am talking now about my colleague [Mr. Cocks].

Mr. SULZER. Governor Morton, when he ran for governor.

Mr. COCKS of New York. What did he carry the district by?

Mr. SULZER. By over 15,000.

Mr. WILLETT. Now, the great complaint that has been made concerning my remarks which have been addressed to the occupant of the White House has been that that poor, weak, insufficient little man has been unable to answer back, and therefore my attack has been unfair. Now, if there has ever been a man who held a public official position in the United States who insisted upon answering back, and who could answer back, it has been the man who is in the White House to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My friend [Mr. Cocks] has said he would be delighted to run against me again in that district upon the platform I have enunciated in the few remarks I have made. If the letters of commendation that have come from one end of his Congressional district to the other—and I am speaking now of his district—are any indication of the temper and mind and heart of the people of his district he is greatly in error concerning the wishes of the voters of that district and the principles to which they are adhering at this minute. Telegrams and letters of high commendation have come to me, and I have yet to receive the first letter from any resident or constituent of the First Congressional District which disagrees with me. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If it were not that it might indicate egotism on my part, I should be delighted to spread upon the record hundreds of letters which have been received from voters of the First District commending me for the remarks I have made. Why? Because they feel as my constituent from the First District does not feel; because they know, as he does not know, that the needs of the people at this minute are demanding relief. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I hold in my hand here letters I have received this morning from about fifteen labor unions, indicating that from 75 to 80 per cent of their members are out of work and are needing bread, and therefore they are pleading with me, as a Member of this House, to do what I can to assist them in this time of need. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman says if he thought what I have said in the way of criticism of the President would have any effect upon him or in any way detract from his popularity or in any way influence him, he would extend his remarks further. Why, of course anything that I say will not influence him. Anything that the Constitution of the United States says does not influence him. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Anything that millions of needy people of this land to-day are saying does not influence him. [Applause on the Democratic side.] "My policies" are the stream flowing from his lips and his never-ceasing tongue. "My policies for my people" are his declarations, and they must be accepted by us. I have been surprised, I will tell you frankly, and I have not hesitated to express my views in emphatic terms.

I have been in close touch with the throbbing hearts of needy people, as I have gone back to my district. I have met them by hundreds, and they have urged me to do something, but as I have looked at the majority side of this House, the side in whose hands are the reins of government, the side in whose hands is the weapon that can strike down the demon that is destroying us, and as I have seen the impotency and the absolute cowardice there, I have gone back to them and said: "There is no hope in our present Government, except to send to the halls of the House of Representatives men who are throbbing with the impulses of true Democracy, and I will pledge my life that we will give you relief." [Applause on the Democratic side.] When the man who represents the district

from which the President of the United States comes stands on this floor and says he has nothing to say in defense of the President, after the usurpations of that office, after the cowardice on the tariff, and a multitude of other things which he has exhibited, after the impotency of his own party, when he says he has nothing to say, it is a startling exhibition of unpatriotic representation in this mighty Hall. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, if you wanted to put through any legislation that would be helpful to the American people, you could do it in a day. You have the power, you have the machinery, you have all the influences that go to carry a complete and perfect consummation anything that you desire to accomplish. Why do you not do it? You do not dare to do it. You are cowards in the face of the American people to-day because you are on the threshold of a national election. Why do you not step to the forefront, unfurl God's great banner that is given to us as a free people, break off the shackles of these mighty trusts that have bound you in fetters of iron for years, and say: "The people shall be our people, and we will help them in the true spirit and letter of the law!" [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ELLERBE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the soil survey and investigation work as conducted by the Bureau of Soils in the Agricultural Department. This work, in my opinion, is not appreciated as it should be; and I sincerely trust the appropriation will be increased. Let us see what is being done by this Bureau.

The scope of the work of the Bureau of Soils as outlined in the official report of the Chief, June 30, 1894, in part is as follows:

One of the most important objects of the work of the Division should be to investigate and map the important soil areas in accordance with their geological relations and their agricultural value. These maps should be of such a character as to show the farmers or prospective settlers the character of the soil and the nature of the crops or the general classes of crops adapted to the general soil formations of the different regions. The soils adapted to the certain classes of crops should also be thoroughly investigated and mapped so that one could see by consulting the maps the areas adapted to certain classes of tobacco, truck, or horticultural interests. Such work forms an essentially new line of agricultural geology and requires for its successful prosecution persons trained in the difficult problems of surface geology and who have a broad appreciation and knowledge of the relation of soils to crops.

There are still large areas of land along the Atlantic coast and in other parts of the country lying out as waste lands which are adapted to the raising of early truck crops. There are large areas of land in many of our States, well adapted to the production of different classes of tobacco and to other agricultural and horticultural crops, which are not at present used to the best advantage because the relations of the soils to crops are not fully understood or appreciated.

The importance of this work has been so manifest to agriculturists throughout the United States that at the present time there are over 400 requests for soil surveys on file, and it is not possible to make as many surveys each year as there are recorded new requests for surveys. Such is the status of the work, when it has only been possible to map 10 per cent of the total area of lands held in farms in the United States, and requests for the work are coming in in a constantly increasing ratio. Some of the reasons for the necessity and demand for this work follow:

The soil survey constitutes an expert opinion of the character of the soils in each community and of the class of crops which can be raised to best advantage and of the methods of cultivation and fertilization which are most certain to produce good crop yields.

The soil surveys are used by agricultural colleges as a basis for further experimentation and demonstration, as a basis for instruction in soil science, and as a basis for advising farmers in planting and caring for crops.

They are used by individuals in search of investments and homes; by companies and individuals having lands for sale; by individuals, communities, and public officials in directing immigration, and by investment companies in placing loans.

In 1901 the Secretary of Agriculture, in his report, further defined the work of the Bureau of Soils, as follows:

The Bureau of Soils is charged with the study of soil problems in their relation to practical agriculture; with the investigation of the physical and chemical properties of soils and of the materials and methods involved in artificial fertilization and its influence upon the original soils; with the classification and mapping of soils in agricultural districts to show the distribution of the various soil types, with a view to determining their adaptability to certain crops, and their management and treatment; with the investigation of alkali problems and their relations to irrigation and seepage waters, the causes of the rise and accumulation of alkali, and the reclamation of injured or abandoned lands.

To assist in solving the many field problems which are met the laboratories investigate the distribution and movements of moisture in soils; the solubility of mineral matter in soil moisture, the chemistry of the various alkali salts, the mechanical distribution of mineral plant foods in the soil

moisture, the nature and physical chemistry relationships of the organic constituents of soils, and also devise methods and apparatus for the physical and chemical study of soils. A study is also being made of the effect of the size of the mineral soil particles upon the rate of solution.

To determine the treatment necessary for each type of soil, if it is to be used to produce the best results, the manurial requirements have been worked out for many soils. The manurial and fertilizer requirements of the principal soil types encountered during the progress of the soil survey are tested. In the past the character of fertilizer best suited to the needs of any soil could only be determined by long years of field experiment. By means of tests it is now possible to indicate in many cases what form of manure or fertilizer is required by different soils under different crop and climatic conditions. This would save millions formerly lost by an unwise use of fertilizers.

This testing of manurial and fertilizer requirements will be continued on all the principal types and classes of soils in the regions where the use of fertilizers or manure is common or is being introduced. In this way the soil-survey reports will not only deal with the appropriate selection of characteristic soils for the production of different farm crops, but will also indicate the proper procedure whereby increased yields of the staple crops may be secured. These two problems—adaptation of soil to crop and the maintenance and increase of crop yields—constitute the great agricultural problems of the country.

A circular has been prepared to meet the many requests received by the Bureau of Soils for detailed information concerning the wire-basket method for determining the manurial requirements of soils. The method consists in growing plants in small wire pots containing soil to which fertilizers of different kinds and in varying quantities have been added.

It should be borne in mind that this is a method not for a study of the requirements of plants, but for the fertilizer requirements of soils in which the plants are used as an indicator.

This is distinctly a soil problem, because it can not be intelligently worked out except as relating to soil study itself. The failure of all others to successfully solve these problems is simply the history of ignoring or paying little attention to the soil factor, because they do not know how to cope with it, although a matter of primary importance.

The Secretary, in his report to the President February 1, 1900, states as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit a report of this Department upon the field operations of the Division of Soils during the year 1899. It covers not only the most important work of this Division, but is, in my opinion, regarded in the light of the possible results of the information which has been secured thereby, the most important work of this character ever undertaken in any country.

Undoubtedly the most pressing demands for a soil survey arise from a consideration of special problems. It may be for the consideration of industries which could be introduced into a section of the country where, from the increased competition and the opening up of new areas, the specialization of crops at present grown in the area, or from various social problems, the industries have languished and new industries or new methods are desired to build up the locality. A very important consideration, however, lies in the introduction and spread of new industries, in the improvement and development of the different types of tobacco, of fruit production, of truck growing, of sugar beets, and of other special crops; also in the improvement of certain soil areas by the use of fertilizers, by the introduction of underdrainage, and in the West by the protection of soils against seepage waters and alkali and the reclamation of lands already injured by these causes. The alkali problem is already well in hand. The influence of the soil upon the production of early truck and upon the production of different types of tobacco has also been pointed out in previous publications of the Division. The recent successful growing of Sumatra tobacco on a certain soil in the Connecticut Valley is a very striking instance of the possibility growing out of the detailed soil survey in any given locality.

It may thus be seen that—

The soil is fundamental in its uses. For these reasons the study of the soil must always occupy a fundamental position in the development of the resources of the United States and in the arrangement of its economic conditions. Only within recent years has the great variety which actually exists in the soil resources of the United States been understood. Beginning in 1899 the soil survey of the Bureau of Soils has been engaged in the classification of soils, in the representation, upon soil maps, of the occurrence of the various types discovered, and in the preparation of reports which describe the characteristics and the uses of the different soils encountered. Since the beginning of this work in 1899 approximately 100,000 square miles of the agricultural regions of the United States have been surveyed. Nearly 600 different types of soil have been encountered, and special studies have been made not only of the soils adapted to the growing of the cereal crops, but also of those special-purpose soils which have a high value for the production of fruit of various kinds, of truck, of market-garden crops, of different varieties of tobacco, of sugar beets, and of many newly introduced crops.

Studies along the Atlantic seaboard have demonstrated that the Norfolk sand, Norfolk fine sand, and the Norfolk fine sandy loam are peculiarly adapted to the production of those early vegetables and fruits which furnish the supply for the Northern city markets. It has also been shown in this connection that where transportation is adequate land belonging to these three soil types which formerly had a value of \$5 an acre can readily be made to have a value of from \$100 to \$200 an acre for the production of the truck crops.

The recent importance of the rice industry in Louisiana and Texas has led to investigations of the soils best adapted for growing this crop. It has been found that in general the heavy silt loams and clay loams of the Louisiana and Texas seacoast prairies are well adapted to rice production, and it has been upon soils of this character that the wonderful strides in rice production have been made possible.

Another problem, fundamental and broad in scope, of great present use, and destined to be of the greatest importance in agriculture and to the scientific world, is brought out in the relation of the work to the experiment stations:

The people of the United States are provided in each State and Territory with at least one agricultural college and experiment station where scientific research along agricultural lines is carried on and where information is imparted to the younger members of the community. A vast amount of scientific agricultural work has been accomplished by these colleges and experiment stations. In the nature of the case, however, it is frequently impossible for the agricultural experiments to be conducted at more than one or two places within the State. Experiments conducted in a limited area and upon a few soil types are occasionally not of general application throughout the State whose interests are to be served. In order that these experiment stations may be made of the most direct application to each farming community within the State served, it is necessary for the farmer to know not only the details of any particular experiment, but also for him to be able to judge whether his own farm contains the types of soil upon which the experiment has been carried on and whether it lies within the same general climatic belt as the experiment station itself. If he can be assured of these two facts, it is then possible for him to derive the greatest benefit from the results of any particular experiment. If he can not be assured of these facts, it remains for him to discover whether the conditions under which he is working are the same as those which are found at the experiment station. The soil survey is thus seen to serve not only a local purpose of this kind, but through its general classification of the soils of extensive regions it has frequently occurred that the results secured at a given experiment station become applicable not only with the limits of that State, but are also found to be applicable in other adjoining States, or throughout a considerable region. It thus renders the results of experiments conducted at the various experiment stations applicable throughout a wide range of territory not restricted by State lines.

In the same way extensive studies throughout the Eastern and Northeastern States have shown that many of the so-called "worn-out soils" are not failing to produce satisfactory crops because of any essential deficiency, but that the occasional low producing power of certain areas is due to unwise systems of cropping and of crop rotation and to a failure properly to adapt the crop to the soil and to the climate. The production of cereal crops upon these soils was still essential under agricultural conditions existing from thirty to fifty years ago. Under more recent agricultural conditions now prevailing in the United States, particularly those giving rise to the extensive production of cereal crops upon the prairie lands of the Central and Northwestern States, grain production is no longer profitable in many of the older States.

But of chief importance and value in the aggregate is the information sought by farmers concerning the adaptation of the 400 different kinds of soils already investigated by the Bureau. The development of the country has brought a keen competition between growers in different sections of the country, and in such cases the growers have found that the character of the soil is one of the primary and most essential factors to be considered in the economy of production and that he who has the natural advantage in this respect has little to fear from his competitors, because he is using the soil peculiarly adapted to that crop—an advantage which others of his region seek to overcome by an increased expenditure for fertilizer, cultivation, or both.

But the soils with which they are so vainly striving to succeed may be superior for the production of some other crop, and if they could only understand to what crop the soils they have are best adapted they could thus put them to their most economic use and be as successful financially as the man who already has complete information in regard to the adaptation of his soil to its particular crop. Just as fast as farmers realize this, and at the present time they are doing so by leaps and bounds, by so much are the demands on the Bureau increased. It is the fundamental information about soil adaptation to crops that is so eagerly sought, and it is utterly impossible with present facilities to help more than a small percentage of the applicants. In just the same way it is found that in many areas the crops at present grown in part are not suited to the conditions as well as some other crops might be and that the introduction of some crop new to the locality, which is well adapted to a certain soil type there, might so fit into the plan of farming as to add much to the possibilities of financial success.

It is not feasible, however, to try those new crops unless the soils they are adapted thereto are understood, because hit-or-miss trials are most disastrous, and consequently too expensive to be indulged in. So generally is this recognized that the agriculture of each section remains much as it has been for a long time, whereas if the soil adaptations are worked out in accordance with the plan of the Bureau of Soils the new crop is tried at once upon the soil to which it is adapted. No risks are run, no losses encountered, and financial success is assured. [Applause.]

Such was the work on the tobacco soils and to such extent with the tobacco problems that soils are now chosen by the growers in the leading tobacco districts of the United States, and favorable results are certain from the start, and the industry has been placed on a very permanent and profitable basis.

As another illustration it is found that not only are the different types of soil of widely different value for growing cotton, but also that the different varieties of cotton require different soils for their most profitable growth, and that the working out of the soil preferences for each of the many varieties of this crop is a most necessary, and entirely possible, problem, the solution of which would save the Southern planters hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. Sufficient progress has now been made in soil studies, to be certain that many of our crops are not only grown to the best advantage on certain classes of soils, but that the different varieties thereof are very definite in their soil preferences or requirements.

In my own district there are thousands of acres of land planted to cotton and producing \$10 to \$15 per acre, that could, if devoted to other crops, produce from \$100 to \$500 per acre. Some men have been pioneers in this great work and deserve the "Well done," of every man who delights in the prosperity of his country.

McIver Williamson, of Darlington County, S. C., has revolutionized corn-growing in my State and proven that with proper selection, preparation, fertilization, and cultivation of soil from 75 to 150 bushels of corn can be grown per acre instead of 10 to 15 bushels, as formerly.

Captain Drake, of Marlboro County, some years ago contested for the prize of \$500 offered by Orange Judd Publishing Company for the most corn grown on 1 acre. This was open to every State in the Union. He opened the eyes of the people of this country when he grew 254 bushels and 50 pounds of corn on a measured acre of Marlboro land.

Some years ago the managers of the Raleigh and Charleston Railroad, in their efforts to develop the country through which their road ran, sent a man to Marion, S. C., who sold one crop of lettuce from a single acre of Marion soil for more than \$1,800.

Captain Westbrook, of North Carolina, made \$23,000 above expenses on 20 acres of land, considered by many to be of little value. Strawberries were grown entirely.

Some years ago the News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C., began urging the people of our State to plant tobacco. After a while a few were persuaded to try it. Now my district is the great tobacco section of South Carolina, with warehouses in five towns in my county. One town, Mullins, sells from seven to twelve million pounds of tobacco each year. With this crop men have canceled mortgages on their farms, improved their homes, and are filling our schools and colleges with their sons and daughters.

If individuals can do this working alone, what could this Bureau of Soils do if we would but give them ample funds to employ trained and skilled experts to do this work?

For three years I have endeavored to have this work done in my district. Each time I am told, "The funds are exhausted."

We can appropriate millions for the Army and millions for the Navy, but, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to appropriating the small sum of eleven millions for the great agricultural interests of the country we falter—afraid. I am not opposed to a reasonable Army. Neither am I opposed to a Navy sufficiently strong to defend the exposed cities of our country. But, Mr. Chairman, if we could cover both oceans with the finest warships in the world and have them manned with the most expert gunners on earth, it could not continue the prosperity of this country if the cotton crop, the wheat crop, and the tobacco crop were a failure.

Mr. Chairman, the men who toil in the sunshine and in the rain, in the heat and in the cold—facing difficulties appreciated by few of us—to grow the cotton that clothes the world and the wheat that feeds the world, are, in deed and in truth, American heroes. Some day the American Congress will appreciate their worth and deal with them in a more liberal way. [Loud applause.]

[From New York Tribune, December 30, 1907.]

SOIL EXHAUSTION—ITS AVOIDANCE SOUGHT BY GOVERNMENT SURVEY.
WASHINGTON, December 29, 1907.

The greatest fear of the American soil tillers—exhaustion and unproductiveness of land—is rapidly being dispelled by the experiments and investigations of the Bureau of Soils here. This branch of the Department of Agriculture has received little advertising; it does its work quietly and the cities hear little of it, but to the great and small farming districts, to the hesitating planter, and to the dependent settler it is a great boon and a daily counsellor. It has shown the way to scientific farming, it has made briar patches into grassy, fertile plains, swamps into blooming cornfields, sandy prairies into acres of production. In short, a man can learn in an hour from the Bureau of Soils what his father spent years in ascertaining, and he can learn it with greater accuracy. From a map or a report he can see what crop his land will best produce, what it will not yield, and, perhaps, that it will bring him undreamed of produce and wealth. The Bureau of Soils has made many farmers rich, and the number that make use of the Bureau is increasing daily.

Its possibilities seem unlimited; its results at present are extraordinary, but its scope is of necessity limited because of a lack of funds with which to carry on the work completely and comprehensively. The authorities of the Bureau, under the direction of Prof. Milton Whitney, have asked for \$500,000 for the fiscal year 1909, and they have some assurances that this amount will be appropriated by Congress. Representatives who have studied the workings of the Bureau and who have satisfied themselves of its utility say that half a million is insufficient, and that the tremendous advantages it is working to the country, both monetary and otherwise, warrant a much larger expenditure. The authorities of the Bureau, however, have been wisely modest in their request, and are daily engaged in explaining the work of the institution to all who are interested. What will be accomplished with the \$500,000, if it is granted, can best be gauged by a consideration of what has been done with the \$200,000 spent in 1907.

In the main, the Bureau of Soils devotes a large portion of its attention to surveying, mapping, and classifying the land of the United States and determining the constituents of soil in such a precise manner that a farmer wishing to plant a certain crop can determine in advance the advisability of such a course by a moment's reference to the report of the Bureau. Irrigation and its success must be largely credited to this Department. Reclamation owes its inception to the Bureau; fertilization and erosion are studied in their most technical phases and reported in simple language, while the transplanting of seed and the adaptability of soil complete the main uses of the Bureau.

The maps issued are used not only by farmers and agriculturists but by landowners of all classes, including real estate and railroad men. From every part of the country come requests asking that particular portions of land be surveyed; thousands of maps and reports are asked for, and many letters of appreciation and thanks are on file at the Bureau. To chart every necessary portion of land in the country is the ultimate aim, but at present the Bureau is ten years behind, even in those regions where a survey will mean a certain and immediate increase in the value of soil. More than 40,000 requests come to the Bureau in a year from struggling farmers, from cattle raisers, from important chambers of commerce, from boards of trade, and from various State departments of agriculture and geological surveys. Several States have cooperated with the Bureau to a considerable extent, Alabama having given \$10,000 for this purpose and, it is said, has received thousands in return. Only a small proportion of the requests can be complied with, as the force of surveyors is small. A systematic plan is being followed out, which in the course of time will give satisfaction to all regions, and which an increased appropriation would greatly facilitate.

Mr. LAMB. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

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

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, by the courtesy of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] I shall take advantage of this opportunity to say a few words regarding a matter that I deem of importance to the city of Washington, to the country generally, and especially of sufficient gravity from every point of view to command the immediate attention and consideration of every Member of this Congress. Some time ago legislation was enacted providing that a suitable memorial be erected in the city of Washington to commemorate the memory and achievements of General Grant. No one in all this land is more in favor of erecting an enduring monument in the capital city of the nation to the great military chieftain of the civil war than I am. It is fitting and proper that it should be done, and I want to see it done. The Government owes General Grant a debt that can never be paid. So long as the Government shall endure his glory will be sung in song and in story.

But, sir, the question now is, Where should this memorial be located? The Commission delegated to locate the site for the monument selected, in the first instance, a site in the Ellipse immediately in front of the White House—between the White House and the Washington Monument. That site, in my judgment, was a very proper location and in all respects most suitable. Afterwards, for some reason or other, the Commission abandoned that site and selected the Botanic Garden as the proper place. In my opinion, that change was most unwise and the gravest kind of a mistake. The Botanic Garden for a great many years has been one of the historic landmarks of the District of Columbia, and under the guiding genius of its eminent director, William R. Smith, it has been useful, as well as ornamental. Thousands and thousands of people coming to this city every year visit the Botanic Garden and enjoy its many beauties. It is one of the pleasure resorts of Washington, especially to every man, woman, and child that loves flowers and trees and plants and shrubs.

It is a monument to the energy of Mr. Smith, and no part of it should be desecrated or destroyed. For years trees have been planted in this garden by the most distinguished citizens of our country, and by eminent citizens of other countries, so that to-day it is one of the most interesting and beautiful places for visitors in all the city of Washington. Every spot in it is reminiscent and historical. No part of it should be injured or destroyed, and it is the most unsuitable place that could be selected for a great monument to a military hero. The place selected in the Botanic Garden by the Commission for this Grant Memorial is near the street toward this end. Already excavations have begun and the work of destruction will go on unless we stop it. Anyone who will take the time to visit the

Botanic Garden will see at a glance how inappropriate the place is for a memorial, and how its erection there will necessitate the lasting injury and destruction of a large number of valuable and beautiful and historic trees—especially one great beautiful tree planted by John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky, in 1862, from an acorn which he brought from that famous Commonwealth to commemorate his untiring efforts in endeavoring to bring about peace and stop the deadly conflict between the North and the South.

That tree is one of the most magnificent in all the garden, and is known as the "Crittenden peace tree." Its destruction now would be a shame—a piece of vandalism. That little acorn, planted by the patriotic hand of Senator Crittenden, has grown into a great oak, one of the finest trees in the garden. That tree is an historic landmark and should be sacred from vandal hands. That little acorn—planted there in 1862—to commemorate an heroic effort for peace, to-day, in this great oak tree, exemplifies that peace in its fullest sense, and it would be a desecration—a lamentable desecration—to destroy it. If the monument goes up the tree must be cut down. It can not be saved by removal. According to the judgment of experts who have investigated the matter and who know the most about the subject, it is impossible to dig up so big and so old a tree and transplant it, or to dig up and transplant any of these great and beautiful trees that must be destroyed to make way for the monument. If they are transplanted they will surely die. If the monument work goes ahead these historic trees will be lost.

I am opposed to cutting down these famous trees and destroying one of the chief beauties of the Botanic Garden. It ought not to be done. Congress should stop it, and stop it at once. As I said, I do not believe this site is the best place in Washington for the Grant Monument. It is an out-of-the-way and an obscure place. If erected there, it can not be seen from the Avenue, and this magnificent Grant Memorial should be in a place with sufficient space around it so that it can be seen from all sides and from all directions. The selection of this site in the Botanic Garden is a mistake, and the Commission selecting it should be condemned by a resolution of Congress, and hereafter we should be more careful in appointing men on commissions to select sites for monuments in this city.

The most suitable site in Washington for the Grant Memorial is the first site selected, in the Ellipse between the White House and the Monument. That was General Grant's park. He laid it out, and spent much of his leisure there during the time he was in the White House. Beyond a doubt it is the most suitable and the most appropriate place in Washington for this monument, and the Congress should see to it that it is erected there and kept out of the Botanic Garden.

Now, I want to say that I am in sympathy with those who desire to make Washington the "City Beautiful." I believe it is such to-day, and destined to grow more so as the years come and go. Every citizen in the land should be interested in making the capital of his country the most beautiful city in the world; but we can never do it with commissions composed of men such as we have appointed heretofore. In the future we should select men who know something about art and trees and perspective, and less about law and science and statistics. I am a friend of William R. Smith, the Director of the Botanic Garden—a truly great man; a man who has done a great work for all the people, a world-wide work for this country; a man who has done more in two generations than any other man in all this land to foster and inculcate the love of the beautiful, the love of art, the love of trees and shrubs and plants and flowers; a man who has studied the soil, who has made its arid wastes blossom like a rose, who has cultivated and propagated in the Botanic Garden all kinds of plant life and distributed them to all parts of the country, to grow and blossom and thrive; a man who has made two blades of grass grow where one grew before; a great botanist, a great scientist, a great worker, a thinker—a philosopher, a great horticulturist, a great landscape gardener, a lover of the beautiful in nature; a man who long ago, before Burbank or any other man in this country, experimented with the possibilities of our soil in different parts of the country in order to find out for what it was best adapted and what it would best produce, and, finding it out, worked wonders in every section of this country. I am a friend of this great Scotchman, and I say, and I think we should give heed to his protest against this desecration of the Botanic Garden that he loves so much, that has been in his charge for so many years, and through the agency of which he has done so much to beautify this city and render such inestimable service to every part of the country. We should listen to his protest and save the trees. They can never be transplanted. They can never grow again. Cut them down now and they are gone forever, with all their wealth of beauty and of historical memories.

William R. Smith loves these grand old trees. Let us save them. Let us give heed to his protest and stop the desecration of the Botanic Garden ere it is too late by taking immediate action to prevent the destruction of its trees and finding a more suitable place and a more appropriate site for the Grant Memorial.

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

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is always a great pleasure to me when I can agree with my distinguished friend from New York. I will not undertake to say who originated the idea, but some time ago I introduced in the House a joint resolution changing the location of the Grant Memorial from the place in the Botanic Garden and putting it up on the ellipse which the gentleman is now advocating. On yesterday, however, the fond hopes which I hitherto had had raised in my soul that the resolution might receive a favorable consideration were dashed to the ground by the fact that the gentleman from Georgia, a Democratic Member of the House, and a very distinguished one [Mr. HOWARD], reported from the Committee on the Library that resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it lie upon the table, and there it lies, I suppose never to rise again. And I am sorry to say that the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from New York and myself, both combined or separate, have been unavailing to secure to Mr. Smith, who is entitled, in my judgment, to better treatment, the removal of the Grant Memorial to a place better suited to it than the Botanic Garden and leave the Botanic Garden, as it ought to be left, to botanic garden purposes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, I heard for the past two days the agricultural bill, carrying some eleven millions and odd hundred thousand dollars for the benefit of agriculture, discussed pro and con. This has been a matter of deep interest to me, coming from an agricultural State and coming from the newest State in this entire Union, but I seize these few minutes allotted me to take up another matter that is a local one, but, indeed, a very important one. For the past ten or twelve years the question of admissibility into the Union has been an all-absorbing topic in what was then the Territory of Oklahoma, but now the State of Oklahoma. After the admission of that Territory into the Union we then began to look to our local conditions and matters of local interest. We found that the eastern half of the State, which was then the Indian Territory, now a part of Oklahoma, comprises about 19,000,000 acres of land, and we found that 16,000,000 acres of the 19,000,000 acres was not subject to taxation, was not subject to alienation, was not subject to incumbrance, but was tied up for all purposes. These lands belong, by allotment and their apportionment, to 101,000 Indians. These Indians are known as the "Five Civilized Tribes," and for the hasty presentation that I want to make I desire to divide them into four different classes. The first is that of freedmen, or the negro; second, the intermarried white; third, the mixed blood, and fourth, the full blood. Just a moment, by way of explanation, as to what these four classes embrace. Intermarried citizens are the white citizens who have intermarried into some one of these tribes. The freedman is the negro who was originally a slave to some one of these Indian tribes, but who was long ago emancipated—I might say, more than fifty years ago. The mixed blood, you may well draw your own conclusions, are Indians who have mixed with white blood and the degree of blood is shown upon the official roll in the Interior Department. It might be interesting to know just how these different classes are numbered and what proportion they bear to the whole 101,000. Of full bloods there are 24,669; of mixed blood, 50,670; of intermarried, 2,506; of freedmen, 23,382.

Mr. GARRETT. That is the whole State.

Mr. FERRIS. That comprises the eastern half of the State and comprises what is known as the "Five Civilized Tribes." I want to say that the Five Civilized Tribes stand, as far as the Indian situation is concerned, separate and apart and alone from any other Indian of the State. Half of my Congressional district is in old Oklahoma and half in the Indian Territory. On the Oklahoma side we have Indians that are Indians in the true sense of the word. They are Indians that are Indians, many of whom are not competent to contract, not now entitled to have the restrictions off from the sale of their land, but the Indians on the Indian Territory side I contend, and I believe it is almost the entire belief of the citizenship of my State, should have the restrictions removed for the good of the Indian

and for the good of the white citizen and for the progress and development of the State.

Before the State was admitted, and after it was admitted, and during the election, and the formation of the constitution, the question of removal of restrictions, as we call it—in short, to let them enjoy their property rights as other citizens—was debated at length. And on this I wish to say that there never was among the Indians or among the whites in Oklahoma a belief other than the fact that they should be hurriedly removed, all excepting the full bloods. Immediately after the Oklahoma delegation came to Congress, five in the House and two in the Senate, we began to take up the matter with the Indian Office and the Secretary of the Interior. We recognized in them a long experience with Indians, we recognized that they knew much about the local situation, we were anxious to work in conjunction with them, anxious to accomplish all we could side by side with them. They were courteous to us, and we were eager to work with them. Day after day we met and talked over the question of Indian restrictions. Meeting after meeting we had and talked over that question.

I had ideas, other members of the delegation had ideas, the Secretary had ideas, the Indian Office had ideas, and their attorneys had ideas, but finally we got our ideas all together and introduced a bill that we all agreed to stand by. That bill reaches this far and no further. But before discussing it I desire to say I wish it went further. I believe the interests of my State demand that it should go further. I believe the interests of the Indians demand that it should go further, and that the interests of the white men demand it go further. But I will not debate my own inclination, neither will I debate the inclinations of the citizenship of my State, but I do desire for a few moments to discuss the provisions of that bill that we have all agreed upon. That bill, if you please, starts out—and I will refer again to the four classes that I have jotted down for my own satisfaction—and removes the restrictions on the freedmen. Is there a man in this House that knows any reason why the restrictions should not be removed on the freedmen? They were negro slaves fifty years ago, but were emancipated even prior to the time that the slaves of the United States proper, the slaves of the white citizens, were emancipated. The Indians emancipated their slaves, those of the Five Civilized Tribes, prior to the emancipation of slaves in 1865. Can anyone understand or know why that bill should not pass as far as the freedmen are concerned? They have been very fortunate to share in that very valuable estate. They have been very fortunate to get on those rolls and be allotted all the way from 160 to 320 acres of valuable land. I see no reason why the restrictions should be kept on them longer. I do not believe it will be the disposition of this House to keep them on longer. I urge you, as a Representative from that State, not to do it.

Next we come to the intermarried white citizens. Can any Member of this House, can any fair-minded, thinking man know of any reason why a white citizen that goes down there and marries an Indian citizen, who, after being entitled to allotment, and after being entitled to derive all the advantages that the Indian citizen does—can anyone have any reason or any idea or offer any explanation why restrictions should not be removed? [Applause.]

The mixed blood of less than half Indian blood. Do you know what class of citizens they are? They are men just like CARTER of the House and Senator OWEN of the Senate. Do you think it is right for this Congress to say who CARTER should sell his land to? Do you think it is right to say who Senator OWEN should sell his land to? Do you think it would be right to force a citizen who has a little strain of Indian blood in his veins, but whose business acumen and whose zeal and business ability is above the average, to be and remain tied hand and foot regarding the control of his property, and be tied and hampered by refusing him the right to deal with his property in an untrammelled way? Surely this House can not do or say that and surely it will not attempt to do so. This bill that the Department has drawn up, and the entire delegation has agreed to support, and the Indian Committee now has in charge only provides that they be turned loose and act as other men may act.

I can not but say in the same regard, and while we are dealing with this class, that this class of Indian citizens, if they may be called Indians at all, are at the head of banking institutions of my State, are good lawyers, at the head of the best institutions of the State, and there is no occasion for any further restrictions, nor has there been for the last decade of years. Of course, while we were a Territory and largely under Federal control and restraint there was some little excuse for such paternalism, but since the State has been admitted as a sov-

ereign State, and in the enabling act specifically reciting that they were full citizens and clothed with every power, surely the Government does not longer care to force restraint and restrictions upon a class of people who are holding the best offices in the State, some of the most competent in the State, educated, and with almost unusual business tact. It is not best for them; "it is not best for the Government;" it is not best for the State, and if this Congress can but understand and believe the facts as they there exist, they will not permit them longer to exist.

The next provision of the bill relates to those of more than half Indian blood and of full bloods. The bill does not remove the restrictions from them, but retains to the Interior Department, as it has been heretofore. I submit this Congress can not object to this provision; I submit there is no authority farmed out here, but all retained by the Department, which, of course, is under the supervision of Congress.

We of the delegation had hoped that the matter might be left to the courts of the State to determine when they were competent to transact their own business. We had from experience learned that government at long range was never satisfactory. While it looks all right and bears every earmark of fairness to let the Interior Department retain control, still knowing as we do the impossibility of transacting the business in person, knowing further as we do of the delays, the attorneys' fees the long trips to Washington, and the red tape, we had hoped to have that authority vested in the State courts, so they could examine each case and pass on the merits hurriedly and upon proof. But we will not debate our inclinations, and will hurriedly say, surely there can be no objection to this provision at the hands of Congress, for they are retaining all they had and so is the Interior Department.

I think it is the duty of this Congress to look to the welfare of the Indian citizen of our State next to the general welfare of the State, which is the youngest child of this Union. I take it that they are both indeed important, and this Congress is anxious indeed to carefully and painstakingly look after them both. This bill renders the Indians a great service, because it will help them to improve their homes and make their lands productive. It helps them because they will have public roads, public bridges, public schools, churches, and all the modern civilizing influences that walk hand in hand with these indispensable virtues. It helps the State because it will put about 6,000,000 acres of land on the tax rolls, will furnish thousands of homes for the homeless, and that will help them to maintain the State. You will remember that there are nineteen million in all; that three million have already been removed; that this bill will remove about six million more, and that will leave about ten million on the rolls free from taxes and free from power to sell, alienate, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of according to their will and wish.

This, of course, is but a terse statement of the effect it will have, for you will remember that the recent census tells us that the Indian Territory has a population of about 700,000 people and that about 101,000 of them are Indian citizens. So you see of the 600,000 class there are many bright-eyed boys and girls who would like to own their own home; would like to have a school to go to; would like to have a church to go to on Sunday; would like to have their parent freed from the taxation that almost amounts to confiscation for the little personal property they have; would like to have each person there pay a little; would like to have the soil share the burdens; would like to have a home they could call their own and not live as tenants all their lives. Let the land prosper and improve! Let the Indian prosper and improve! But let them come side by side in the grand new State of Oklahoma.

To-day in Oklahoma there is the warmest feeling between the two races. There is the warmest kindred spirit. There is the highest degree of brotherly love extant. Now, with this in view, let the Indian citizen be a free man. Let the white man own his own home. Let the State prosper and improve. Let Congress delegate to fair Oklahoma and her citizenship the same courtesies and kindnesses now that she did when they said every man within the State of Oklahoma should be a full citizen and clothed with all the rights of a citizen.

To-day in Oklahoma there is no red man, no white man, but one united citizenship. The Indian citizens, though largely in the minority, have been elected to the highest offices in the land—that of the Senate and Member of Congress. They are in the State legislature and the State senate that is now in session. They hold the major portion of the county offices on that side of the State. They are equal before the law of the State and nation, save and except for the restraint placed upon their lands. The kindest feeling exists between the two races. We are proud to find a clause in the enabling act that makes them

full citizens. We believe them to be full citizens. We stand side by side with them in all their undertakings.

It is a feeling to be applauded. It is right and it is proper. We are anxious to have it always remain the same. We find among them prodigates, the same as we do among the other races; but no more. We find lack of frugality there, as we find it everywhere else. We also find among them brainy lawyers—honest and upright citizenship and honor and intelligence walking hand in hand with the white race of Oklahoma and of other States.

Oversentimental men point to isolated cases where Indians have been defrauded out of their lands, and they offer that as an excuse for further denial of freedom and of right. But that is an unfair test, for it is quite true in dealing with more than a hundred thousand people, I care not of what race or persuasion, there will be weaklings; there will be men unable to cope with the skill, zeal, and overzealous brother even of the same race or persuasion.

No; that is not a fair test. The true test should be, What will benefit the largest number? And about this I submit there can be no doubt. Practically all will be benefited and few harmed.

And let me suggest for the benefit of those who we will concede may not act wisely with their estates that the State is well able to care for them and will do so.

I am going to say that the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in the major portion of cases are holding more land than they can hold profitably and more than they desire to hold themselves. We take a pencil and begin to calculate and we find that on the average they only have about 190 acres per capita. Many would at first blush say: "Why that is not too much land for one farmer to own," and while, in my judgment, it is, for small farms well tilled and well improved are always best, still it is not unreasonable, at least. But when you come to think that every member of the family has 190 acres as distinguished from heads of families, you can at once realize what I mean by saying they are land ridden and land poor. Example: Suppose Mr. "A" has a wife and eight children. This, as we will all agree, constitutes a total of ten in that one family. Now, multiply that ten by 190 acres, the per capita amount for big, little, old, and young, and we find one family with 1,900 acres of land. I am going to make the bold assertion that 1,900 acres of land are too much for a family of moderate or no means to own. It is more than they can till. It is more than they can use. It is more than they need. It holds the value of their own land back to permit it to lie idle. It retards the growth of the country; it denies the Indian family of close proximity with neighbors and home owners who would help to improve the country, help to improve the Indian citizen, help to maintain the State and to in all things accomplish the purpose of nature when she bequeathed this earth of ours to us as a sovereign race.

Now, in addition to the countless benefits that the Indian citizen would derive from the release of this restriction, you would give six-sevenths of the entire population of that half of the State a chance to help build up and improve the country, a chance to help build roads, build churches, build schoolhouses, help them to an opportunity to own their own homes, and make use of land that to-day lies idle. There are two sides of this matter. The Indian citizen comprises 101,000, the white citizen 600,000 on that side of the State and 1,300,000 in the entire State. These white brothers have helped make that a good State. They have brought their families from their homes and from old, tried, and true conditions into that frontier and helped make the land that was worth \$1.25 per acre worth forty and fifty. They have left friends and settled conditions in the old home States to take up that new home in that new country. They have denied their bright-eyed boys and girls, that they love the same as you love yours, the right to have free schools, the right to live in their own homes, the right to live near churches, the right to have roads on the section lines. They have been forced to raise their families in poorly constructed tenant houses. They have been forced to deny their faithful wives and mothers the comforts and blessings of that one green spot called "home." These are some of the things that they have undergone to make Oklahoma what it is to-day, thus patiently and uncomplainingly awaiting a time when Congress could know of their conditions and could and would remedy them and relieve them.

To-day the State is new. To-day the closest ties of friendship exist between the two races. There is no doubt about that. Then, in the light of this, let me urge this Congress to do nothing, or, rather, do not refuse to do the one thing that will let this happy situation ever attend the two races. I speak of it in a spirit of delicacy when I say that if one race was continu-

ally discriminated against, and, in turn, the other race continually discriminated for, it would in time work an unfriendly feeling that would work to the disadvantage of the weaker race. I submit this is true of principle, true of experience and logic that will stand alone the world around.

We urge you to pass this bill that the Interior Department wants and has agreed to support; one that the Indian Office wants and agrees to support and aid with; a bill that was drawn by the Department; a bill that every member of the Oklahoma delegation has agreed to support, of course having a few mental reservations; but in substance it is right. The main criticism we have offered and urged was that it did not go far enough—a bill that is the product of many meetings, many conferences in which all of the Oklahoma Members were present, including the two United States Senators, and always including the Interior Department and the Indian Office; a bill that does not harm a hair in the head of any; a bill that does not touch the lands of the full bloods at all; a bill that does not touch the homesteads of those of half and more Indian blood; a bill that removes restrictions from a class of people who never have needed this restraint, for the ones affected by this bill are mostly people who have no Indian blood at all in their veins, but became a part of the tribes by marriage or as former slaves. And for the class of mixed bloods of less than half, you are dealing with men who are the best qualified business men in our country.

I earnestly ask for this bill, for it can not be wrong. I earnestly ask for this bill because it is a step in the right direction; I earnestly ask for this bill because it will help both white and red citizens; I earnestly ask that this bill be passed, for the State needs it badly, and you alone have power to give it. [Applause.] Idle lands as rich as the Nile in this twentieth century should be used. Industrious, frugal people should have the opportunity to own a home. Idle land does not produce and renders no one an advantage. You will not live to learn of your mistake if you pass this agreed bill. Oklahoma and her entire citizenship will suffer if you do not pass the bill. Oklahoma will rejoice if you pass the bill. In the name of no class, in the name of no race, in the name of no special interest, but in the name of great and small, weak and strong, red and white, and of the million and a half of people within the borders of Oklahoma, I ask for the passage of this bill. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

For the benefit of those who desire information in detail as to the quantum of Indian blood, as shown by the official rolls of the Interior Department, I will append to my remarks a tabulated statement which affords that information.

Statement of Indians, by blood, on the rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes. ADULTS.

Degree of blood.	Choctaw.	Chickasaw.	Creek.	Cherokee.	Seminole.	Registered Delawares. ^a	Total.
Full	4,178	848	3,256	3,581	649	126	12,638
15/16				1			1
7/8	26	8	17	61			112
13/16				6			6
3/4	338	119	196	676	7	16	1,352
23/32				1			1
11/16	3	1					4
5/8	21	7	30	69			127
9/16	2			5			7
1/2	678	279	475	1,556	183	27	3,198
7/16	3	3		7			13
13/32				1			1
3/8	112	57	33	270		1	473
11/32				1			1
5/16	13	2	1	33			49
9/32	1			16			17
17/64				2			2
1/4	596	215	322	1,799	10	19	2,961
7/32				1			1
3/16	42	10	2	105			160
5/32	1			15			16
9/64				1			1
1/8	408	199	205	1,823		5	2,730
8/32	4	2		20			26
5/64				2			2
1/16	335	157	63	2,072		3	2,630
7/128				1			1
3/64				3			3
1/32				2			2
1/64	150	60	21	801			1,032
1/128	6	7	2	99			114
1/256				14			14
				1			1
Total	6,977	1,974	4,623	13,045	810	197	27,635
1/2 blood and less.	2,409	991	1,124	8,645	198	55	13,417

^a Net registered Delawares.

Statement of Indians by blood, etc.—Continued.

MINORS.

Degree of blood.	Choc-taw.	Chicka-saw.	Creek.	Chero-kee.	Semi-nole.	Total.
Full	4,141	690	3,556	3,620	750	12,157
15/16	9		4	15		28
29/32				1		1
7/8	155	54	144	298		651
53/64						1
13/16	5	1	8	24		38
3/4	274	136	354	650	169	1,583
23/32				1		2
11/16	12	11	6	11		40
21/32	1					2
5/8	168	44	119	197	4	472
9/16	16	1	12	29		58
17/32	2	2	4	7		15
1/2	956	545	664	1,372	211	3,748
15/32	2			2		4
7/16	49	13	9	112		183
13/32				27		29
49/128				2		2
3/8	423	212	206	1,178	9	2,028
13/32				1		1
23/64				6		6
11/32	7	3		10		20
43/128				1		1
5/16	68	29	39	181		317
19/64	3			1		4
9/32	13	5	3	85		106
17/64	3					3
1/4	1,331	499	610	2,226	134	4,800
7/32	8	6				58
13/64				12		12
25/128				1		1
3/16	250	111	52	525		938
11/61				10		10
1/6				2		2
5/32	20	18	3	401		442
9/64	3	5		37		45
17/128				3		3
65/512				4		4
1/8	1,416	473	763	3,536	12	6,200
13/128				1		1
3/32	106	18	5	157		286
5/64	4	1		25		30
9/128			1	12		13
1/16	1,360	406	571	3,564		5,901
1/18				1		1
7/128				3		3
3/64	8	3		66		77
1/32	949	343	108	3,968		5,368
1/64	333	70	29	1,387		1,819
1/128	23	9		118		150
1/256				11		11
Total	12,059	3,710	7,272	23,345	1,289	47,675
1/2 blood and less	7,335	2,771	3,063	19,092	266	32,627

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the usual leave.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19158—the agricultural appropriation bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Mr. BEDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 18450.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18450) authorizing the construction of a railroad bridge over the Mississippi River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 17050.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17050) to amend section 18 of an act entitled "An act to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to enable the people

of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," approved June 16, 1906, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WEBB. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection until I can state the object of this bill.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. STURGISS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of Willis B. Cross (H. R. 19532, 60th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

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

S. 3126. An act to carry into effect the judgment of the Court of Claims in favor of the contractors for building the U. S. battle ship *Indiana*—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1368. An act to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amounts paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4713. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands belonging to the Indians on the Siletz Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 568. An act for the relief of Capt. George Van Orden, United States Marine Corps—to the Committee on Claims.

S. C. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution directing an examination of Pigeon River, at Port Sheldon, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 5530. An act to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 5262. An act to repeal an act approved April 30, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes," and for other purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

S. 158. An act for the establishment of a park at the junction of Maryland avenue, Fifteenth street, and H street, NE., Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 4545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept conveyances to the United States of lands from the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2969. An act for the relief of O. Maury & Co., of Bordeaux, France—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5617. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept and care for gifts presented to vessels of the Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 4687. An act to relieve William G. Gosslin and his assigns of and from the effect of a release made by him and his wife, Marthena Gosslin, of certain land in California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 5938. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war, and certain widows and helpless and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5594. An act for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at or near the easterly end of Michigan Island, Apostle Group, westerly end of Lake Superior, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 513. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Maryville, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 3722. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act providing for second and additional homestead entries, and for other purposes," approved April 28, 1904—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6071. An act 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—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 5123. An act to authorize the extension of the public building in the city of Manchester, N. H., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 2671. An act authorizing extra officers for the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4749. An act for the relief of Dewitt Eastman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6006. An act to correct the military record of John M. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5473. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy in certain cases to mitigate or remit the loss of rights of citizenship imposed by law upon deserters from the naval service—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 4856. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to lease San Clemente Island, California, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3969. An act to amend the laws of the United States relating to the registration of trade-marks—to the Committee on Patents.

S. 5983. An act authorizing certain life-saving apparatus to be placed at the Farallone Islands, off the coast of California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 6192. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war, and to certain widows and helpless and dependent children of such soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. C. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution directing a survey of certain waters in the State of Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE. *

Mr. PARSONS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence until April 1, 1908, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 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 J. W. Cloyd, administrator of estate of J. W. Cloyd, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, papers relating to the claim of Albert Nelson, of Allendale, Cal., for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions and letter only 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. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18618) fixing the status of the Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1305), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19364) ratifying bonds of road district No. 1, Maricopa County, Ariz., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1306), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19411) authorizing the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to issue bonds to the amount of \$15,000 for the purpose of constructing dams and dikes for protection against glacier streams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1307), 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. 15438) for the establishment and organization of a corps of trained women nurses for the United States Navy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1309), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LOUD, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7578) to purchase three new steam colliers, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1310), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 157) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point, Mr. Colon Eloy Alfaro, of Ecuador, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1304), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5589) 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, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1311), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19863) 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, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1312), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17276) for the relief of S. R. Hurley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1313), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13586) for the relief of William Radcliffe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1314), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6032) to pay to the administratrix of the estate of George W. Fleming for services rendered as letter-box inspector from March 29, 1902, to June 13, 1903, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1315), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11632) for the relief of Phoebe Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1316), 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. 11388) granting a pension to Margaret Shea—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15638) granting an increase of pension to Ben de Lemos—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. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 19859) to provide for the payment of certain volunteers who rendered service to the Territory of Oregon in the Cayuse Indian war of 1847 and 1848—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 19860) to authorize grants of land in national forests for cemetery purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGGOTT: A bill (H. R. 19861) to amend an act entitled "An act creating the Mesa Verde National Park," approved June 29, 1906—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 19862) for the removal of obstacles from R street, between Eckington place and Second street NE.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Pensions: A bill (H. R. 19863) 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—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 19864) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 19865) to provide mail clerks on naval vessels—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 19912) for the improvement of the Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 157) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point, Mr. Colon Eloy Alfaro, of Ecuador—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. AMES: Resolution (H. Res. 313) to pay to John P. Kenney a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PAYNE: Resolution (H. Res. 314) concerning the special message of the President of the United States of March 25, 1908—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 19866) granting an increase of pension to James J. Book—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 19867) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Austin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19868) granting a pension to Amalie Schmitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19869) granting an increase of pension to David Wills—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 19870) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 19871) for the relief of Sanford A. Pinyan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 19872) granting a pension to Delia A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLISON: A bill (H. R. 19873) for the relief of the legal representatives of William P. Bird—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 19874) for the relief of Louis S. Barrett—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAULFIELD: A bill (H. R. 19875) to place the name of Charles A. Coulson upon the muster-in roll of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 19876) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Sargent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 19877) granting an increase of pension to Edgar M. Lull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19878) granting an increase of pension to Rollin S. Burbank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 19879) granting an increase of pension to William R. Dodsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 19880) granting a pension to Baker W. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 19881) granting a pension to Mary A. Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 19882) granting an increase of pension to Warren Mallory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19883) granting an increase of pension to D. R. Jamison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 19884) granting a pension to James W. McLaughlan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 19885) for the relief of the heirs of John Fox, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19886) for the relief of the heirs of Aaron S. Printz, late of Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19887) for the relief of the heirs of John Sours, late of Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 19888) granting an increase of pension to John E. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 19889) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19890) to correct the military record of Milton Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOFF: A bill (H. R. 19891) granting an increase of pension to Duncan C. Milner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 19892) granting an increase of pension to Henry Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANING: A bill (H. R. 19893) for the relief of Thomas J. Shocker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 19894) granting a pension to William H. Long—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 19895) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Bayles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 19896) for the relief of Elizabeth Jane Bruce, Forest M. Bruce, Virgil W. Bruce, Anna B. Bruce, Warren W. Bruce, Jessie C. Bruce, Lizzie M. Bruce, Leni Lorena Ward, Lina Agnes Ward, Roy Edward Ward, Ola Ann Ward, Susan Ann Ward, Verna Ward, Gladys Ward, and Marguerite Ward—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 19897) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 19898) for the relief of George Palmer—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 19899) for the relief of Hugh E. Carney, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 19900) to correct the military record of Hugh Reid and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 19901) granting a pension to Clara S. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 19902) granting an increase of pension to William J. Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 19903) granting an increase of pension to Milton Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 19904) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Norman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19905) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Cowart—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 19906) for the relief of A. H. Thompson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19907) for the relief of the estate of Joseph M. Wade, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULTON: A bill (H. R. 19908) granting an increase of pension to William E. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19909) for the relief of James B. Houston—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STURGISS: A bill (H. R. 19910) providing for the payment of the amounts due the employees in and the contractors who furnished castings to the United States armory at Harpers Ferry, Va., from January 1, 1861, to April 19, 1861, inclusive—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19911) to correct the military record of Willis B. Cross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, for H. R. 6169, to promote efficiency of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of North American Fish and Game Protective Association, for a treaty with Canada for protection of fisheries interests in the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Grant Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Milton Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Petitions of International Union of United Brewery Workmen and Machinists' Helpers' Union No. 9713, against decisions of the courts relative to labor unions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Goshen Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of First Baptist Church of China, Me., for the Sims prohibitory bill—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of South Montville (Me.) Grange, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of William P. Bird—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of voters of Sixth Congressional District, against the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Republican county committee of New York, for legislation to enable reenlistment of innocent soldiers of the Brownsville affair, without loss of time, rank, or pay, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of National Association of Manufacturers, for forest reservations in White Mountains and Southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Association of Clothiers, for the Fowler currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAULFIELD: Petitions of International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen and District Council of Cement Workers, of St. Louis, for building of war ships in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of W. D. Hixon and Valley Grange, No. 878, Patrons of Husbandry, of Somerset County, Pa., for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, for temperance legislation—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alonzo E. Chadwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petitions of citizens of Franklin, Juniata, and Huntingdon counties, Pa., for S. 3152, for additional protection to the dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Thomas J. Abbott, of Rockford, Ill., for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of National Guard Association of Illinois, for H. R. 14783, to promote efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of E. J. Parker, for incorporation of clearing houses—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Oklahoma, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oklahoma, against the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOULDEN: 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. HAYES: Petition of G. K. Edwards and 65 other citizens of San Jose, Cal., asking for an oriental-exclusion act and protesting against the extension of the right of naturalization—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of Commercial Club of Faribault, Minn., indorsing the Nelson amendment to the Aldrich currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of International Machinists' Association, of Jersey City, against any treaty of arbitration with Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Metal Polishers' Union of Newark, for battle-ship building in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Palestine Lodge, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Jersey City, for La Follette-Sterling employers' liability bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Natchaug Grange, of Chaplin, Conn., for H. R. 15837 (Currier good-roads bill)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Torrington, Conn., against treaty of arbitration with Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Emmet Club of Danbury, Conn., against arbitration treaty with Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Society of Stamford, Conn., against prohibition legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Dalla Seabury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Metal Polishers' Union of Newark, N. J., for battle-ship building in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Newark Credit Men's Association, for the amendments to the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWLAND: Petition of O. F. Frazer and 47 other citizens of Chagrin Falls, Ohio, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of San Francisco Chapter of American Institute of Architects, favoring uniform plan for improvement of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: Petition of citizens of Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin, against a tariff on oil and coal—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of citizens of Howard County, Ind., favoring passage of Sherwood bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Indianapolis, favoring increase of pay of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Kokomo, Ind., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Kokomo, Ind., against sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of Commercial Club of Faribault, for H. R. 18204—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Commercial Club of Faribault, for Nelson amendment to Aldrich bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Travelers' Goods and Leather Novelty Workers, against any prohibition legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of Tri-City Building Trades Association, of Rock Island, Moline, and Davenport, against the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Robert Emmet Association, against treaty of arbitration with Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLCOTT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Richard H. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of Sara Lang Kahn, of Indianapolis, for appropriation in aid of the Lincoln Farm Memorial—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Mary E. Walters—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Clifton Springs (N. Y.) Grange, No. 1042, favoring a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of District Council No. 2, Metal Polishers' Union, of Newark, N. J., for shipbuilding in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Newark Association of Credit Men, for amendment to bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 126, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers, of Newark, N. J., against prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of S. C. Baylor and other citizens of Illinois, against the Penrose bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of A. C. Gaylord and others, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, for construction of battle ships in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Michael Kruzka, president Polish Newspaper Association of America, favoring the Bates resolution of sympathy for the Prussian Poles—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Chapter American Institute of Architects, for present site of the Grant Memorial—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of American Wine Growers' Association, against the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring H. R. 6169 and 7597—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, for the Justice currency bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Citizens' Supply Company, of Columbus, Ohio, against H. R. 171 and 172, relative to drugs under pure-food act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of Travelers' Goods and Leather Novelty Workers, against prohibition legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chicago Architectural Club, favoring present site of Grant Memorial—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of citizens of New York, in favor of Kittredge bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of Hudson (Mass.) Grange and Gardner Grange, favoring a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of F. Z. Harrington and others, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Saratoga Grange, No. 25, Patrons of Husbandry, for S. 3152, additional protection to dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. H. Dotterer Subdivision, No. 166, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Carbondale, Pa., for S. 4260 and 5307 and H. R. 17036 and 17137—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ben de Lemos (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 26, 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. CULBERSON, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

SENATOR FROM MARYLAND.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. John Walter Smith, Senator-elect from the State of Maryland. I ask that they be read and filed, and, the Senator-elect being present, I ask that he be sworn after the reading of the credentials.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland presents the credentials of the Senator-elect from Maryland, which will be read.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Curtis	Guggenheim	Perkins
Allison	Depew	Heyburn	Platt
Bankhead	Dick	Hopkins	Rayner
Borah	Dillingham	Johnston	Richardson
Brandegee	Dolliver	Kean	Simmons
Brown	du Pont	Knox	Smith
Bulkeley	Flint	Lodge	Smoot
Burkett	Forker	Long	Stephenson
Burnham	Foster	McCreary	Sutherland
Burrows	Frazier	McEnery	Taylor
Clay	Frye	McLaurin	Teller
Crane	Gallinger	Nelson	Warner
Culbertson	Gamble	Overman	Warren
Cullom	Gary	Paynter	Wetmore

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Secretary will read the credentials presented by the Senator from Maryland.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 25th day of March, 1908, John Walter Smith was, in accordance with law, duly chosen by the legislature of the State of Maryland a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired portion

of the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1903, to fill the vacancy caused by the decease of Hon. William Pinkney Whyte. Witness his excellency our governor and our seal hereto affixed at Annapolis this 25th day of March, in year of our Lord 1908.

AUSTIN L. CROTHERS.

By the Governor:
[SEAL.]

N. WINSLOW WILLIAMS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, the Senator-elect being present, I ask that he be sworn.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I am constrained to object to the oath of office being administered to Mr. Smith under the circumstances of this case. I do not think his election by the legislature of the State of Maryland is in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the United States. The Federal Constitution, Article I, section 4, provides that—

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Exercising its prerogative under that provision of the Constitution the Congress on the 25th of July, 1866, passed the following act:

REVISED STATUTES, TITLE II, CHAPTER I—ELECTION OF SENATORS.

SEC. 14. The legislature of each State which is chosen next preceding the expiration of the time for which any Senator was elected to represent such State in Congress shall, on the second Tuesday after the meeting and organization thereof, proceed to elect a Senator in Congress.

SEC. 15. Such election shall be conducted in the following manner: Each house shall openly, by a viva voce vote of each member present, name one person for Senator in Congress from such State, and the name of the person so voted for, who receives a majority of the whole number of votes cast in each house, shall be entered on the journal of that house by the clerk or secretary thereof; or if either house fails to give such majority to any person on that day, the fact shall be entered on the journal. At 12 o'clock meridian of the day following that on which proceedings are required to take place as aforesaid, the members of the two houses shall convene in joint assembly, and the journal of each house shall then be read, and if the same person has received a majority of all the votes in each house, he shall be declared duly elected Senator. But if the same person has not received a majority of the votes in each house, or if either house has failed to take proceedings as required by this section, the joint assembly shall then proceed to choose, by a viva voce of each member present, a person for Senator, and the person who receive a majority of all the votes of the joint assembly, a majority of all the members elected to both houses being present and voting, shall be declared duly elected. If no person receives such majority on the first day, the joint assembly shall meet at 12 o'clock meridian of each succeeding day during the session of the legislature, and shall take at least one vote, until a Senator is elected.

SEC. 16. Whenever on the meeting of the legislature of any State a vacancy exists in the representation of such State in the Senate, the legislature shall proceed, on the second Tuesday after meeting and organization, to elect a person to fill such vacancy, in the manner prescribed in the preceding section for the election of a Senator for a full term.

SEC. 17. Whenever during the session of the legislature of any State a vacancy occurs in the representation of such State in the Senate, similar proceedings to fill such vacancy shall be had on the second Tuesday after the legislature has organized and has notice of such vacancy.

The constitutionality of this act has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States and sustained.

It will be observed that this act prescribes the method of procedure for the election of a Senator under three different conditions: First, at the beginning of a full term; second, for filling a vacancy which happens during a recess of the legislature; and, third, for filling a vacancy happening when the legislature is in session.

The case now before the Senate arises under section 17 of this act, which is as follows:

SEC. 17. Whenever, during the session of the legislature of any State, a vacancy occurs in the representation of such State in the Senate, similar proceedings to fill such vacancy shall be had on the second Tuesday after the legislature has organized and has notice of such vacancy.

The Senate will observe that the proceedings for the election of a Senator at the beginning of a term are as follows:

The legislature of each State which is chosen next preceding the expiration of the time for which any Senator was elected to represent such State in Congress shall, on the second Tuesday after the meeting and organization thereof, proceed to elect a Senator in Congress.

Section 17 modifies the general course of procedure only in providing that the legislature shall proceed on the second Tuesday after the legislature has organized and has notice of such vacancy.

It appears from the certificate presented and the records of the Senate that this election on the 25th day of March was not the second Tuesday after the organization of the legislature and notification of the vacancy.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to inquire from the Senator what is the section of the act he is reading from?

Mr. BURROWS. Sections 16 and 17 of the Revised Statutes, commencing with section 14.

It seems from these credentials and from the records of the Senate that this election did not occur on the second Tuesday